Summer 2016

Birth of a Powerhouse: How One University Reimagined, Restructured, and Revived Outreach

Slone H. Cansler
Western Kentucky University, scansler@murraystate.edu

Recommended Citation

BIRTH OF A POWERHOUSE: HOW ONE UNIVERSITY REIMAGINED,
RESTRUCTURED, AND REVIVED OUTREACH

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In partial fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

By
Slone Hutchison Cansler

August 2016

BIRTH OF A POWERHOUSE: HOW ONE UNIVERSITY REIMAGINED, RESTRUCTURED, AND REVIVED OUTREACH

Date Recommended ___7/18/16___

(signature)
_____
Barbara Burch, Chair

(signature)
_____
Randy Capps

(signature)
_____
Tim Todd

(signature)
_____
Don Swoboda

(signature) ___8/8/16___
_____
Dean, Graduate School   Date

This work is dedicated to my children, Cole and Katie, who always help me remember that we should never give up on what we want. Their patience, curiosity, and passion for this project pushed me forward when my own motivation was spent.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this work would not have been possible without many, important people who have supported, loved, encouraged, and pushed me to the finish line.

To my family, friends, and coworkers who have served as a great source of support and encouragement during this time, thank you just doesn't seem to be enough. I've lost count of the things I've missed in the four years since the focus of my energy became weekend classes, weeknights studying, and endless hours spent researching and writing. I am blessed beyond measure with an amazing, support system made up of people who never made me feel guilty for not being there, always understood why I wasn't, and provided endless reminders that it would all be worth it in the end. Your love and support amazes me and I will forever be thankful for all you've given me.

To Dr. Barbara Burch, who absolutely knows more about higher education than anyone else I've ever met, thank you for your guidance, support, and wisdom about this project. You have provided me with encouragement to see things with fresh eyes and not to fear the road less traveled.

To Dr. Don Swoboda, Dr. Tim Todd, and Dr. Randy Capps, that you for investing your time in me and this project. To my cohort VIII colleagues and partners in crime, you were absolutely my rocks and words cannot express how much I valued your encouragement and friendship on this journey. To the faculty and staff of the WKU Educational Leadership Doctoral program, thank you, for investing your time, energy, and talent in all of us with just enough curiosity to be dangerous.

Finally, thank you to the brave souls who agreed to be interviewed for this study. This research could not have taken place without your willingness to share your thoughts, feelings, and experiences with me. Spending time talking with each of you was a privilege and I feel honored to be the one who gets to tell your stories.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

.

BIRTH OF A POWERHOUSE: HOW ONE UNIVERSITY REIMAGINED,
RESTRUCTURED, AND REVIVED OUTREACH

Slone Hutchison Cansler   August 2016   112 Pages

Directed by: Barbara Burch, Randy Capps, Don Swoboda, and Tim Todd

Educational Leadership Doctoral Program   Western Kentucky University

Today's modern higher education landscape presents myriad challenges to higher education leaders and administrators. Among those challenges is how universities respond to demands for accountability, growth of alternative models of postsecondary education delivery, the need to serve and increasingly diverse society, and reduced state and federal appropriations. Research suggests that the biggest changes for American higher education are imminent and will necessitate new business models, new forms of collaboration and partnerships, and innovative about the enterprise of higher education. This study sought to gain understanding about the development process and structural framework that allows a university's outreach unit to be responsive to university mission, foster and nurture innovation, engage stakeholders, and create an alternative and impactful revenue stream.

Current and former Western Kentucky University employees were selected to participate in this study based on their involvement with the planning and implementation process that occurred during the development of the Division of Extended Learning and Outreach. This qualitative study explored: establishment of need and value for the new unit, how vision was shared and clarified, how structural components were prioritized; the role of leadership, and establishment of practices that would sustain the unit over time. Results indicated that creation of the potential for revenue generation was important as change leaders established need and value. In addition, effective communication was

paramount to sharing and clarifying vision. Prioritizing for innovative practices was an important structural component of the unit and leadership's commitment to collaboration was identified as a key contribution to successful change. Finally, the development of a strong culture of academic support and commitment to continued agility and innovation emerged as key factors in the unit's ability to remain relevant and responsive.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Institutional outreach and engagement research by Ostrander (2004) indicates that one of the key factors in a university's effort to build relationships with society is the formation of a functional unit that serves as the bridge between the university structure and the community at large. Ostrander also argues that the development of outreach units, and their dynamic framework, should be sensitive to local community and university needs and ever-changing circumstances. In addition, Ostrander states that the key to developing and maintaining an effective outreach presence is the creation of an organizational structure that is conducive to such work.

According to Sullivan and Richardson (2011), university outreach units are often the first responders to changes in economic needs, innovation, service, partnerships, and trends. Adding to the complex list of responsibilities for outreach units, is the academy's responsibility and accountability to both internal and external stakeholders and a commitment to the university mission. Units charged with bridging the gap between society's needs and the university's resources must have an underlying organizational structure that supports and encourages flexibility, responsiveness, responsibility, and innovative creativity, (Ostrander, 2004).

In 1862, Abraham Lincoln signed into law the Morrill Act which provided for the establishment of a system of industrial colleges, one in each state. The system of land-grant colleges, so named for the policy that allocated 30,000 acres of federal land to each eligible state for development of a school, were to specialize in agriculture, engineering and the teaching of military tactics. The land-grant colleges were not designed to educate

the children of the rich and privileged elite, but rather to offer opportunities to the middle class who would work in agriculture and industrial areas.

The Morrill Act was representative of a new ideal of American democracy, (Bonnen, 1998). Moreover, it was a set of core values that served as a roadmap for a relatively new nation to be able to provide broad access to educational opportunities, generate its own workforce with the appropriate skills, and improve the welfare of society at large (Franz & Townson, 2008). The values were forged by leaders who believed that the best way to create prosperity was by allowing equal access to knowledge by building a bridge between the university and the community it served (Fitzgerald, Burns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012). Though the vision of access and service to society was birthed as the land-grant movement, partnerships that advance the economic, social and civic good of society have become a function of the modern American university. Often described as outreach, extension, or service, the nature of this long-standing tradition of commitment to the needs and advancement of society has aligned the university with a larger social agenda in such a way that both the university and society may benefit (Bonnen, 1998; Spanier, 1999; Votruba, 1996).

Pressures facing higher education today present significant challenges to traditional university structures and functions. Often considered higher education's first line of defense, there is a renewed and necessary focus on university outreach and engagement to reach more diverse audiences and expand the scope and reach of higher education. Because outreach units must respond to new and ever-changing environmental and market pressures, an examination of the transformative process that guides

organizational change and the resultant structure can be useful to today's higher

education leaders.

Significance of the Study

For American universities, the heyday of growth funded by a never ending stream

of government subsidies is long over. The "New Normal" defined by Moody's Investor

Services (2010) as a stagnant economy and stock market, government budget crises, and

need for greater operating efficiency, has forced institutions of higher learning to adapt to

an austere reality. Key features of that reality include, demands for accountability, growth

of alternative models of postsecondary education delivery, and the need to serve an

increasingly diverse society. All the while, these tasks must be accomplished with fewer

state and federal appropriations. Moody's Investor Service (2010) reported that state and

federal government shortfalls will continue to put additional funding pressures on public

institutions which will require administrators to find creative, innovative ways to address

university financial needs.

Mehaffey (2012) states that the biggest changes for American higher education

are still to come in the form of new business models, new forms of collaboration and

partnership and new ways of thinking about the enterprise. Much of the planning,

innovation, and resource delivery necessary to successfully weather the current and future

changes in higher education will be the responsibility of university outreach and

engagement units. Therefore, it is important for research to be conducted that will

illuminate the development process and structural framework that allows a university

outreach unit to be responsive to university mission, foster and nurture innovation,

engage stakeholders, and create an alternative and impactful revenue stream. In addition,

there are few studies examining the process of change in university outreach units,

though modern pressures on universities and expectations for their outreach units necessitate such a study. According to Kezar and Eckel (2002) the literature on change in higher education is often inconsistent and offers little information that could be considered useful to administrators and leaders. Much existing research pertains to the content of change, the factors related to change outcomes, and conditions related to change. Moreover, much of the literature comes from simple reflections of former college presidents and tends to be general in nature with suggestions such as "involve the faculty" or "improve communication." (Cowan, 1993; Guskin, 1994; Kaiser & Kaiser, 1994; Leslie & Fretwell, 1996; Roberts, Wergin, & Adam, 1993; Taylor & Koch, 1996; Walker 1979). There is a need for research that explores, in detail, how successful organizational change is facilitated in higher education today.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine how administrators at Western Kentucky University (WKU) facilitated the process of developing a university outreach unit that would allow the university to fulfill its mission of enhancing responsiveness to the needs of the constituents. The aim of this study is to elucidate key factors and practices that were part of the WKU Division of Extended Learning and Outreach (DELO) development process, and organizational structures that came about during the DELO development process that allowed the unit to effectively:

> …focus the University's effort to expand educational opportunities, target particular populations, enable closer linkages with constituents, inform various publics of services available, and act as a clearinghouse through which community, business, industry, government and others may tap into the

4

intellectual capital of Western's faculty, students, and staff… serve as a catalyst for institutional flexibility and adaptability to enable timely and affordable delivery of appropriate educational content. (WKU Board of Regents Minutes, 2003 p. 4)

During this turbulent time for higher education, university outreach units have an important role to play in allowing postsecondary education to be agile, flexible, innovative, and responsive. Though many outreach units operate on the fringes of the university structure, these departments dedicated to engaging stakeholders in meaningful ways and bringing the resources of the university to bear on societal issues, play a significant role in carrying out the university mission and contribute to institutional effectiveness.

Research indicates that effective outreach and engagement is vital to the survival of America's higher education institutions. The Kellogg Commission (2000) has called for "land-grant and public universities to create new kinds of programs and services, and if need be, new kinds of institutions to meet the needs of traditional and non-traditional learners" (p.11). As higher education leaders contemplate the need for innovations that allow teaching, research, and service to go beyond the traditional borders of the university, leaders are faced with the challenge of rethinking many of their own long-held assumptions of what college is and how higher education works. Today's colleges and universities, each with its own definition of and vision for outreach, engagement or service, are under tremendous pressure to connect with stakeholders in meaningful ways with less funding and government support than ever before. Universities and their

outreach units are not only capable of servicing this need in a modern society, but should see fulfilling society's knowledge needs as their primary responsibility (Kohl, 2010).

With a renewed focus on the knowledge economy and lifelong learning, universities are expected to bring programming to stakeholders. Economic development initiatives often call on universities to speed innovation, job creation, and economic growth by partnering with industry. The demand for courses of study and certification programs that will help stakeholders qualify for better jobs and more promising careers are in high demand (Bok, 2003). Units charged with outreach and engagement foster and nurture innovation, engage the community and campus in relevant ways, and can produce alternative revenue streams that provide benefits across the university. The DELO unit at WKU serves a variety of functions and that have been identified in the research as key factors related to the success of a modern, innovative university. University outreach units are thrust into the spotlight as new approaches to higher education become a necessary part of the new American higher education system. The renewed emphasis on the outreach mission of the university makes it important for higher education practitioners in general and outreach administrators in particular to understand how change takes place and how units should be structured to yield the best results for both internal and external constituencies as well as the intricacies of the change and development process that produces that structure.

A study of the organizational and change process that occurred during the formation of a university outreach unit like DELO and the effectiveness of the resulting organizational structure is important because universities are expected to provide

accessibility to training, the new knowledge economy has created a need for life long

learning, and traditional funding sources for higher education are decreasing.

A large majority of American universities, both public and private, have adopted

the ideals set forth by the supporters of the Morrill Acts. At the heart of the American

university mission is the idea that education should be accessible and universities should

be engaged with their constituencies. Accessibility and engagement initiatives such as

distance education, learning on demand, and workforce training are the unique purview

of university outreach units (Bonnen, 1998; Spanier 1999; Vortuba, 1996).

As previously stated, the proliferation of a knowledge economy necessitates life-

long learning for members of society, thereby challenging the university to find

innovative and effective ways to reach stakeholders who are not representative of the

traditional 18-24 year old age group. Innovation, flexibility, and responsiveness

characterize university outreach units (Alexander, 2000; Michael & Holdaway, 1992;

Sporn 2001).

Pressures created by decreased state support have left university administrators

wondering how to continue to meet society's expectations. Clark (2001) argues that the

"entrepreneurial response" has become a necessity for institutions that want to survive

modern challenges and remain competitive and viable. Income generated by a university

allows for increased flexibility and responsiveness to a growing body of demands without

the hindrance that often comes with funds allocated by state or federal governments. The

"demand-response imbalance" posited by Clark (1998, p. 129) can be overcome by a

diversified funding base which includes university generated revenues that allow the

institution agility to move ahead on projects, initiatives and other activities. Outreach and

engagement units, such as DELO, when developed and structured to be entrepreneurial and revenue generating, can provide the much needed university generated funds that allow institutions to be flexible, innovative, and responsive to an ever-growing list of constituent needs.

In addition, this study will explore how faculty incentives made possible by an additional revenue stream impacted the change effort. This aspect of the study should be particularly compelling for higher education leaders given budget reductions and other fiscal constraints facing American higher education.

Research Questions

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, several key areas of the university change and development will be examined with the following research questions:

1. How was need and value of a new outreach unit established?

Faced with declining state support and the constant charge of serving broad audiences in diverse ways, higher education administrators are pushed to create meaningful and effective changes in the university structure to meet ever-emerging needs. In examining the change and development process that was at work during the formation of DELO, it is imperative to explore the impetus for change and the way change leaders went about determining how and why outreach needed to be transformed at WKU. In addition, it is important to determine how community and workforce needs, decreased state appropriations, and institutional mission influenced decision making during this stage of development.

2. How was vision clarified and shared for the new outreach unit?

Kotter and Cohen (2002) state that when leaders take on large-scale change, clarifying and sharing a vision is a necessary step to ensure success. Maurer (2004) states that making the case for change is a crucial, initial, and often overlooked, step in the change process. It is important to understand how WKU change leaders went about the process of visioning the future of DELO, but also how they shared that vision, created trust and buy-in, and made the case that change was both necessary and urgent for WKU to meet its academic and societal obligations. A goal of this research question is to examine the processes used by change agents in articulating a clear and guiding vision so that stakeholders would understand and support the goal of developing a new outreach unit.

3. *How were the structural components of the new outreach unit prioritized, designed, and implemented*?

Research by Ostrander (2004) indicates that in order to increase a university's engagement and outreach with its constituents, new organizational structures are necessary to develop and sustain partnerships. This question will explore how change leaders determined the structural framework for the new DELO unit so that new plans would align with existing structures elsewhere in the university while simultaneously allowing for development and innovation. Bolman and Deal (2008) argue that organizational structure must be created by planning for desired end results while considering environmental factors, talents and abilities of employees, and accessible resources. This question is also posed to examine the resultant organizational structure of

the DELO unit and the key aspects of the unit that provide for agility, ongoing innovation, and sustained revenue production.

4. What was the role of leadership in the creation, design, and implementation of the new outreach unit?

According to Appelbaum, St-Pierre, and Glavas (1998), during strategic organizational change leaders must articulate a vision of the future, establish and create commitment and momentum among organizational members, develop enabling structures, and value collaboration and transparency. To fully understand the change process it is necessary to understand how leaders used communication, incentives, and other mechanisms to generate commitment to and motivation toward the end goal of a new, self-supporting, revenue-generating outreach unit.

5. How were long-term sustainability practices and processes developed that would ensure continued success of the new outreach unit?

The DELO unit at WKU has operated, successfully, for 13 years. To fully explore the development of DELO model it is imperative to examine, policies and practices that were developed to ensure the unit's sustainability over time. Schneider, Brief, and Guzzo (1996) suggest that clear and concise communication, organizational rewards and incentives, ongoing resource allocation, and monitoring and assessment are necessary components of sustaining change in organizations. Sustainability has been an important factor in DELO's continued success, and this question will illuminate the factors that contributed to that sustainability.

Theoretical Framework

Most higher education administrators today are familiar with institutional change. No area of higher education is immune to the myriad pressures facing American colleges and universities today. As leaders think more intentionally about change, whether willingly or not, the need for widespread involvement, careful planning, and communication and leadership is paramount to the secure future of American higher education, (Kezar, 2001).

Researchers in the field of organizational change typically identify six main theories of change that assist in developing insights and understanding about the change process: 1) evolutionary, 2) teleological, 3) life cycle , 4) dialectical, 5) social cognition, and 6) cultural models to explain change in organizations (Kezar, 2001; Van De Ven & Poole, 1995). Each model has its own assumptions about how change occurs and the outcomes associated with change. In this study, the teleological change model will be utilized as theoretical framework to attempt to explain change at WKU during the time of DELO's implementation.

Teleological Model of Change

Teleological change models are predicated on strategic planning, bureaucratic and scientific management, and organizational development (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). Characterized by goal setting, planning, functionalism, social construction, and symbolic interactionism, teleological theories of change have at their core purposeful cooperation and an envisioned end state (Van De Ven & Poole, 1995). Kezar and Eckel (2002) argue that within management of higher education, teleological change models both explicitly and implicitly shape thinking about and perceptions of organizational behavior. The

pressures and inherent changes in today's higher education institutions are monumental. If institutions are to weather the storm, change must be at once intentional and continuous. Intentional change requires administration and leadership to "chart a deliberate course" (Eckel, Hill & Green, 1998 p. 1).

The teleological model of change is an appropriate framework to guide exploration of the higher education change process in an outreach unit because the themes of mission, vision, strategic planning, leadership, and incentives are all factors in the teleological change model.

In 2003, WKU's DELO began operating with a vision guided by university strategic goals of enhancing responsiveness to constituents, increasing student learning, and developing student populations. The aim of the new unit was to serve as an expansive outreach arm that would marry the talents and interests of WKU's faculty and other university resources with the needs of stakeholders on a local, national, and international level, (WKU Provost/Academic Affairs Report, n.d.).

Since that time WKU's DELO has produced growth for the university in several of the areas that fall under the outreach umbrella. The university's online course enrollments increased from approximately 13,000 in 2006 to approximately 30,000 in the 2012-13 academic year. Prior to DELO, online enrollments for WKU were virtually non-existent. Dual credit enrollments for high school students increased by more than 75% from 2007 to 2013. DELO's On Demand learning unit grew more than 35% between 2007 and 2013. Additionally, DELO's Center for Training & Development grew partnerships with local, regional and national agencies at a rate of 266% from 2011 to 2012, (WKU DELO, 2008, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014).

In addition to enrollment growth and expanded engagement, DELO's operations have produced an additional revenue stream for the university. A financially self-supporting unit, DELO utilizes a distribution mechanism whereby revenue is shared with university departments whose members help create successful programming. Departments are given a portion of available funds based on participation in DELO programming. A matching amount is given to each department's college and additional funds are distributed to University Libraries and Academic Affairs. Departments and colleges are able to use the funds for professional development, equipment needs or academic support, and a variety of other projects that benefit individual units (Division of Extended Learning & Outreach Annual Report, 2011).

In 2006, DELO, during its third year of operation, distributed $500,000 back to the university. By 2008, the returned revenue had increased to $1,300,000, (Division of Extended Learning & Outreach Annual Report, 2008). In 2012, DELO provided $10 million in services, support and operational funds to academic departments and colleges in support of the WKU's academic mission, (Division of Extended Learning & Outreach Annual Report, 2012).

Methodology

Patton (1990) states that in the course of daily life as human beings set about their responsibilities they are often seeking to make the world a better place. In so doing, the question of whether people are succeeding at their task arises and examination or evaluation of the accomplishments and effectiveness takes place. Those who are engaged in the systematic evaluation process are conducting evaluation research. Evaluative research, which yields different information than typical academic research, is often

referred to as applied research. The purpose of academic research is the discovery of truth for the sake of knowledge itself. The purpose of applied, evaluative research is to inform action and decision, and to apply findings to improve the conditions of society and, on a larger scale, improve the world. Qualitative research takes place in the real world, focuses on context, and is emergent rather than tightly prefigured (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This study will utilize qualitative research methods to explore how change agents went about facilitating and implementing plans for DELO, the WKU outreach unit.

This study will use an intrinsic case study technique to determine what can be learned from the organizational change practices used during the formation of the unit. Stake (1995) suggests that an intrinsic case study is undertaken because the researcher wants a better understanding of a particular case. The purpose of intrinsic case study is not to generate understanding of a construct or theory building, but is conducted because the case itself is of interest.

In this study a purposive sampling technique will be used to focus data collection on the process of DELOs development. Current and former administrators, change leaders, and faculty administrators who were instrumental in the development process or who were among the first to participate in the unit will be interviewed. Data will be collected using open-ended interviews and will be analyzed using thematic narrative analysis.

Narrative analysis in the human sciences can refer to an entire life story, brief topically specific stories, or extended accounts of situations that develop over a series of interviews. All forms of narrative analysis require the researcher to construct texts for

further analysis by organizing documents, composing field notes, and examining transcripts.

Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that thematic analysis provides a certain level of theoretical freedom that allows flexibility which has the potential to provide "rich and detailed, yet complex" accounts of data. Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within data. Finding common thematic elements across research participants is an efficient use for thematic analysis (Riessman, 1993).

Thematic codes were established by developing a preliminary list of categories, themes and patterns were analyzed after thorough review of the data transcribed from tape recorded interviews. Responses will be sorted and grouped by research area and analyzed to develop a master coding list of response categories. A master coding list was used to code the full transcript of each interviewee. Themes, patterns, and categories will were determined after analysis of each interview transcript.

It is appropriate to use an intrinsic case study technique and thematic narrative and content analysis to conduct this study of the structural development and change process associated with WKU's outreach unit as the primary area of interest are the key elements of the development and change process that were specific to DELO.

Delimitations

This study is focused specifically on the development process of the DELO unit at WKU and the resulting organizational structure. Because the goal of this study was to gain a detailed perspective on the key elements of organizational change and development associated with a successful university outreach unit as well as its organizational structure, only a single university unit was chosen. Therefore, some of the

findings in this study may not be generalized to all universities or outreach units across the nation, each of which is sure to have its own unique structure, culture, and mission.

Though many faculty, staff and administrators were involved in the development process that took place during the formation of DELO, only limited and specific administrators, faculty administrators, and staff were selected to participate in the interview process as the aim of the study is to gather detailed personal accounts of the change and development process from the perspective of the leadership group. Though data could have been collected from a larger population of WKU personnel through the use of a survey instrument, survey results would not have provided rich, detailed descriptions of the change process or the motivations and perceptions of personnel who were involved in and affected by the change. These are important aspects of the study because an emic perspective is necessary to fully understand constructs such as motivation, commitment, organizational reward systems, and leadership roles.

Limitations

Because this study will consist of a case study of a single university outreach unit and thematic narrative and content analysis will be used to examine the data, some limitations will be present. Limitations are primarily attributed to the methodology chosen. Thematic and content analysis require interpretation by a researcher and some nuanced data could be missed. In addition, it is possible that additional researchers may not be able to replicate the study and produce similar results due to the subjective nature of open ended interviews, thematic analysis, and the unique characteristics of universities and outreach units.

Summary

This study will examine DELO's development with a case study approach. Data codified during interviews with change and development agents will be coded using thematic narrative analysis to determine what key themes emerge as drivers of effective change. Documents used in the planning, development, and implementation of DELO were analyzed to gain additional insight into the change process. Areas of change and development that were examined included the role of university leaders, the nature of collaboration between leadership, faculty, and staff, use of incentives, and the role of vision and university mission during the planning and development process.

Chapter Two will include a literature review of topics related to the history of American higher education, its history of outreach, and challenges facing today's institutions. Chapter Three will include a detailed description of the methodology used in this study. Intrinsic case study research and its purposes will be reviewed as well the data analysis techniques of thematic analysis, and coding. Chapter Four will present the findings of the study and Chapter Five will offer a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

According to the 2014 State Higher Education Finance Report (2015), state funding for higher education has decreased 18.9% since 2008. From 2008 to 2013 state appropriations for higher education fell 21% or $14.1 billion. During the same time period, the number of students enrolling in higher education grew by 8% or 1.2 million (Federal and State Funding of Higher Education, 2015). Tuition increases continue to offset the cost associated with earning a college degree, adding more fuel to an already blazing fire of broad, public discontent with the present state of affairs in American higher education. Twenty five states now receive more per-student revenue from net tuition than from government funded educational appropriations (Federal and State Funding of Higher Education, 2015). This nation's public higher education goals, aimed at increasing accessibility for underserved populations, has created monumental challenges for institutions tasked with reaching learners at every age and ability level. Technological advancements have made earning a college degree as simple as logging on to a computer and massive open online courses (MOOCS) have thrown the doors to accessibility wide open with their expansive reach and free content. A proliferation of for-profit colleges brought a new form of consumerism to higher education when prospective students realized that their choice of college was no longer bound by geography or time constraints and that customer service was a top priority for a new genre of online schools.

Current research in higher education indicates that societal and other external demands, diverse learners, economic and fiscal tensions, and changes in technology will remain constant, rendering the traditional assumptions about and practices of higher

education unsustainable in the future. Eckel et al. (1998) state that leaders in higher education must make changes at the deepest, most fundamental level of the university in order to enable an institution to reinvent itself. Gumport and Pusser (1997) argue that environmental demands have moved beyond the query of how universities will do more with less, and now beg the question of whether universities can even continue to exist in their current state and what kind of institutions will emerge as a result of adaptation to current and unyielding demands.

Theories about why and how higher education should change as well as what that change should look like, abound among higher education scholars as well as those in the business and organizational management sectors. While many ideas and theories exist about what could and should be the saving grace for American higher education, entrepreneurialism characterized by adaptation, innovation, collaboration, and transformational change dominates much of the research as the answer for American colleges and universities.

Adaptation in Higher Education

According to Sporn (2001), adaptation and restructuring are effective ways of dealing with changing external demands. Restructuring often entails changes aimed at increasing flexibility, efficiency, and effectiveness. These adaptations may manifest themselves as new ways of managing relationships with the external environment, new authority structures, and new ways to generate and allocate resources. Taken together, Sporn argues, these kinds of changes are evidence that universities are moving toward an entrepreneurial model as a means to increase their chances of success, and in some cases, survival, in a dynamic and changing culture.

Similarly, Alexander (2000) states that non-profits, such as colleges and universities, are expected to embrace more business-oriented practices such as professionalizing management practices and demonstrating measurable outcomes while keeping costs low, essentially reconfiguring the rules for organizational survival:

Adaptation can become particularly complex for nonprofits because they may embody attributes of both public and private sector organizations. As is the case for public organizations, nonprofits may pursue multiple objectives, reimbursements may not flow directly from clients, and organizational stakeholders can hold diverse expectations. Like private organizations, they may serve the needs of discrete populations, and they must generate their own resource streams to survive. (p. 288)

In studying adaptation at universities, Sporn (2001) found that there are seven critical factors that emerge as necessary considerations during the university adaptation process:

Environment - Adaptation is triggered by environmental factors which initiate the process.

*Mission and goal*s - In order to adapt, universities need to develop clear mission statements and goals

Culture - An entrepreneurial approach that emphasizes individual responsibility and rewards creative new activities helps universities deal with changing and diverse needs of external constituencies.

Structure - Units may operate with autonomy and adjust their services and functions in areas such as academic, vocational, and continuing education, but still remain accountable for their activities and successes.

Management - Professionalization of university management is required for a successful adaptation process. Administrators should be full-time managers with proven experiences in effective decision making and successful strategy implementation.

Governance - Shared governance and participation of interest groups is necessary to reach consensus about changes that respond to changing environmental demands. A variety of stakeholders should come together during the process to make adaptation strategies successful.

Leadership - Leadership serves several important purposes during university adaptation. Commitment of leadership demonstrates importance of the change and provides resources that can be used during adaptation. In addition, leadership is responsible for communication a vision and mission that increases motivation and identification with new response strategies.

The birth and growth of outreach units during and after the land grant movement are higher education's early response to the need for adaptation. A creation of medieval times, universities began for the purpose of teaching theology and the preparation for a group of society's elite who were to be future spiritual leaders. Branching out to offer training in the areas of medicine and law, medieval universities responded to the needs of stakeholders and the communities they served, in effect, giving birth to the idea of university engagement and outreach (Bonnen, 1998).

Lawyers, doctors, and civic and religious leaders were prepared for practice with a liberal arts curriculum in the early days of the European universities. The American higher education system, established in the 17th and 18th centuries, followed the path of the original European institutions and focused on limited training for society's most elite young people. However, as the new nation grew, so did the democratic ideals that defined America. A rapidly advancing society that valued justice and equality found itself in need of more than training in theology, medicine, and law.

Bonnen (1998) proposes three primary reasons that American higher education shifted: 1) a need for highly trained professionals to function in an increasingly industrialized society; 2) a public dissatisfaction with the elitism of traditional religious-based institutions and a perception that universities were not willing to concern themselves with the needs of a growing society; and 3) a middle class, made possible by industrialization, wanted more and better opportunities for their children through access to training and skills that could be found in American universities. American universities have a long and rich history characterized by a commitment to connect the knowledge and resources of the university with the society it serves. Predicated on the idea of accessibility, needs of society, and equality, the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 provided for a federally funded university system that would span across the entire nation. Modern scholars of higher education note that changing environmental needs and a technology driven knowledge economy have pushed higher education into "new" territory. Vortuba (1996) stated that making educational programs available that are convenient, flexible, and catered to learner needs is a "new" and "challenging" way of doing business for

higher education. However, it was learner-centered, flexible, convenient programming that characterized the land grant and early outreach movement.

Entrepreneurialism in Higher Education

Clark (2001) makes a compelling argument for the great, guiding power of entrepreneurialism in higher education in saying that entrepreneurial universities will provide a way to expand choice and enlarge merit with their competitiveness, openness, and adaptiveness:

> The concept of the entrepreneurial university becomes the umbrella under which we speak of the self-steering, self-reliant, progressive university. This umbrella conception stresses a forward-looking orientation, a willingness to seek out the new frontiers of knowledge. It stresses that the university is engaged in the pursuit of opportunities beyond means that are currently available. It stresses that collegiality need not be limited to defense of the status quo, but that collegial as well as personal forms of authority and leadership can be sources of adaptive behavior and thereby linked to change. (p. 23)

Michael and Holdaway (1992) define "entrepreneurial higher education" (p. 17) as a market-system of higher education where administrators embrace business practices in an effort to generate funds, foster greater cooperation with those in the external environment, and provide extension services as a means to reduce dependency on government funding.

Clark (1998) states that entrepreneurial universities share five distinct characteristics: a strengthened steering core, an expanded developmental periphery, a diversified funding base, a stimulated academic heartland, and an integrated

entrepreneurial culture. According to Clark the five aforementioned elements are an "irreducible minimum" (p. 8).

Strengthened steering core - universities need to be organized in refashioning their programmatic capabilities and as such a strengthened steering core becomes a necessity for universities aiming to become quicker, flexible and focused in their reactions to growing, dynamic demands. The core should embrace both central university administration as well as academic departments.

Expanded developmental periphery - entrepreneurial universities establish units that are skilled at reaching across traditional university academic boundaries and forming relationships, linkages and alliances with stakeholders outside the university. Professionalized outreach offices specialize in knowledge transfer, workforce needs, and continuing education. Academic department alone cannot do all the things that universities now need to do. Outward reaching units should be structured to cross traditional boundaries and serve as a bridge between academic departments and the environment outside the university walls.

Diversified funding base - enterprising universities recognize the need to generate funds from a source other than government allocation. Referred to as "third stream income" these additional dollars provide valuable discretionary money that enhances the opportunity to make meaningful and impactful decisions about direction without waiting for government funds which are often slow to arrive and come with a long list of rules attached.

Stimulated academic heartland - whether the academic departments accept or oppose adaptation and innovation is often the deciding factor in the success of

24

transformation. For meaningful change to happen departments and faculty must be able to reach outside with programs and relationship building as part of the effort to increase third-stream income.

Integrated entrepreneurial culture - universities that practice entrepreneurialism develop an internal culture that embraces change. The synergy of ideas and practices is particularly dependent on the cultural and symbolic side of the university as institutional identity and reputation are cultivated. Organizational structures and procedures should be a reflection of organizational values. A strengthened steering core, expanded developmental periphery, diversified funding base, and stimulated academic heartland are the four elements that make transforming beliefs operational.

Rhoades and Slaughter (1997) maintain that academic institutions have, by necessity, become capitalist entrepreneurs as they have shifted focus from state support to alternative funding streams that mirror those of the private sector. In addition, entrepreneurial ideologies strengthen ties between the university and its community as needs of external stakeholders and constituents become the impetus for new programming and initiatives. While some in the academy lament these relationships on the basis that they misdirect focus to a consumer mindset, the idea of the university as an economic development driver is not at all new. Land grants, formed by the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, were created to link higher education to the needs of the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy. The service these early colleges provided was distinctly catered to community needs and dedicated to fostering economic development.

Webster et al. (2000) posit that colleges and universities take on entrepreneurial activities in response to the recognition that the university is a resource to enhance

25

innovation, knowledge transfer, and economic development. Entrepreneurialism is often

discussed from the perspective of research institutions that are in the business of

technological and medical discoveries which can be patented. However,

entrepreneurialism, as Clark (1998) states may also be enacted at other kinds of

universities through innovations in undergraduate education, continuing education, and

engagement initiatives.

Webster et al. (2000) states that academic institutions must enter a revolutionary

period where they assume roles in economic development through teaching as well as

research. He argues that universities should assume an active role in economic

development that allows the mission of the university to remain untouched, but

understood in such a way that it can be carried out by a variety of methods.

Bok (2003) cautions that the push to have universities make their services more

widely available in a marketplace of higher education can be a double-edged sword for

the mission and future of American higher education if the rewards of the marketplace

begin to outweigh the risks for the "soul" of the academy:

> State officials ask campuses to speed innovation, job creation, and
>
> economic growth by cooperating more closely with industry. Businesses
>
> urge universities to do more to train their executives... Citizens
>
> everywhere look for courses of study that will help them qualify for better
>
> jobs and promising careers. These growing demands allow universities
>
> and the faculties to profit from academic work in more ways than ever
>
> before. Ironically, however, the very same opportunities could easily end

by harming the academic enterprise and sullying its contributions to the

nation's welfare. (p. 199)

Still, Bok admits that there can be a place for entrepreneurial enterprise in higher

education when prudence is exercised and universities take caution not to compromise

too much in their quest to make money.

Clark (1998) argues that collective entrepreneurship does not lead to devaluation

of academic legitimacy and reputation that eventually result in fewer resources and less

meaningful development, but rather that entrepreneurialism done right allows universities

to become capacity builders with resources to create infrastructure and opportunities far

beyond what they would normally have. This upward momentum culminates in a climb

in both quality of education and reputation.

Michael and Holdaway (1992) share a similar view stating that marketing is

important for entrepreneurial universities and can be seen as both a process and a

philosophy. Marketing as a process involves phases of need identification, development

of programs, delivery systems, and feedback. As a philosophy, marketing requires careful

planning, coordination, and execution of institutional activities that result in optimal

benefits to stakeholders, society, and the institution. Kotler and Fox (1985) state that the

correct use of marketing as a fundamental element of an entrepreneurial university,

allows the organization to sense, serve and satisfy needs in a way that benefits all

involved.

Clark (2001) points to the "demand-response" (p. 129) imbalance as one impetus

for adoption of an entrepreneurial culture in higher education. Clark conceptualizes the

"entrepreneurial response" (p. 44) as a growing necessity for universities that want to "be

a viable, competitive part of the rapidly emerging international world of learning. Vaira (2004) characterizes entrepreneurialism in higher education as a business ethos that values high flexibility, innovation and products that match client demands. Collective thought posits that a successful future for higher education will be more innovative, entrepreneurial, collaborative, social, and virtual (Eckel et al. 1998; Mehaffy, 2012; Selingo, 2012).

Innovation in Higher Education

Hage (1999) states that organizational innovation has been consistently defined as the adoption of an idea, product, service, technology, or a new administrative practice that is new to the organization. Christensen and Eyring (2011) state that innovation can be the strength of every university if leadership is willing to create "a pattern of innovation that is continuous and focused on the university's unique mission—without undue concern for either tradition or what other institutions are doing" (p. 15). Bartel and Garud (2009) state that successful innovation must be predicated on productive social interactions, organizational designs, and processes.

Massy, Sullivan, and Mackie (2013) posits that resistance to change is a significant barrier to innovation in higher education particularly when incentive and reward models tend to favor traditional structures, policies and practices. Wildavsky, Kelly, and Carey (2013) share a similar stance with regard to innovation, stating that when innovation does occur in higher education, it is often slow-moving and limited, therefore dragging down the momentum for transformational change. Christensen and Eyring (2011) argue that higher education was able, for many years, to avoid the competitive, disruptive, and innovative forces that precipitated change in other

institutions. However, an increased focus on outcomes and steady improvements in the models used to deliver higher education, have made competitive disruption in the educational marketplace a reality that demands attention and action.

According to Mone, McKinley, and Barker (1998), research in the fields of organizational learning and evolution indicates that when there is a gap between an organization's actual results and those desired by managers and external constituencies, managers search for new ways of achieving results which often results in innovation.

Bartel and Garud (2009) posit that most organizational innovation comes from the stimulation produced through creativity and novel ideas, however, successful innovation requires careful coordination of the efforts of groups and individuals. Research has indicated three prominent aspects of successful organizational innovation: creation of new ideas; commercialization of new ideas into valuable products and services; and the ability to sustain products and services over time.

Obenchain, Johnson, and Dion (2004) state that long traditions and customs are the dominant cultural vehicles of colleges and universities which necessitate the mindful balancing of history with tradition during times of innovation and change.

Born of higher education's entrepreneurial culture characterized by innovation, new educational models such as extended traditional universities, distance education, university/industry strategic alliances, and competency based programming offer the prospect of meeting the needs of increasingly diverse audiences (Hanna, 1998). A strong rationale and framework for organizational change is an important factor in achieving strategic institutional advantage through innovative design and delivery systems, according to Hanna (1998):

While opportunities will abound for all, the abundance of opportunities will

demand greater focus and clarity about purposes and competitive strengths as

organizations compete in a larger more complex marketplace. No institution can

afford to ignore this environment, even those who are currently positioned at the

top of the higher education pyramid. (p. 93)

Teleological Change Model

According to Kezar (2001), there are six frameworks for organizational change:

1) evolutionary, 2) teleological, 3) life cycle, 4) dialectical, 5) social cognition, and 6)

cultural. Each model has a specific set of assumptions that assist in understanding, and

describing change. The teleological theory assumes that organizations are both

purposeful and adaptive. Leadership as well as administration orchestrate change that is

rational while playing an instrumental role in the process.

In change environments teleological action is characterized by analytical decision

making by actors who have sufficient knowledge about the problem or issue at hand, an

opportunity for decision makers to examine relevant strategies and select the best fit for

the problem at hand, and adequate resources to implement the strategy such as the ability

to develop programs, plans, and budgets (Bekmeir-Feuerhahn, 2009).

The teleological framework of change, sometimes referred to as the planned

change model, uses purposeful social construction among individuals in the organization

in order to develop a repetitive pattern of goals, implementation activities, evaluation

practices and modifications based on the goal of the organization. When teleological

models fall short of achieving change it is commonly because key stakeholders do not see

the need for change, they make bad decisions, or the group can't reach consensus on

goals or actions. Direct personal experiences with issues or problems, brainstorms

sessions and teambuilding opportunities have all been identified as ways to overcome the

pitfalls commonly associated with the teleological change process (Van de Ven & Poole,

1995; Van de Ven & Sun, 2011; Weick & Quinn, 1999).

The teleological change framework is punctuated by themes such as mission, a

focus on leadership's role, collaboration, vision, persuasive and effective communication,

and developing support structures and processes that include rewards and incentives. The

teleological theory provides a basis for change in organizations where a careful balance

between history and tradition must be maintained alongside a culture of innovation and

change.

Cameron (1984) characterized such dual-purpose organizations as "Janusian"

referring to the Roman god Janus, who was depicted as having two faces looking in

different directions at the same time. Janusian organizational thinking is characterized by

the simultaneous existence of opposite antitheses and creative idea generation of

leadership in bringing the two incongruent ideas into agreement thereby producing a new

solution that allows the institution to be flexible and adaptable while remaining loyal to

its mission and traditions. This stance is similar to that of Christensen and Eyring (2011),

which was noted previously and takes the position that successful institutions of the

future will find a way to innovate within the framework of their heritage and traditions.

University Mission

Mission statements not only provide the guiding premise for daily university

operations, but also set the tone and direction for strategic changes aimed at creating

better alignment between an institution's mission and its offerings, programs, and

services that affect both internal and external stakeholders. Gumport and Pusser (1997) suggest that during times of higher education change, administrators have often used mission in the absence of policy in an effort to develop plans that remain true to the traditions and purpose of the university.

Institutional missions themselves should be flexible, able to respond to changing societal needs, well-grounded and, provide a strong foundation for tradition. Clear university missions have the ability to create a shared sense of purpose that not only inspires institutional members, but also tells a story of history, commitment and values to those outside the university (Gumport & Sporn, 1999; Hartley, 2004; Scott, 2006).

According to Hartley and Schall (2005), university missions serve a "mean-making" (p. 6) function that provides important guidance about institutional purpose and priorities and the responsibility to implement them. This concept is critical to the planning and implementation of successful strategic change initiatives.

As change leaders and administrators take on the daunting responsibility of planning and implementation of change strategies, goals and purposes must be prioritized. According to Dickeson (1999), prioritization, guided by the philosophy of the university mission, is a necessary process to accomplish reform. Overton and Burkhardt (1999) cite extensive higher education research that indicates a need for the academy to be more "responsive, accountable, relevant, and accessible to its constituencies" (p. 217). These ideas are echoed in the sentiments of many of the mission statements of universities across the nation (Morphew & Hartley, 2006).

Overton and Burkardt (1999) also argue that the ability of American higher education to survive and adapt to advancing technologies and increased societal

expectations is dependent on institutional ability to remain engaged with stakeholders during times of change and adapt to changing needs of society.

Gumport and Sporn (1999) state that as university administrators take on the role of change agent, three distinct areas emerge as additional priorities that should be considered during times of change in institutions: 1) the management of resources relationships; 2) institutional legitimacy; and 3) expanding professional authority though collaboration. Additionally, providing and communicating vision and designing or restructuring and planning for both for effectiveness and long-term sustainability are also cited in the literature on organizational adaptation in higher education as important priorities for leaders facilitating change.

Managing Resource Relationships

Meeting expectations for compliance with environmental demands, being aware of the forecasting of future trends and needs, and securing efficient linkages between management tools such as planning, budgeting, and accountability are important in establishing a stable foundation for later stages of strategic planning and development in higher education (Gumport & Sporn, 1999). In addition, expanding the institution's integrated entrepreneurial culture or mindset, which helps establish the idea that change is welcome and necessary in the university community, and expanding the developmental periphery beyond the traditional boundaries of the university should be top priorities as change agents think about managing resources relationships during planning and development of new initiatives (Clark, 1998).

Careful management of resources relationships also involves creating balance among competing ideas, philosophies, and needs. New initiatives aimed at making

universities better prepared for future demands and survival should focus on accomplishing both affordability and accessibility.

Balance between institutional interest and public interest is also a consideration. External stakeholders often have an expectation that institutions of higher education will provide well-educated graduates, offer solutions for societal problems, and be a driving force in meeting economic development needs such as workforce credentialing. Though the vision of access and service to society was birthed as the land-grant movement, partnerships that advance the economic, social and civic good of society have become a function of the modern American university. Walshok (2012) argues that the role of knowledge in society is as a primary resource that shapes organizations, communities, and economies. In addition, she suggests that the way to capitalize on our knowledge economy is for individuals, and organizations to have access to innovative knowledge centers that bring information to people where they are and in ways that they can use and understand. Votruba (1996) stated:

> American universities are in the process of losing their monopoly on advanced learning. Traditional higher education is at the mercy of a market that is producing a new array of educational providers who are challenging the traditional assumptions and services of higher education and making available educational programs that are convenient, flexible, and catered to learner needs. (p. 29)

Often described as outreach, extension, or service, the nature of this long-standing tradition of commitment to the needs and advancement of society has aligned the university with a larger social agenda in such a way that both the university and society

may benefit (Bonnen, 1998; Spanier, 1999; Votruba, 1996;). University change agents should recognize these expectations and create programming and services that, when held against the backdrop of university mission and the long tradition of American university services to society, provide a well-rounded picture of university-community collaboration that does not comprise either interest (Bok, 2003; Dickeson 1999; Dyer, 1999).

Finally, in managing resources relationships, university administrators who are planning and organizing change, should make cultivation of new resource streams a priority so that dependence on traditional resources is reduced (Gumport & Sporn, 1999, Sporn 2001). In an American academic scene characterized by decreased government funding and market competition, there has been the emergence of an entrepreneurial culture in academia. According to Webster et al. (2000), entrepreneurial activities, such as cultivation of additional sources of revenue, can be used to not only improve regional and national economic performance, but also improve the financial advantage of the university and its faculty.

According to Clark (1998) when universities undertake change and begin to inoculate the existing culture with ideas of transition, discretionary funds are necessary and a widening of the financial base becomes essential. Similarly, Dickeson (1999) states that strategic planning and goal setting need resources for sustainability and that "achieving congruence between ends and means marks the well-balanced institution."

<center>**Sustaining Institutional Legitimacy**</center>

"Legitimacy is a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (Suchman, 1995). Governed by institutional mission,

university administrators should prioritize adaptations, innovations, and change with the purpose and traditions of the university in mind, maintaining and sustaining institutional legitimacy (Gumport & Sporn, 1999).

Dickeson (1999) suggests that administrators must carefully evaluate the "artful balance of legacy and promise" in addition to balancing stability, flexibility and purpose. In prioritizing for institutional legitimacy, administrators should evaluate the impression of the university from the perspective of those whom the institution is seeking legitimacy and they should consider the priorities and actions of similar institutions. Seeking to see the university through the lens of both internal and external stakeholders and examining how peers are dealing with similar issues affords change agents the ability to gauge if the prioritization process has produced results that are in accord with the perceived values and mission of the university.

Expanding Professional Authority Through Collaboration

In repositioning higher education for new responsibilities, the dynamic of governance and decision-making are important considerations for leadership. According to Duryea (1962) change agents should embrace collaborative efforts that allow those in the academic domain of the university to exercise their knowledge and expertise in decisions that involve the core academic aspects of new initiatives and programs. Similarly, Clark (1998) suggested that collaboration in the form of a strengthened steering core and a stimulated academic heartland are aspects of an entrepreneurial culture in higher education. Likewise, Dickeson (1999) suggested that "bottom up" planning is a crucial component of priority setting in a balanced university.

36

According to Welsh and Metcalfe (2003), change agents face a monumental challenge in attempting to bring faculty on board during the design and implementation of activities that require campus-wide participation such as organizational adaptation. The researchers argue that when change originates with administrators the situation can be perceived by faculty members as an edict that tends to lessen the chances that the effort will gain momentum on the academic side of the house. Thus, it is important for administrators and change agents to seek the input and expertise of faculty from the outset of planning for change.

Kezar and Lester (2009) state that institutional mission can also drive cooperation and collaboration in that it provides shared vision and gives collaborators a logical framework for working together with a shared sense of purpose. Institutional strategic planning for change in an effort to meet the demands of the future is one aspect of "institutional effectiveness" or continuous improvement expected by regional accrediting agencies throughout the country. Activities aimed at increasing institutional effectiveness are also tied to and guided by the mission of the university. According to Welsh and Metcalfe (2003), regional accreditors also outline an expectation that institutional effectiveness activities be undertaken with input and participation from various groups across campuses including administration, faculty and staff. In order for institutional effectiveness activities aimed at strategic change to be effective, change agents need to seek input and draw on expertise of faculty as well as other staff members from the beginning of the change process in order to create cross-campus buy-in.

Lindquist (1978) identified collaboration as one of the five necessary change strategies for institutions of higher education. Referring to the process of working

collaboratively as creating "ownership" Lundquist argued that by involving the people whose expertise, time, skill, and understanding is crucial to the success of a change effort, leadership can create a culture that welcomes change. Kezar and Eckel (2002) found that collaboration is heavily dependent on institutional culture and that change agents need to be aware of the institutional culture and develop a change strategy that will work within that cultural framework. "Reading the institutional culture in order to develop and match the strategies for change are fundamental to an effective change process," (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

Kezar (2006) posits that institutional collaboration often fails because change agents attempt to facilitate collaboration inside an organizational design that is traditionally focused on individualist contributions. However, if organizations can be redesigned in the areas of structure, processes, people, and rewards, successful implementation of collaborative efforts is more likely.

Kanter (2000) identified culture as mediator of collaborative efforts and argued that collaboration in organizations appears to work best when "the scope for collaboration is more open, understanding grows between specific individuals, communication is frequent and intensive, and the interpersonal context is rich… Only relationships with full commitment on all sides endure long enough to create value for the partners." Likewise, Sporn (2001) found that university culture punctuated by entrepreneurial dynamics such as individual responsibility, rewards and creativity can help universities generate new revenue streams, and increase perceptions of relevance among external stakeholders.

Clark (2001) argues that joint participation among the university community is a necessary precursor to successful collaboration and a strengthened steering core.

Collegiality and collaboration create a campus culture with a singleness of purpose and a "sense of joint effort." Cross-campus participation and collaboration among the major groups such as administration, faculty and staff in a model of self-governance can lead to a smooth adaptation process as well as more effective critical decision making and change implementation (Cameron 1984; Sporn 2001; Weick & Quinn, 1999; Welsh & Metcalfe, 2003).

Providing and Communicating Vision

According to Kezar and Eckel (2002) the most commonly described process within change is vision and mission:

Change often invites risk and an uncertain future or destination, so having a compelling reason for change and a proposed direction is crucial. A motivating vision or mission can become the blueprint and compass for many employees. This compass allows people to move toward something new and beneficial, not just unknown. (p. 299)

Organizational vision, when well-conceived, is made up of both a core ideology and an envisioned future. Vision is cultivated when leadership can balance the notion of why an organization exists and what it stands for with a forward thinking ideology about what the organization aspires to be, achieve or create. Alignment of the traditional, sustaining mission with the progressive, envisioned future should be a top priority of change agents when articulating a vision for the organization (Collins & Porras, 2005).

Ruvio, Rosenblatt, and Hertz-Lazarowitz (2010) argue that vision should be optimistic, desirable, challenging, clear, brief, and achievable. Studying entrepreneurial vision in business and educational settings, the researchers found that the most significant

aspects of educational entrepreneurial vision are communication and inspiration and that educational entrepreneurs tend to provide visions that are inspirational and realistic.

Providing a guiding vision during organizational adaptation requires leadership to reach for a lofty goal of not only articulating the message of an inspired future to stakeholders, but also aligning the organization in such a way that the vision may actually become a reality. Alignment is a double-sided process that requires a careful evaluation of the current processes and strategies of the organization to ensure that they reflect and preserve one half of the vision- the core ideology. In addition, change agents seeking alignment must examine the same process and strategic elements of an organization to discover any "misalignments" that could be pulling the organization away from its envisioned goals, (Collins & Porras, 2005).

Articulating a clear vision for the future is imperative in the process of implementing strategic organizational change. Change agents and leaders who can create a sense of urgency, develop enabling structures, communicate, involve people, and practice transparency can reinforce and institutionalize change, (Applebaum, St. Pierre, & Glavas, 1998).

Cameron (1984) found that during organizational adaptation effectiveness of a leader was determined by his or her ability to create meaning for others and provide a sense of understanding about tasks and processes. Dual-purpose communication of this nature provides considerable leverage for change agents who seek buy-in for their initiatives. When stakeholders sense that leadership is demonstrating commitment, the process of adaptation gains a sense of importance and that vision communicated by

40

committed leadership increases motivation and identification with new initiatives (Sporn 2001).

A variety of communication channels can and should be used by change agents in articulating vision to constituents. A clear and effective communication strategy has been identified as an important priority for leaders facilitating change. An effective organizational leader might utilize newsletters, social media, and collaborative settings such as town hall meetings and open forum question and answer sessions to communication the vision for change in an engaging and persuasive manner (Eckel et al., 1999; Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Lindquist, 1978).

Graetz (2000) argues that communication initiated by change agents is an effective way to build support for change particularly when that communication flows throughout the organization utilizing a variety of channels at every level of the hierarchical structure. Weick and Quinn (1999) found that in an organizational setting, everyday conversations between change agents and internal stakeholders provided opportunities for powerful change interventions. During times of organizational change, leaders and change agents should be careful to optimize every opportunity to communicate the vision, goal and purpose of the change initiative.

Designing for Effectiveness

Bolman and Deal (2008) characterize organizational change as a "complex systemic undertaking" (p. 378) that often requires retraining, a revision of roles and responsibilities, changes the power balance, and, perhaps most importantly, intrudes on tradition and deeply-rooted custom. Kotter (2007) argues that while change is both essential and difficult for leaders, those who enjoy the most success in leading their

organizations through change will embrace and use concepts such guiding visions, clear communication, rewards, and planning for sustained success.

According to Bolman and Deal (2008), agents of change should focus on the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frameworks of an organization in order to implement effective and lasting change, innovation or adaptation.

Structural frame - Administrators leading change should understand the complex array of elements and circumstances of an organization as well as the organizations, goals, environment, stakeholders, and strategies. The structural frame refers to the "social architecture" of work and change agents who can find the correct balance of both horizontal and vertical procedures to knit together the pieces into a cohesive whole will be better able to design a structure that works for collective purposes and toward the goal and vision of the organization.

Human resource frame - This frame focuses on the relationship between the organization and the people who work in it. Change agents should seek a proper alignment between the needs of the organization and the needs of the people who are employed by the organization. This framework can also serve as a guide for administrators as they develop strategies and a long-term philosophy for creating or improving human resource strategies in a new or restructured organization.

Political frame - According to Bolman and Deal (2008) those who lead change must use a keen political sense to know how and when to negotiate, collaborate, and stand their ground. Change agents must consider long-term relationships, develop networks of political support and know how to navigate often complicated political agendas. Administrators working to make changes in this frame should recognize that

from a political perspective, goals, structure, and policies emerge from an ongoing

process of bargaining and negotiation among major interest groups.

Symbolic frame - Change agents should recognize the role that culture, displayed

through customs, values, practices, and artifacts plays in anchoring and identifying an

organization. As administrators lead change they should be mindful of the importance of

the enduring nature of team building in creating the spirit among a community of

believers united by a shared faith in a common goal and vision.

Taylor, deLourdes Machado, and Peterson (2008) argue that administrators who

are tasked with design as a result of organizational adaptation or restructuring due to

organizational change efforts, must employ holistic and strategic management techniques

so that changes in each of the four previously identified frames reinforce and support

each other. "The truly visionary, strategic, and transformational leader is the Integrator,

who effectively integrates vision, focus, and implementation" (Taylor et al., 2008, p.

381).

While studying the institutional transformation process at six colleges and

universities over a four-year period, Kezar and Eckel (2002) found that certain strategies

emerged as particularly effective in helping stakeholders and key participants accept and

embrace change initiatives. The researchers identified staff development, robust design,

and collaborative leadership as important indicators of successful change because they

allowed for the creation of an environment where "sensemaking" activities could occur.

According to the researchers, those inside the changing organizations were encouraged to

participate in collective processes such as roundtable discussions and workshops. Faculty

and staff were also offered development opportunities that helped personalize the change

for individuals. Kezar and Eckel's (2002) findings reflect the importance of the human resource frame as outlined by Bolman and Deal's (2008) organizational reframing guidelines as well as findings by Graetz (2000) that indicate that using a variety of communication channels across all levels of an organization is most effective during times of organizational change.

Planning for Sustainability

Organizational change can be a monumental undertaking involving stakeholders at all levels as well as large investments of time and money. Change agents who have invested significant resources in visioning, communication, and design or restructuring or design for change have a vested interest in making sure that those changes are sustained over time.

Boyce (2003) argues that in order to sustain institutional change, institutions must create an environment that is conducive to collective dialogue that results in collaboration, developing a shared vision, and connecting the organization to the environment. In essence, managers of newly formed organizations or units should consistently create opportunities for meaningful interactions with both internal and external stakeholders and welcome new and creative ideas aimed at programs, offerings, and services that continue to move the organization toward its shared, collective vision. Organizations, institutions, and units that can be proactive and flexible remain alert and agile in order to react to new opportunities for growth and threats, both of which help protect sustainability over time (Boyce 2003; Coblentz, 2002).

According to Coblentz (2002), in order for organizations to remain sustainable over time three key aspects must be present: institutional sustainability, financial

44

sustainability, and moral sustainability. Characteristics of institutional sustainability include having a mission and articulating that mission in a way that provides definition of the organization's purpose and goals. In addition, a sustainable organization will also have a strategic plan for the future that defines goals and expectations and the activities that will be carried out in order to achieve those goals.

Buchanan et al. (2005) propose that sustainable organizational change may be best determined by three primary criteria of the change process itself: the substance of the change process, the implementation process, and the temporal dimensions of that process. Organizational stakeholders may regard some changes as central to the organization's functioning and therefore those changes may be considered more substantial than those that are considered to be less important or peripheral. The management of the implementation process may also influence whether or not the change process is welcomed and sustained by organizational members, and finally, the timing and sequencing of change could affect whether stakeholders commit to change efforts or revert to "the old way of doing business."

According to Coblentz (2002), sustainability is a "never-ending organizational initiative" that requires team effort guided by a strong leadership vision. Flexibility, continued creativity, innovative thought, and a close connection with the external environment allows the organization to continue to function in a way that meets the needs of the audience it intends to serve (Boyce, 2003; Coblentz, 2002; Kotter, 2007; Senge, Carstedt, & Porter, 2001).

This chapter has provided a review of the literature relevant to the change process in higher education, including the areas of adaptation, innovation, and entrepreneurialism.

The connection between early higher education outreach and adaptation was also explored. The teleological change process, which serves as the framework for this study, was also examined along with a review of the research on the process of priority setting during the change and adaptation process. The following chapter will describe the methods used to conduct this research as well as an account of the study's context and research design.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to explore the processes of change that occurred at WKU during the creation of a university outreach unit that would allow the university to enhance responsiveness to stakeholder needs. This study also seeks to determine what key factors and practices were utilized by administrators and leadership during the development of the unit as the university worked toward to goals of expanding educational opportunities, increasing university adaptability, and increased revenue generation. Understanding the key processes of change and adaptation and giving a voice to the stories of change agents and those most affected by change influenced the goal of the study and serves as a determining factor in the selection of its design and methods.

Qualitative research and analysis involves the process of describing, interpreting and explaining a phenomenon of interest through non numerical data collection methods such as interviews, observations, and document analysis. Qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive, and grounded in the lived experiences of people (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). According to Patton (1990), a researcher employing qualitative methods is allowed the freedom to approach data collection without being hindered by predetermined categories which contributes to the depth, openness, and rich detail that is yielded by qualitative inquiry. This research will take the form of an intrinsic case study to examine the organizational change and development process that took place during the formation of the WKU DELO unit. Stake (1994) suggests that an intrinsic case study is appropriate when the subject under study is important in and of itself and the researcher is not necessarily seeking to understand a construct or build a theory.

In order to gain insight about the change and adaptation process at WKU, five overarching research questions were developed:

1. How was need and value of a new outreach unit established?

2. How was vision for a new outreach unit clarified and shared?

3. How were structural components of the new outreach unit designed and implemented?

4. What was the role of leadership in the creation, design, and implementation of the new outreach unit?

5. How were long-term sustainability practices and processes developed that would ensure continued success of the new outreach unit?

This qualitative case study focuses on the process of adaptation that came about as change agents structured a number of seemingly unrelated offices with varying responsibilities into a functional, revenue-generating university outreach unit. In the research on organizational change, common themes such as motivation, trust, communication, and vision emerge as key factors in the change process (Collins & Porras, 2005; Heath & Heath, 2010; Kotter, 2007). In addition, innovation, reframing, and organizational restructuring are common themes in the research on institutional adaptation, survival and success (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Clark, 1998; Gumport & Sporn, 1999). To best understand the processes and it is important to examine these themes through a qualitative lens that illuminates the perspectives and narratives of those who led, were intimately involved with, and were affected by the change and adaptation that took place during the formation of DELO.

This chapter provides a rationale for the selection of a qualitative design, an account and description of site selection, and outline of research design and an overview of validity. Finally, research methods are reviewed.

Qualitative Inquiry

Qualitative methods are well suited for studying development and changes. Organizational development is a dynamic process and its nuances cannot be fully captured using typical quantitative methods such as pre- and post-tests or other kinds of statistical indicators. The non-linear pattern of organizational development is much more likely to be understood through qualitative inquiry that allows for detailed descriptions of real, lived experiences with the development process (Patton, 1990). This study follows the complex organizational development process of the DELO unit and therefore necessitates a qualitative case study design that will allow the process to be studied using a variety of methods including interviews, historical, and document analysis. Utilization of a variety of methods serves a dual purpose in case study research as it allows the researcher a wider lens to investigate a complex phenomenon and can assist in the triangulation of data which contributes to improved validity for the study.

Case Studies

According to Hartley (2004), in case study research the phenomenon cannot be separated from its context, but rather is of interest because the researcher seeks to understand how a behavior or processes are influenced by and can, in turn, influence the context of the phenomenon under study. Case studies that are intrinsic or descriptive are those that explore a phenomenon as it occurs, in nature. Though defined differently by

49

both Stake (1995) and Yin (2010), both descriptions focus heavily on the contextual aspect of the phenomenon being studied.

Stake (1995) emphasizes the importance of issues when using a case study design asserting that researchers must be cognizant of the political, social, historical, and especially personal contexts that exist when conducting case study research. However, he argues, it is the consideration of these issues within the context of the phenomenon that work to increase our understanding of situations, matters, and problems:

Although case studies have been used by anthropologists, psychoanalysts, and many others as a method of exploration preliminary to theory development, the characteristics of the method are usually more suited to expansionist than reductionist pursuits. Theory building is the search for essences,   pervasive and determining ingredient, and the makings of laws. The case study, however, proliferates rather than narrows. One is left with more to pay attention to rather than less. Its best use appears to me to be for adding to existing experience and humanistic understanding. (p. 53)

As described in Chapter Two, the teleological change model provides the theoretical framework for this study. According to Kezar (2001), common themes that emerge related to the teleological model of change are mission, vision, strategic planning, leadership, incentives, and collaboration. Lindquist (1978) suggests that the vision for change should be tied to the mission and that mission should be naturally be tied to strategic planning.

The teleological change model as a conceptual framework by examining whether common themes, specific to the teleological model, were present during the

organizational change and development process of DELO. In addition, the same themes serve as a guide for development of the study's semi-structured interview questions as well as the deductive or provisional coding list used for initial coding of the interview data.

Data Collection

Semi-structure interviews with past and present employees of WKU as well as document analysis will be used to answer the research questions in this study. The use of multiple methods of data collection as well as consistent checking of findings in order to establish converging lines of evidence contributes to effective triangulation and more robust findings (Yin, 2010).

Research questions were developed around the teleological model themes in order to identify and clarify the experiences and perceptions of participants. Purposive sampling was used to identify participants from each sector of the university community including university leadership, professional administration, academic administration, and staff.

Creswell (2007) writes, "We conduct qualitative research because we need a complex, detailed understanding of the issue" (p. 40). The organizational development process of DELO presented multiple complexities in the areas of institutional framework and purpose, structural design, and collaboration across the university community. Nine semi-structured interviews were conducted in an effort to gain a better understanding of the magnitude of the complexities that existed and how change agents chose to manage and meet challenges of change.

Interview Participants

Participants for this study were selected using purposeful sampling. Purposeful qualitative sampling allows researchers to intentionally select individuals and sites that are information rich (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 1990). University leaders, administrators, staff members, faculty, and other current and former employees were chosen because of their experiences with the organizational planning, development or implementation of DELO as a unit. Participants' background and experience with DELO includes but is not limited to leadership, finance, and program development.

Context

As stated, this study explores the change process related to developing a university outreach unit that would allow WKU to enhance responsiveness. It also seeks to illuminate key factors and practices that contributed to the development process as well as the resultant organizational structures. Since 2003 the DELO unit has produced significant growth of WKU in several areas of outreach. University online enrollments and high school dual credit enrollments have increased dramatically. On demand learning aimed at providing flexible education options for diverse learners as well as training and development programs with regional and national agencies have also experienced significant increases. The unit serves as an incubator for new programmatic offerings thereby removing the risk of "trying out" new programs from individual academic units. Growth in DELO's programs has not only produced higher enrollment numbers for the university, but also provided additional dollars for the university. The additional funds have allowed DELO to create a revenue-sharing program that benefits the university as a

whole, participating academic departments, and individual faculty who elect to design or participate in DELO programs.

Setting of the Study

WKU, located in Bowling Green, KY, is a public institution that was founded in 1906. In the fall of 2015 it reported an enrollment of 20,068 students. WKU offers associates degrees, certificate programs, undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral degrees. A goal of the university is to "enrich the quality of life for those within its reach," according to the WKU Mission Statement (WKU website, n.d). The DELO unit is located on the south campus of WKU and is housed inside the Knicely Conference Center, a comprehensive facility that accommodates seminars, workshops, as well as additional outreach activities developed or facilitated by DELO.

Interview Protocol

The interview protocol used during data collection for this study was developed to elicit answers to key research questions identified for this study. The questions were shaped by the desire to examine in detail the development process of DELO and to elucidate the key factors and practices that were utilized during the process. The interview protocol reflects questions that address how change agents and administrators approached the change process while also examining the experiences of those who were participants in the change process. By designing the interview protocol to address the perspective of leaders and change agents, as well as those who were participants, the questions posed in this study help illuminate a variety of perspectives across the university population. The interview protocol followed a semi-structure approach which allowed respondents the latitude to elaborate on their experiences with the university

53

change process in general as well as the DELO model in particular. The kind of responsiveness allowed by the protocol allowed for transcript data to be rich and provide insight from a variety of perspectives. The general interview protocol for this study can be found in Appendix B.

Analysis and Coding

After completion of the first interview the analysis of the data as applied to the research questions began. This stage of the research is focused on organizing and making meaning from the materials that have been collected during the interview process. Data analysis for the study was ongoing with the analysis of interview transcripts and the coding of data. The coding process began with deductive coding or a "start list" of codes developed from the list of research questions. Codes were revised and developed as dictated by the data during the data collection and analysis process.

Analysis for this study was conducted throughout the data collection process while interviewing participants and examining other materials such as meeting notes, annual reports, etc. In accordance with the research questions for this study, the initial themes used for coding were mission, vision, collaboration, incentives, strategic planning, leadership, goal setting, entrepreneurialism, and outreach. Through repeated analysis of interview transcripts and inductive content analysis, a number of additional themes emerged from the data. The additional themes that were identified through analysis were: partnerships, culture of support, and revenue generation. The original themes of need and value, sharing and clarifying vision, structural design, designing for sustainability, and the role of leadership were all present in the data. The emergent themes of partnerships, creating a culture of support, and revenue generation added depth

54

and additional understanding to the study as they illuminated areas of the implementation, development and structure that were not know to be of great importance in the beginning of the study. These themes were included under the sustainability section as they all emerged as reasons that the unit was and is sustainable for the future. Analysis of the transcripts indicated overlap of some existing and emergent themes. For example, the existing theme of sharing and clarifying vision was punctuated by strong communication on the part of both change agents and leadership. Likewise, results showed that in the area of partnerships the communication process of leaders and change agents was also significant.

Thematic analysis, the process whereby data is collected and examined for patterns, was reflexive. Clarke and Braun (2013) refer to searching for themes as an "active" process: "themes are not hidden in the data waiting to be discovered by the intrepid researcher, rather the researcher constructs the themes."

According to Gilgun (2005), negative case analysis is a process which allows researchers to look for themes that do not fit with codes that have been previously established. Gilgun states this approach is important for gaining additional understanding of the concept and discovering new relationships and constructs that the researcher may not have accounted for or expected in the initial stages of the study.

This stage of the research centered on organizing and making meaning from materials collected. A process of deductive coding based on the study's research questions provided initial structure for analysis, however allowing themes to emerge through the process of negative case analysis allowed for flexibility and discovery of

emergent constructs and potential patterns that could exist between initial and newly discovered themes.

Validity

According to Patton (1990), while qualitative analysis can be highly creative, the qualitative researcher has an obligation to address issues of validity and reliability in qualitative inquiry. Patton suggests triangulation of data sources as an effective way to validate information. Similarly, Yin (2010) states that researchers conducting case studies constantly check and recheck the consistency of findings from a variety of sources in an effort to establish "converging lines of evidence" which contribute to robust findings and provide evidence of triangulation.

Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) suggest that validity of qualitative studies is strengthened when the data presented are well linked to the categories of prior or emerging theory and the measures reflect the constructs at work. According to Creswell (2007), member checking, a process that involves the researcher asking study participants to evaluate the accuracy of the interpreted data, is another strategy used to address credibility of the findings.

A variety of methods were used to check the validity of this study. Triangulation of data sources as well as constant checking and rechecking was used while collecting and analyzing data. Triangulation of transcript analysis with content analysis showed that change agents and leaders used university mission as a guide for establishing the new unit. Achieving the outreach mission of the university was paramount to the change and implementation process that resulted in the Division of Learning and Outreach at WKU.

Summary

The methods, context, and design of this research study were carefully planned for the purposes of scholarship and research. For this study, research relies on qualitative analysis carried out by a case study method. The study was conducted at WKU and uses the experiences of a variety of actors in the change process as a means of studying that change process as well as the resultant structure of the university outreach unit. The theoretical framework for the study is the teleological change or planned change model. This model provided the foundation and direction for the study in the form of research questions and an initial coding scheme. During the course of analysis the additional themes, of partnerships, a created culture of support, and revenue generation emerged as important aspects of the change process as well as the structural design of the DELO unit. Chapter Four reports the findings of the data analysis with regards to the change process in general and the formation of DELO specifically.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This research explored the key factors and practices that were developed to create an effective, successful university outreach unit. The study also explored the entrepreneurial nature of the unit's culture and the impact of revenue generation on the unit as well as the institution's broader academic community. This exploration takes the form of a case study and sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How was need and value of a new outreach unit established?

2. How vision for a new outreach unit clarified and shared?

3. How were structural components of the new outreach unit designed and implemented?

4. What was the role of leadership in the areas creation, design, and implementation of the new outreach unit?

5. How were long-term sustainability practices and processes developed that would ensure continued success of the new outreach unit?

With these questions as a guide, the research was driven by an in-depth exploration of the processes, practices, and procedures employed by administrators, the leadership team, and others who were intimately involved with the outreach unit from its inception. According to Kezar (2001), there is a large body of research centered around the success of the teleological model, however, this literature failed to answer the question of how change occurs. This study explored the question of how change occurred when WKU restructured and centralized its outreach effort. This study utilized individual interviews as well as document analysis as the primary tools for data collection. For the purpose of confidentiality respondents who were chosen to be

interviewed for this study were referred to by the general area of responsibility they held at the time that the outreach unit was being planned and implemented. For example, Senior Administrator, Faculty Administrator, Professional staff, etc., were used as identifiers. This chapter reports the findings that emerged during the analytical process.

This chapter also contains an overview of the educational outreach structure at WKU prior to the formation of DELO as well as an account of the internal and external forces that served as the impetus for centralization of a self-supporting, entrepreneurial outreach unit.

Teleological change environments are characterized by the presence of analytical decision makers who possess the knowledge and experience to solve the problem or issue at hand; an opportunity for those decisions makers to examine a variety of strategies in order to find the most plausible solution; and the availability of resources necessary to move forward with the chosen strategy. Recurrent themes in the teleological model of change include mission, vision, collaboration, role of leadership, persuasive and effective communication, development of support structures, and processes that include rewards and incentives. Many of these elements served as catalysts for examination of the data in an effort to determine if they were present or utilized during DELO's formation and, if so, to what extent. The findings in this chapter are organized by research question and the chapter concludes with an overview of how processes were integrated to shape the organizational structure and resultant culture of DELO.

Research Question One

According to the research participants interviewed in this study, the academic

outreach structure that existed at WKU prior to DELO was very nearly non-existent. A

handful of loosely organized offices were responsible for areas such as: correspondence

courses, small business development, and non-credit programs. University employees

responsible for outreach activities had little in the way of mission-centered goals,

reporting structure, or planning to help guide their efforts. Most of the offices that

comprised "outreach" were placed into that category because there was little

understanding of where they fit into that larger university structure, what to do with them,

or to whom they should report.

According to historical and planning documents, outreach activities carried out

prior to the formation of DELO lacked a cohesive and overarching goal. There was no

plan to guide outreach strategy, collaboration between outreach units, or collaboration

with the broader academic community

Research participants for this study identified a number of factors they felt were

critical to the development and formation of DELO. Timing of the widespread utilization

of online learning was cited by several participants as discussions about reforming

outreach at WKU were taking place in 2002 and 2003.

In addition to timing, according to historical and planning documents, the

unversity's Provost/Academic Affairs office was taking part in a strategic plan,

Challenging the Spirit, in 2003-2004. That strategic plan put forth five strategic goals for

the university: 1) Increasing student learning; 2) Developing student populations; 3)

Assuring high quality faculty and staff; 4) Enhancing responsiveness to constituents; and

5) Improving institutional effectiveness. The plan's fourth goal of enhancing

responsiveness to constituents served as an impetus for the formation of an outreach unit

that would allow the university to compete in an ever-changing competitive marketplace

characterized by more diverse student populations, the need for lifelong learning, and

growth of the non-traditional student population.

The objective underlying the goal of enhancing responsiveness to constituents

was the universities need to respond to "educational, social, cultural, and economic

development needs through increased outreach, applied scholarship, service, and

innovative opportunities for lifelong learning." Among the activities cited as necessary to

achieve the goal and objectives were increased educational access, increased

collaboration with community partners such as K-12 schools and business, and increased

faculty engagement through initiatives that benefit Kentucky's economic growth.

Strategic planning efforts led university change agents to devise a plan for an

outreach unit that would allow WKU to be a competitor in the online learning

marketplace, balance tradition, and bring financial rewards and incentives back to the

university. The mission statement served as a map for strategic planning and the pending

change effort:

> Western Kentucky University (WKU) prepares students of all backgrounds to be
>
> productive, engaged, and socially responsible citizen-leaders of a global society.
>
> The University provides research, service, and lifelong learning opportunities for
>
> its students, faculty, and other constituents. WKU enriches the quality of life for
>
> those within its reach. (WKU website, n.d.)

Of the five primary research questions in this study, the first three questions posed to respondents focused on how administrators and the leadership team first established need and value of the unit among a diverse university community. An examination of the university's mission statement highlighted the need for a centralized unit that would provide a pathway for university resources to reach external constituents. Leadership had to convince the greater university community that there would be value in centralizing the outreach units of the university. The opportunity to reach goals set forth by university mission was one value proposition that the leadership team promoted to faculty, staff, and other internal stakeholders. DELO's potential for revenue generation was also widely communicated to the university community. A senior level administrator spoke about the message that was shared during DELO's planning phase:

> "They (academic departments) could expand the influence and support area of WKU, they could reach students that come to campus…. It could be a self-supporting unit and even contribute new resources to the university, and that's where, of course, it got everybody's attention. It would also help to create a positive attitude and positive image of WKU…"

Another respondent, a former senior academic administrator at the time of DELO's formation, said that some people perceived WKU to have taken a step back from outreach in the years leading up to the formation of DELO:

> "WKU wasn't that different from a lot of other schools in that faculty were pretty much interested in things in their department or the academic programs they offered and if you came up with an idea, in some cases, there was a threat to some individuals or units."

In communications about DELO, those leading change used university mission and expectations as a framework for the justification for a new unit, a senior academic administrator said:

> "Most of (the communication) was that we were trying to serve a region and how can we claim that we're doing that if we're kind of withdrawing and not extending ourselves to new things, online, and a lot of other things..."

Several respondents mentioned that environmental and marketplace pressures also played a role in communications as leaders attempted to establish need for the unit. A senior administrator at the university said that changing marketplace dynamics became a useful communication tool for change agents:

> "We recognized the opportunity for distance learning and the market niche that could be created. At the time Kentucky universities were doing very little in the way of online, asynchronous learning… we wanted to be sure that WKU got out in front of that and, in fact, helped shape that curve in Kentucky rather than being shaped by it or playing catch up to other institutions."

A respondent, a former senior academic administrator, said that at the time of DELO's implementation the revenue-generating potential that was often discussed as a benefit of the unit also contributed to the value proposition of a new outreach unit:

> "A very big part of the internal sell for this was that this would generate revenue that you don't have. That was attractive and while it was attractive then, since 2008 it has been absolutely crucial."

Another former academic administrator provided a similar response saying that incentives helped faculty members understand how the unit could generate additional revenue to be used to fulfill needs within academic colleges and departments:

"WKU's leadership always understood the role of incentives. There were incentives that were tied into units who were providing the programs. If you did more work and the program was successful, then you get part of that success."

Respondents said the DELO model that was presented by leaders helped faculty understand how the new unit could be valuable as a way to achieve mission-centered goals such as bringing educational opportunities to a wide audience, but it also helped faculty to directly connect their involvement with the unit to direct gains in their own colleges and departments. As a senior faculty administrator explained:

"What was neat about the DELO model was that there was revenue sharing in it... Going from 30 students to 60 students in a program doesn't necessarily add opportunities for new budgeting lines, new opportunities for professional development, more discretionary funds. DELO provided that model. You could do outreach and didn't have to risk your own resources, but the benefits were great and could benefit everybody."

A former professional staff member for DELO stated that revenue sharing played a key role in establishing the value of the unit in the academic community:

"When it came right down to it, we were there to make money and help those departments have part of that money that otherwise they wouldn't have had. So, the model of being the entrepreneurial partner was very important."

Focus on organizational mission during the change process is a common characteristic of the teleological change model. The literature on teleological change suggests that the evolution of the change should have a clear focus on the mission of the organization. Respondents' answers to the questions in this study about establishing need and value indicate that, in the case of DELO, university mission served as a map for change agents to understand where change needed to occur, but also helped clarify why the university needed a new, centralized outreach unit.

In summary, findings related to how need and value for the new unit were established were:

- Created new opportunities to reach goals central to university mission;

- Created potential for new revenue generation;

- Created a positive attitude toward and image of the university;

- Provided alignment between university mission and expectations;

- Created responsiveness to marketplace demands and dynamics;

- Created opportunity for distance learning and took advantage of market niche;

- Allowed new revenue stream to fulfill needs in academic colleges/departments;

- Faculty outreach activities more directly connected with and provided benefit to academic departments;

- Faculty incentives were imbedded in the operational structure of new outreach unit; Provided new venue for entrepreneurial activities

Research Question Two

The second primary research question for this study sought to gather information about how leaders approached the process of sharing and clarifying the vision of DELO.

65

As discussed in Chapter Two, vision for a change process can be cultivated when leaders are able to strike a balance between missions, which are deeply rooted in tradition and history, with goals that focus on forward-thinking innovation. The literature indicates that when change agents are communicating vision, they must have a clear, concise message. Respondents in this study who were considered key leaders indicated they used a number of tactics to help internal and external stakeholders understand the vision for a new unit.

A respondent who served the role as one of the earliest primary change leaders during the planning stages for DELO indicated that a carefully crafted and concise message allowed communications to be clear and direct:

> "All you can do is keep your message fairly tight in terms of what you're going to do. What I told people was that we were going to centralize what we're doing, we're going to get services to you and you're going to control your programming and you'll be a part of this major piece."

All respondents indicated that the vision for the new outreach unit was communicated clearly. They also indicated that there was a strong emphasis on collaboration and transparency- both of which associated with effective change strategies. Respondents said that senior administration, as well as leadership at the unit level, played a significant role in the process of sharing and clarifying vision for the new unit. All those interviewed indicated that communication from leadership to the university community as well as external constituencies helped gain widespread support from a number of university academic departments.

Interviewees also indicated that prior experiences and knowledge of those leading the change was widely shared during the initial phases of planning for the unit.

According to the teleological model, teleological action is characterized by analytical decision making by actors who have sufficient knowledge about the problem or issue at hand, an opportunity for decision makers to examine relevant strategies and select the best fit for the problem, and adequate resources to implement the strategy such as the ability to develop programs, plans, and budgets.

A former senior academic administrator said that hearing stories about successes at other universities and trusting in the expertise and knowledge of leaders proved to be an important selling point for the new unit:

"… for any vision to be successful people have to believe in it… when they came and explained what had been done, that their outreach built a building and had $2 million in extra revenue… they would share those experiences about how it could be. They would share those stores and say 'let's be conscious about this helping the university'…it was meant to help the whole institution as long as we could all be successful together."

A respondent who was a professional staff member in DELO offered a similar response saying that knowledge and expertise of those leading change efforts helped people feel good about the vision that was being shared and it expanded the reach of the vision when leaders made the effort to be highly engaged with internal and external constituents:

"Certainly the great experience that they came here with was absolutely necessary for success because the whole thing was so fragile. (The change agents) were always out there meeting people, at every opening, every ribbon cutting, and that was extremely important. I can't tell you how valuable that was. It did a whole lot

of improving the value proposition because we became a visible face of the university."

Respondents in this study indicated that communication and collaboration were key factors in the success of helping organizational members understand what the new unit would do and the role that unit would play in the overall functioning of the university.

In summary, findings related to how the leadership team shared and clarified the vision for the new outreach unit were:

- Communications about new unit were concise and carefully crafted;

- Messages were intended to educate stakeholders and gain support for unit;

- Prior experiences and knowledge of leadership team was crucial for building trust and support for the vision;

- Diverse group of internal stakeholders were included in collaborative communication activities;

- Clear and open communication allowed for transparency and understanding in processes and function of new outreach unit;

- Academic community was assured control of programming would remain with departments;

- Awareness of unit's function and purpose was increased through frequent and widespread communication across diverse internal and external stakeholders

Research Question Three

The third primary research question for this study was designed to gather information about how leaders were able to prioritize for change and create a unit-level organizational structure that would support university mission, outreach goals, and the need to be self-supporting.

According to the literature on prioritization in higher education Dickeson, (1999) indicated that prioritization should be guided by university mission when leaders are seeking organizational change. Overton and Burkhardt (1999) cited an extensive body of research that indicates universities should prioritize in ways that allow the organization to be more responsive and accessible to stakeholders while adapting to changing needs of society. Clark (1998) argued that a top priority of university leadership should be concerned with expanding the institution's integrated entrepreneurial culture and expanding the developmental periphery beyond the traditional boundaries of the university.

Respondents in this study stated that engaging constituents from a wide variety of backgrounds, as called for in the mission statement of the university, provided a valuable information when leaders were setting priorities for the new outreach unit. One senior administrator stated that balancing the innovation of new outreach endeavors to reach a broader audience while maintaining the traditional feel and spirit of a residential university required careful planning:

"We made some very important decisions early on (about prioritization)… so we've created quite the dynamic all the while determined not to change the culture of our campus from being a campus-based, highly-engaged undergraduate

69

experience, so we think we've found that right blend of online and face-to-face, and ITV. We've found a good blend to bring all those elements together without compromising the importance of the campus experience."

A senior level academic administrator added that expanding the university's integrated entrepreneurial culture as well as the developmental periphery of the university, as suggested by Clark (1998), was also a priority for leaders which proved to be an important piece of the unit's success:

"I think in a lot of ways the fundamental thing that they came up with was a way to tie academic expertise to a chance to generate revenue. They asked, 'what is it that we have in the academic mission, what expertise do we have that we can sell in a sense sort of outside the normal?' It (DELO) has also made academic expertise more available to the community. I think its role as an entry point for the university is really crucial. DELO has been an entry point for lots and lots of different constituencies."

Those interviewed for the study overwhelmingly indicated the importance of establishing and structuring DELO as self-supporting, agile, and flexible unit as one of the reasons for its success. A senior academic administrator said that DELO's approach to identifying and meeting market and environmental needs made it especially valuable not only to the university, but to external audiences as well:

"It's entrepreneurial certainly in the sense that it's out there to come up with ideas that will make money and generate income, but it's also entrepreneurial in being receptive to new ideas sort of in the spirit of what would be good for the community."

A senior administrator said that putting in place a structure that would allow for fast response time and freedom to assess and find solutions to educational needs was a priority for DELO change agents from the beginning:

"If they can create something, they don't need to seek anybody's permission. They can just go for it. It's intended to be free market, free enterprise, and entrepreneurial."

Responses to the research question regarding the prioritization process that was used when creating DELO's operational structure indicate that mission played an important role in setting priorities. This finding is typical in change efforts that can be explained by the teleological framework.

In summary, findings related to how structural components of the new outreach unit was designed and implemented were:

- Engagement of diverse constituents encouraged effective alignment of structural priorities;

- Structural design created space for innovative practices within traditional university environment;

- Structure was entrepreneurial in nature;

- Design allowed for broader university reach as called for by strategic planning;

- Allowed agility and flexibility in meeting educational needs of constituents;

- Connected academic expertise of university to educational and workforce needs

- Incentives and rewards were a priority in university structure

Research Question Four

Literature on change indicates a strong correlation between support from upper level administration and widespread support for the change process in higher education. However, more recent literature shows collaborative leadership may be more important to leading change effort than top-down support. In any case, prior research indicates that while collaboration is necessary for successful change, administrative support continues to play an important support role in the change process (Clark, 1998; Cowan, 1993; Lindquist, 1978).

During the course of interviewing participants for this study, collaboration emerged as an important aspect of DELO's formation as well as its continued success. Respondents consistently identified the collaborative nature of the unit and the leadership at each level of the university as a key factor that helped get DELO up and running. In addition, respondents also talked extensively about leaders' ability to engage with both internal and external stakeholders to educate and create awareness about a new outreach unit which, in turn, helped encourage collaboration.

One of the leadership team said that meeting with internal stakeholders and explaining exactly what the new unit would do, as well as educating faculty about how the unit could serve as a resource for their academic efforts, was a key selling point for the unit:

> "When I met with deans the key there was to say 'we're not here to tap into your income, we're here to give support to this new unit, create a different image, rethink, and reconceptualize what we're doing in continuing education.' And we also took some of the threat away. You have to convince them that you're not just

there to snap up their programming and their people and call it yours. They have

to feel a part of the unit."

Another change leader said developing a culture of trust took time as the DELO

model was very different than what many academic stakeholders were accustomed to:

"It took a while to convince deans and department heads that there was a unit that

truly was not competing for their money, not competing for their students, was

not competing for their credit for getting the job done. We made it very clear that

we were a service organization for them. We were partners to help them be as

successful as possible in carrying out their business. We, as an organization,

DELO, had to add value to the mix and if we couldn't then we didn't have a

partnership because unless we could add value, we added cost."

A senior level academic administrator said the personalities and abilities of the

leadership was a key factoring in drawing faculty and other members of the university

community into the DELO effort. The administrator described the personalities of those

leading the change as "welcoming," "positive," "affable," and "engaging." In addition,

the administrator said, leaders were open to new ideas and often extended their expertise

and skills sets to departments and units that were typically labeled as "difficult to work

with." The respondent said the "tone" set by leadership was important because it created

opportunities for outreach in areas and units that had never participated in the past:

"Leadership was obviously very important in that. They were willing to tackle

some things in the early days. They had a willingness to go out and connect with

folks and try something and that created a lot of goodwill, but it also

demonstrated their willingness to be flexible and innovative and I think all of

that contributed to a growing reputation for DELO during that period."

Several respondents noted that one of the tools they felt was most valuable in

building a collaborative community during the implementation of DELO was

transparency. A senior level academic administrator said that transparency about what the

unit would do, how incentives were awarded, and how the DELO/academic unit

partnerships would work built a sense of trust among stakeholders and participants and

that trust served as a motivator while also fostering much- needed buy in from the

academic community:

> "They would show how the split would work with units, and distributions were
>
> shared at the CAD (Council of Academic Deans) meetings, I gave out the same
>
> information at our department meetings. There were no secrets. Things that are
>
> college-generated ought to be shared with everyone. I think our faculty would see
>
> this and see how many funds were available. It increased the trust of the faculty
>
> about doing distance learning. It wasn't a mandate, but here was this great
>
> opportunity. I trusted them 100 percent. Trusting them was really the key piece to
>
> this."

Duryea (1962) suggested that those leading change in higher education should

welcome opportunities that allow faculty to be involved in the core of new academic

programs or initiatives. Clark (1998) suggested that a "stimulated academic heartland" (p.

7) was an important aspect of developing a culture of entrepreneurialism in higher

education. A key change agent at the time of DELO's implementation said collaboration

and cooperation were at the heart of the unit:

"Of course you have to have clear expectations and commitments by all the

partners. With DELO the whole this is DELO doesn't belong to DELO, as a

matter of fact, DELO doesn't belong to the provost's office or the president's

office. DELO belongs to the university. The fact is that the deans own DELO,

the department heads own DELO, and the partnering faculty own DELO. That's

why I think it's so well supported. Because there is something in it for you

regardless of what hat you're wearing on the campus."

While collaboration fostered by effective leadership practices emerged as a key

factor in the implementation of DELO, respondents identified additional qualities of

leaders that they felt contributed to the development of a strong and successful outreach

unit. A former professional staff member said a visible passion was one key aspect that

encouraged motivation and cohesiveness among those involved with DELO. The

respondent described one of the leaders as a "tenacious leader" who "truly believed" in

the unit and had "a conviction" that DELO could be successful.

Leaders closely tied to the development of DELO noted that collaboration within

DELO itself was crucial to the success of the unit. Both indicated that they valued a team

concept, input, and feedback from others who worked in the unit. One key change agent

said that it was important for all the members of the DELO staff to understand the

mission, vision, and goals of the unit in order to foster its success:

"We had to agree and we had to convince ourselves that we understood our

mission and that was how we were going to communicate that mission to each

other and then communicate that to the campus leadership and the deans, and at

the same time we had to explain what we were all about to the broader

community and businesses… we had to talk about what we were all about.

We first had to make sure that we were committed and everybody was on the train

and wanted to go the same direction."

Another change leader agreed that building a strong sense of camaraderie among

the DELO staff as was a necessary preliminary step in presenting a capable and efficient

image to the rest of the university community:

"I think we knew we had to start with an internal structure that was defensible,

describable, and explain the benefits of the unit… however, we had to build a

sense of community within. I think that would be the number one thing for me.

We had to build a sense of community within the different units. We practiced

relationship building, we had frequent internal staff meetings. That was the

beginning of building that sense of community and it spread campus wide. There

had to be an internal sense of community because you had to have these

proponents of what you were doing going forth to share the vision also."

Results of this study indicate that personalities and perceptions of change leaders

played a role in gaining organizational support for DELO. In addition, portrayal of the

new unit as a support system for faculty was noted as influential in garnering support

from the academic community.

In summary, the findings relative to the role of leadership in the development of

the unit were:

- Leadership support of collaboration fostered change process;

- Transparent leadership communication fostered trust of leaders;

- Attitudes and personalities of change leaders were instrumental in building culture of support;

- Passionate leadership fostered positive image and attitudes across university community;

- Camaraderie among outreach staff presented positive image of new unit;

- Leaders valued team concept and feedback from followers

- Created wide-spread buy-in through collaboration across diverse constituencies;

- Willingness to take on challenges and build connections fostered trust;

- Leaders served as educators about functions of new unit;

- Promotion of unit's academic support functions was crucial to gaining faculty trust

Research Question Five

The fifth and final primary research question for this study was designed to explore how change agents were able to build a sustainable outreach unit. The questions sought to better understand what structural or leadership components may have contributed to the unit's longevity over time.

According to Coblentz (2002), sustainability is a "never-ending organizational initiative" (p. 4) which is characterized by flexibility, continued creativity, innovative thought, and a close connection with the external environment. Three themes emerged during analysis of respondent interviews as the primary reasons that the DELO unit has been sustainable for 13 years. A developed culture of support, partnerships, and revenue generation emerged as important reasons that DELO has been able to not only survive, but flourish for more than a decade.

A senior DELO leader said that while incentives to faculty have been an important part of DELO's sustainability and the thing that many in the university often point to first as a reason for success, the support that DELO provides for faculty to be able to obtain outreach goals is an often overlooked, but extremely important priority of the unit:

"I have to say that our culture here, of support, is over and above any kind of incentives. I think that's the main driver. Faculty don't see us as competition and that's very valuable. The early leaders and those leading the change were very smart about that. They made the right decisions and because we're not in competition with other deans or department heads or administrators for students. From the very beginning we knew we had to be seen as the support arm for all faculty and that all faculty could view us as their help in reaching goals of teaching, research, scholarship, and service. And that's what we do. We're an administrative support unit. That's our first thing."

A senior level academic leader shared a similar opinion about the support function of the DELO unit:

"DELO was there with support for faculty. If you weren't trained on Integrity, if you needed help with Blackboard, we had the technicians who could help. Training our faculty and having resources to make this easy was another huge piece of the success."

The senior DELO leader said that providing support in the way of training or taking on administrative functions lifts a burden off of the people that DELO counts on the most to provide programming for its outreach. In instances where faculty were

avoiding taking on programs that would have been worthwhile and increased

enrollments, but were too complicated and cumbersome administratively, DELO had the

ability to step in and take care of things like figuring out the logistics, accounting, and the

money management:

"Faculty are very smart people, but they can't do their jobs and the administrative

jobs at the same time. You can't ask people to do that."

Each respondent in this study indicated that the partnership building function of

DELO played a significant role in the unit's sustainability and success. A change leader

said the philosophy of creating a relationship between the unit, stakeholders, and

constituents was a major, guiding principle for both leaders and staff members in the unit:

"I think the strategy of operating partners, making everything we did a

partnership… that gained not only support, but made all parties to the partnership

successful and I think that's why it carried and hopefully will continue to carry

on."

The same leaders said every relationship inside and outside the unit was viewed

as a partnership and that allowed everyone to have buy-in, feel like their opinion and

presence mattered, and built a sense of shared responsibility and reward for those who

were involved with DELO.

A former professional staff member said the partnership culture was understood

and embraced by staff members in the unit and everyone understood that relationship

building was part of the foundation that DELO would be built on:

"We did focus on building awareness and cultivating awareness and we did

always use the term 'partners' or 'partnerships.' The key really was the

relationship building and the one-on-one sales pitch that the DELO directors

would do for their programs. They went out and cultivated those relationships and

they realized that they had to look where there were needs and they would

approach people and ask what they could do for them."

A senior administrator said that DELO serves as resource for business and

industry in the area by promoting a relationship building culture not only for the unit, but

also for the university as a whole:

"There's some salesmanship involved. When a corporation needs a group of

employees to do a particular thing that's where the partnership comes in…It's part

us selling to the corporate sector what DELO can do for them and part the

corporate sector understanding that when they have a need they can come to

DELO and they can probably meet that need."

Respondents indicated that incentives and revenue generated by DELO are but

one factor when it comes to the unit that balances a diverse outreach initiative and also

supports WKU faculty and staff in their efforts to take the educational resources of the

institution to the community are region. However, some respondents indicated that the

alternative revenue stream provided by DELO has been absolutely necessary in the last

six years. A senior leader said:

"What we've done is we've grown DELO into a multi-million dollar operation

and most of that revenue gets distributed back out across academic affairs and

academic departments. That has really been a critical financial environment,

particularly in the financial situation where we currently find ourselves with state

funding."

Another senior level administrator said that DELO's revenue generation has had a significant impact on the university and its ability to maintain financial equilibrium in recent years with DELO funds being used to create their own testing facility and performing extensive renovations on a university conference center:

> "DELO has been generating over $8 million every year for the last few years in surplus. They finish the year and they have at least $8 million left over and then they decide what each of the participating colleges are going to get. The president's office starts the year with $300,000. DELO starts the year with one million."

A senior leader said that the entrepreneurial spirit of DELO has been paramount in the unit's ability to generate excess revenues in the millions. And by embracing the spirit of risk and opportunity the university has been able to give faculty and departments a reason to continue working toward growing and expanding the outreach mission of the university:

> "We were willing to take risks, we put a business plan together, and we began to generate revenue. We were distributing that back out to our academic units and faculty were quick to get on board because they knew they could make some money teaching the course and supplement their departmental and college budgets at the same time. If we'd started by having that money going back into the central budget and then get redistributed out to the entire campus, I don't think we would have had the buy-in which was necessary to do this thing in the first place. So creating that incentive and being very businesslike and entrepreneurial in our thoughts, and taking some risks, that's what made it pay off."

The results of this research indicate that both the success and longevity of WKU's outreach unit are dependent upon three important factors: providing support services, structure, and training, creating partnerships, and providing alternative revenue streams to partnering units.

In summary, findings relative to the development of long-term sustainability for the new unit were:

- Development of strong culture of support for academic departments;

- Created diverse internal university partnerships;

- Provided alternative revenue stream to fund academic and university needs;

- Contributed to financial stability during times of decreased state appropriations;

- Generated revenue is distributed directly back to academic departments;

- Cultivated relationships among diverse group of external constituents;

- Provided flexible programming for educational, workforce, and training needs;

- Maintained awareness of market demands and educational content delivery trends

Summary

This chapter details the results of this study by exploring both existing or a priori themes as well as those themes that emerged through analysis of participant interviews. Primary research questions for this study provided the organizational framework for this chapter and participant responses were analyzed and then organized under major areas of exploration for this study.

Analysis of transcribed interviews indicated that the mission of the university played a significant role when change agents were establishing the need and value of a new centralized outreach unit. How university change agents created an efficient

structural unit that would support the goals and mission of outreach was explored by examining the priorities of change agents during the implementation phase.

In addition, respondents indicated that the role of leadership in leading collaborative efforts across the university was invaluable in achieving buy-in from academic leaders and faculty. Finally, the chapter discusses findings related to ways that change agents were able to create sustainability for the new unit. The themes of support, partnerships, and revenue generation were all discussed in detail. The following and final chapter of this study provides an overview of the results of the analysis and explore the significance of the findings. Chapter Five provides conclusions for the study and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In today's rapidly evolving higher education environment university outreach units are often the first-responders to changes in economic needs, innovation, service expectations, partnering, and environmental and market trends. Changes in funding formulas and sources as well as enrollment trends and accountability, have created the need for universities to respond to constituent needs in creative and innovative ways. The outreach function of the modern, American university, which should bridge the gap between society's needs and the university's resources, requires careful planning and organization along with a healthy dose of creativity and innovation (Ostrander, 2004).

Outreach has been a buzzword in higher education since the Morrill Act of 1862, when land grant colleges were established to meet needs of those outside the university, particularly in the areas of agriculture and industry. Since that time, the structure of higher outreach units and the role those units play in the functioning and operation of individual institutions has changed dramatically. Outreach units can be centralized or siloed, and the range of responsibilities vary widely from dual credit programming to life-long learning opportunities for senior citizens. The outreach function and character is as individual as each university itself.

In 2002, WKU leaders determined that in order to stay relevant and competitive in the changing landscape of higher education, the university's outreach efforts should be centralized and repositioned in the larger university structure. In the years prior, WKU's outreach activities were carried out by a collection of offices, each operating on its own. The lack of collaboration, connection, and purposeful planning resulted in an outreach component presented a limiting factor in enabling WKU to respond to its commitment to meeting the needs of the community and the region.

84

After the implementation of the Division of Extended Learning and Outreach in 2003, WKU saw its online enrollments increase from nearly zero to more than 30,000 a decade later in 2013. In addition, the unit took on the responsibilities of dual credit programming for high schoolers, summer and winter terms, and training for regional business and industry. Operating with a business model that focused on entrepreneurialism and rewards, the unit was able to generate millions of dollars in revenue while providing rewards and incentives for members of the academic community who were willing to partner with the unit to create and deliver programming. Dollars generated by DELO are pumped back in to academic departments to provide professional development opportunities as well as technology and facility upgrades. The additional revenue stream made possible by the DELO structure has been an important part of the university's ability to grow its reach and influence in the region and beyond. In addition, money generated by DELO has contributed to the university's ability to maintain its financial equilibrium as state appropriations have decreased more than 18% since 2008 (Federal and State Funding of Higher Education, 2015).

The purpose of this research was to gain understanding of how leaders at WKU were able to plan, structure, and implement an outreach unit that allowed greater reach for the university while providing an additional revenue stream that incentivizes future outreach activities and provides much-needed dollars to academic units.

The methodology for this qualitative study focused on the individual experiences of those who were intimately involved in the change process that resulted in the new unit. Their experiences and insights helped to define key aspects of successful change including fostering collaboration and buy-in, creating a culture of trust through

transparency and communication, and the role of financial incentives in the change process.

The interview protocol used for this study was based on five key research questions which were formulated to gain insight about establishing need and value, clarifying and sharing vision, priorities of leaders, role of leaders, and establishing sustainability practices for the unit. The sample of respondents included 9 individuals who served in a variety of positions at WKU during the time of DELO's planning and implementation. Each interview session was taped and transcribed before being codified to determine the important aspects of the change process.

Overview of Findings

This summary provides findings related to the process leaders used to establish the need and value of a new, centralized outreach unit at WKU.

Research Question 1. *How was need and value of a new outreach unit established?*

Change leaders responsible for the design and implementation of the DELO unit at WKU relied on both university mission and strategic planning to promote the formation of the unit as a positive change for the university. The presence of strategic plan which was also guided by university mission, lent relevance to the proposal of a new outreach unit and provided rationale for the change. The formation of a centralized outreach unit helped create the needed alignment between university mission and expectations which contributed to a positive attitude about the university as well as improve the image. Prior to the development of DELO, outreach was not a top priority for WKU. Leaders presented the unit as a way for WKU to meet the needs of constituents while responding to widespread changes in the way courses were delivered as well as a

changing student demographic. Timing related to marketplace pressures and the changing environment of online learning was an important factor in the development of the unit and its subsequent success.

Leadership at WKU realized that significant environmental changes in state funding and resource allocation were likely to become the new reality of higher education institutions in Kentucky. The entrepreneurial nature of the unit and leadership's desire to be a front runner in online learning and programming allowed DELO capacity to generate revenue that would fulfill the needs of academic departments and colleges at a time when state appropriations were becoming more scarce. Because faculty incentives were imbedded into the operational structure of the new unit, academic departments were able to see the direct benefit of participation in outreach activities. The ability of the DELO model to generate revenue and provide financial incentives for participation proved to be important factors in fostering support for the new unit.

The entrepreneurial DELO model that fostered collaboration between outreach and the university's academic community satisfied the need of WKU to meet its outreach obligations set forth by university mission. Members of the university community recognized value in a unit that would help meet mission-centered goals and but generate much-needed revenue to support the academic units that would be instrumental in creating programming for outreach.

Research Question 2. *How was the vision for a new outreach unit clarified and shared?*

Findings of this study indicate that the organizational vision for DELO and the purpose it would serve in the large university structure was communicated by leaders in a way that was concise, understandable, and transparent. Communication style and

practices of leadership was crucial to sharing the vision with the larger university community. Direct communication from leaders played a key role in educating members of the WKU community about the change that would be needed to develop DELO. In addition, conversations between leadership and stakeholders, both internally and externally, helped constituents become more comfortable with the change effort and provided value in the form of visibility and recognition.

Involving a diverse group of stakeholders from across the campus community allowed for collaboration which set the tone for how the entire DELO unit would operate. In addition, through collaboration with academic departments and colleges, faculty were able to understand that control of academic programs would remain with academic units which facilitated understanding that DELO would not be competing with academic departments, but would serve as a support system for growing outreach activities at WKU.

Change leaders served as tireless champions of the outreach unit during the planning and implementation stages of the unit. Former experiences and expertise of leaders in the area of outreach was important in both educating the larger university community about the possibilities that existed in a centralized change unit and fostering trust that the change process and resultant unit would yield the results that leaders promised. The commitment and tenacity of those who were primarily responsible for leading the change was an important factor in helping facilitate trust that the new unit would be a positive change for the university and belief that the new unit could and would function as change agents promised.

Research Question 3. *How were structural components of the new outreach unit designed and implemented?*

Leadership made engagement of diverse constituents a priority when creating a structural framework for the new outreach unit. The involvement of stakeholders from a variety of backgrounds allowed change leaders to strike an effective balance between the needs of the organization and the needs of both internal and external stakeholders. The model for DELO and its resultant structure satisfied the university's need for expanded and innovative outreach and met the needs staekholders in two important ways.

First, the DELO structure placed great value on the input and expertise of academic faculty for bringing high-quality academic programming to the community and region. The operational framework allowed a tangible connection between the universtiy and the needs of the community and region. Additionally, this connection was strengthened by the unit's ability to respond to educational and workforce needs quickly. The DELO structure allowed programming to be created and delivered in a fraction of the time that would be required inside the traditional university structure. The same agility allowed DELO to increase the reach of the university by capitalizing on the entrepreneurial nature of the model. DELO's structure allowed for creativity in the areas of revenue generation and provided ample space and freedom to explore programming and activities that answered community needs and facilitated the idea that WKU was a good steward of community and place.

Because providing an additional revenue source for academic colleges and departments through rewards and incentives was prioritized during the structural design of DELO, departments that found themselves without sufficient funding for necessary

activities and equipment, were able to partner with DELO to generate their own funding

and then decide how to best use that funding to meet their needs. In s

The structure of the DELO unit embraced creativity, rewards, and individual

responsibility by focusing on faculty contributions in the form of programming. The

model also helped faculty members make sense of how their contributions, though

individual, played a role in the larger scope of DELO and WKU. These elements are

recurring in entrepreneurial cultures and business models.

Research Question 4. *What was the role of leadership in formation of the new outreach*

unit?

Fostering collaboration was one of the most important tasks of leaders during the

change process at WKU. The ability of change agents to foster collaboration and engage

with stakeholders both inside and outside the university was crucial to the continued

forward momentum of the change effort as well as gaining buy-in from key stakeholders

and constituents. Transparency in leadership communications was also important as it

helped foster a sense of trust among followers. The passionate personalities and positive

attitudes of change leaders also served as motivation for other members of the broader

university community to support the vision and mission of the new unit. Those leading

change exuded a passion toward their work that was permeated meetings and events.

Change agents presented themselves as champions of the change effort and the unit that

would be born of that effort. Their openness, congeniality, prior knowledge, and

tenacious attitudes were noted by respondents as key factors that influenced others to

follow them with confidence. Change leaders were viewed as helpers who were there to

build a unit that would serve as a support structure for the academic community rather

than compete with it. Leaders welcomed feedback and input from those inside and outside the unit and maintained an open communication structure that resulted in widespread camaraderie and buy-in from diverse constituents. The open channel of communication created a sense of trust among participants in the change process and lent understanding to the concept that DELO was available for many kinds of partnerships thereby extending the benefit of DELO across the entire university community.

Research Question 5. *How were long-term sustainability practices developed to ensure success of the new unit?*

The operational culture of DELO prioritized commitment to a strong and flexible support system for faculty and academic departments. This support system, which provides assistance and training for faculty and allows academic departments to dispense with many of the administrative challenges related to providing outreach programs, has made DELO a crucial element of WKU outreach. In addition, DELO has a diverse array of internal partnership built over time. Through constant assessment of outreach needs and trends, DELO created a vast web of internal partnerships across the campus community which has allowed faculty and administrators from all areas to experience the support as well as financial benefit that comes along with being a DELO partner.

Faculty incentives have funded millions of dollars in academic and university projects in the 13 years of DELO's existence. The alternative revenue stream has proved to be of exceptional value in the current educational climate of decreased state support. A key concept of DELO's structural design was directly rewarding faculty for their work with DELO programs and initiatives. Incentives that are funneled directly to academic departments facilitated the connection between effort and reward for faculty members

and motivated additional involvement throughout the academic community. Constant monitoring of community and workforce needs as well as input and feedback from external constituents has allowed WKU to expand its partnership base regionally and nationally. DELO and widespread participation from the WKU academic community allowed DELO to be a responsive and agile outreach unit that could quickly meet the needs of the community and region in the areas of degree attainment, continuing education, and workforce training needs. That agility and responsiveness were crucial to the structure of DELO in the early days of the unit and have been a contributing factor to the sustainability of the unit over time. The unit's ability to respond to environmental was important in the scope of achieving university mission, but also in remaining relevant and competitive in an every-changing higher education marketplace. Because of DELO's agile and flexible structure that essentially reduces risk of "trying out" new programs for the academic units, the unit is able to avoid more lengthy, traditional program approval process. This allows the unit the freedom and authority to meet market demands as well as community and regional educational needs in a timely manner.

Key to the future success of DELO is continued freedom to operate as an entrepreneurial, self-supporting unit. Flexibility and continued partnerships with business and industry as well as trends related to lifelong learning should provide an alternative source of revenue for the university as state appropriations will shrink in the coming years. DELO's future will depend on its creativity in finding solutions to new and emerging educational issues as well as its ability to maintain the agility to remain competitive in an increasingly crowded and ever-changing educational marketplace.

Conclusions and Discussion

1. *Change efforts/ initiatives are more likely to be successful to the extent that they can be tied to and justified by organizational mission.*

Change leaders at WKU were able to use the existing university mission as justification for the change that lead to a centralized outreach unit. Connecting change efforts to the guiding mission of the institutions allowed members of the large university community, as well as external stakeholders to understand the planned change from a familiar framework. Organizational members are able to make sense of large-scale institutional changes when the changes are presented in a way that conveys movement toward meeting organizational goals. Strategic planning efforts also contributed to the successful change in that strategic planning goals, which were also guided by university mission, lent a sense of timely relevance to the proposed change. In the face of significant changes to the higher education landscape, change leaders used university mission as justification for change and the strategic planning process provided a reason for change leaders to move toward change with urgency.

2. *Imbedding the key priorities for success, financial incentives and academic support, in the structure of the new unit was crucial for the unit to remain functional and successful over time.*

Change leaders at WKU prioritized financial incentives and support for academic units in the structural framework of the new outreach unit. Financial incentives for faculty who provided programming for the new outreach unit, as well as the philosophy that the unit should function as a support arm for academics rather than competition, were key elements of the unit's success. By creating an operating structure that focused on the

top priorities identified as faculty motivators by change leaders, the centralized unit established itself as a partner and supporter of the academic community. Imbedding these priorities into the structure of the unit insured that the character of the unit would remain stable through leadership changes over time. While the structure could be changed, it would be a significant undertaking that would change the character and purpose of the unit and would likely draw a great deal of criticism from the academic community which provides the programming that is absolutely necessary for the outreach function.

3. *Change efforts will be more successful if those leading the change are perceived to be experienced, communicative, and collaborative.*

Change efforts at WKU were successful because change leaders were seen as knowledgeable about similar kinds of change at other universities. Their knowledge fostered as sense of trust among stakeholders who were unfamiliar with change and the concept of a centralized outreach unit. Trust allowed participants to move forward and take the initial steps required to partner with the unit. Trust continued to grow as change leaders explained plans for the new unit and communicated openly about the function of the unit as well as where it would fit in the larger university structure. Communication about the new unit was nearly constant across the university community in the months leading up to the formation of the unit. Finally, change leaders sought involvement and feedback from a diverse group of internal stakeholders which created a collaborative momentum for the new unit.

Recommendations

The following recommendations related to designing, implementing, and leading change are based on the findings of this study:

- Change efforts should be tied to university mission and/or strategic planning efforts in order to lend understanding, meaning, and relevance to proposed changes

- Those leading change should be prepared to serve as the champions of the change effort, constantly seeking new audiences with whom to share information about the proposed change

- When creating a functional unit, key priorities that support participation and involvement should be incorporated into the unit's structure, i.e., rewards, incentives, promotions, recognitions, etc.

- Large scale change efforts should be led by change leaders who are knowledgeable and experienced in similar change efforts

- Change efforts should be carried out in such a way that both internal and external stakeholders are able to recognize the benefit to the organization as well as the benefit to the organization's constituents

- Change leaders should place high value and importance on communication and be able to achieve open, but concise communication among diverse audiences.

- Change leaders should seek genuine collaboration from varied stakeholders and be open to collaborative feedback

Study Implications

The implications of this research indicate the complex nature of leading change in today's diverse and ever-evolving world of higher education. The literature review has shown that change leaders must consider the complexities that exist throughout the change process. Leaders must be able to create a delicate balance between university

mission and society's needs, between the needs of those in the university and those that it serves, and, most of all, must have a thorough understanding of the importance of collaboration and communication throughout the change process.

In addition, those leading organizational restructuring must understand that change can happen for many reasons, but planned or teleological change yields greater control over the change process allowing change leaders to create their own vision and culture of collaborative change. Leadership at WKU made an important decision to take on planned change at the time that new learning delivery models were being implemented in colleges and universities. Taking the initiative to start their own change process and take control of that process gave WKU the ability to create a unit that served the university's unique needs as well as the needs of the community and region it serves.

Because American higher education is in a constant state of evolutionary change, it is imperative that university administrators and change agents understand the necessary steps and processes that can produce positive, effective, and lasting change. In addition, today's colleges and universities are under tremendous pressure to find ways to become more self-sufficient. Creating additional revenue streams by providing more accessibility to a wider range of audiences and learners has proven to be successful for WKU. The challenges facing higher education necessitates a thorough understanding of the creation, structure, and sustainability of a revenue-generating outreach unit that balances university mission and vision with market pressures and the needs of its constituents.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study focused specifically on change in one university outreach unit. Additional research that looked at the change process in a variety of universities and

across a variety of units would be of great benefit to leaders and administrators in higher education as change happens for a variety of reasons and cannot always be planned as in the teleological change model. Because of the constantly-changing nature of today's higher education landscape, leaders and change agents should be armed with a vast array of research-based knowledge and experiences that allow them to navigate many different varieties and models of change.

Additional research in the area of outreach itself would be of benefit to university leadership as the pressure to reach more audiences with fewer resources increase. Today's higher education administrators are tasked with reaching outside the traditional university borders and provided new and innovative services in addition to graduate and undergraduate degrees. The responsibility of university outreach units is ever-expanding and ever-changing and these challenges necessitate a thorough understanding of effective operational structure and practices across a variety of outreach units.

Finally, decreased funding for universities has also created the need for universities to generate their own sources of revenue. Research to examine best practices of a variety of revenue-generating units across a variety of institutions could help university leadership understand how and where to begin or enhance efforts to become less dependent on state appropriations and tuition increases and more dependent on self-generated revenue.

Summary

This study provides insight into two important aspects of higher education today- change and outreach. The results of this study show that strong, knowledgeable leadership, engaged and open communication, collaboration, and incentives all play a

role in facilitating successful change. Even though this study only examined change in a single outreach unit, it still provides valuable insight about planning and implementing change. The teleological or planned change model served as the theoretical framework guiding this study.

The results of the study indicate that the teleological themes of mission, role of leadership, collaboration, vision, persuasive and effective communication, and developing support structures and processes that include rewards and incentives were all present during the planning and implementation process of DELO at WKU. Not only were teleological themes present, they proved to be most influential in helping change agents bring about much needed change to an outreach unit that was no more than a collection of small offices and units that didn't "belong" anywhere within the university structure. This study is significant in that it illuminates the importance of shared vision and meaning across a university community as well as the importance of strong leadership that can navigate an ever-changing, ever-evolving higher education outreach landscape with hope and determination.

REFERENCES

Appelbaum, S. H., St-Pierre, N., & Glavas, W. (1998). Strategic organizational change: The role of leadership, learning, motivation and productivity. *Management Decision*, *36*(5), 289- 301.

Alexander, J. (2000). Adaptive strategies of nonprofit human service organizations in an era of devolution and new public management. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *10*(3), 287-303.

Bartel, C. A., & Garud, R. (2009). The role of narratives in sustaining organizational innovation. *Organization Science*, *20*, 107-117.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T.E. (2008). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, choice,   and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace*. Princetion: Princeton University Press.

Bonnen, J. T. (1998). The land grant idea and the evolving outreach university. In R. M. Lerner & L. A. K. Simon (Eds.), *University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century* (pp. 25–70). New York, NY: Garland.

Boyce, M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *28*(2), 119-136.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Buchanan, D., Fitzgerald, L., Ketley, D., Gollop, R., Jones, J. L., Lamont, S. S., & Whitby, E. (2005). No going back: A review of the literature on sustaining organizational change. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *7*(3), 189-205.

Cameron, K. S. (1984) Organizational adaptation and higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *55*(2), 122-144

Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation.* New York: Elsevier.

Clark, B. (2001). The entrepreneurial university: New foundations for collegiality, autonomy, and achievement. *Higher Education Management*, *13*(2), 9-24

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The Psychologist*, *26*(2), 120-123.

Coblentz, J.B. (2002). *Organizational sustainability: The three aspects that matter*. Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development.

Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (2005). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. London: Random House.

Cowan, R. B., (1993). Prescription for small college turnaround, *Change* 25 (1), 30-39.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dickeson, R. C. (1999). *Prioritizing academic programs and services: Reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duryea, E. D. (1962). The challenge of change. *Improving College and University Teaching*, *10*(2), 65-67.

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *On change: En route to transformation*. American Council on Education. An occasional paper series of the ACE project

on leadership and institutional transformation. *Retrieved from*

http://www.lmu.edu/Assets/Academic+Affairs+Division/Intercultural+Affairs/Pre

sident$!27s+Leadership+Development+Initiative/pldiretreat2012+reading1.pdf, .

Federal and State Funding of Higher Education: A changing landscape. (2015) *Issue*

brief. Retrieved from *http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-*

briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education

Fitzgerald, H., Burns, K., Sonka, S., Furco, A., & Swanson, L. (2012). The centrality of

engagement in higher education. *Journal Of Higher Education Outreach and*

Engagement, 16(3), 7-28. Retrieved from

http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/861

Franz, N. K., & Townson, L. (2008). The nature of complex organizations: The case of

cooperative extension. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *120*, 5–14.

Gilgun, J. F. (2005) Grab and good science: Writing up the results of qualitative research.

Qualitative Health Research, 15(2), 256-262.

Graetz, F. (2000). Strategic change leadership. *Management Decision*, *38*(8), 550-564.

Gumport, P. J., & Pusser, B. (1997). *Restructuring the academic environment. Planning*

and management for a changing environment: A handbook on redesigning

postsecondary institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gumport, P. J., & Sporn, B. (1999). Institutional adaptation: Demands for management

reform and university Administration. In John Smart (ed.) *Higher Education:*

Handbook of Theory and Research. Bronx, New York: Agathon Press.

Guskin, A. E. (1994). *Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning*. AGB

    Occasional Papers No. 27. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of

    Universities and Colleges

Hage, J. T. (1999). Organizational innovation and organizational change. *Annual Review*

    of Sociology, *25,* 597-622.

Hanna, D. E. (1998). Higher education in an era of digital competition: Emerging

    organizational models. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *2*, 66-95.

Hartley, J. (2004). Case study research. In C. Cassell, & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential*

    Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research. 323–333. London:

    Sage.

Hartley, M., & Schall, L. (2005). The endless good argument: The adaptation of mission

    at two liberal arts colleges, *Planning in Higher Education, 33*(4) 5-11.

Heath, C., & Heath, D. (2010). *Switch: How to change when change is hard.* New York:

    Random House.

Kaiser, J. R., & Kaiser, P. R. (1994). Persuasive messages to support planned change.

    College and University, 69(2), 124-129.

Kanter, R. M. (2000). When a thousand flowers bloom: Structural, collective, and social

    conditions for innovation in organization. *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science*

    View, 2, 167.

Kellogg Commission Executive Report. (2000). *Returning to our roots: The engaged*

    institution. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and

    Land-Grant Colleges.

.Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st*

century: Recent research and conceptualizations. San Francisco: Jossey-
Bass.

Kezar, A. J. (2006). Redesigning for collaboration in learning initiatives: An examination
of four highly collaborative campuses. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(5),
804-838.

Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change
strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive
concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(4), 435-460.

Kezar, A., & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in
Higher Education*, *50*(7), 715-740.

Kohl, K. (2010). "Coping with change and fostering innovation: An agenda for
professional and continuing education." *Continuing Higher Education Review*,
74, 9-22.

Kotter, J. P. (2007). Leading change. *Harvard Business Review, 85*, 96–103.

Kotter, J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2002). *The heart of change: Real-life stories of how people
change their organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business Press

Leslie, E., & Fretwell, E. K. (1996). *Wise moves in hard times*, San Francisco: Jossey-
Bass.

Lindquist, J. (1978). *Strategies for change* (pp. 29-30). Berkeley: Pacific Soundings

Massy, W. F., Sullivan, T. A., & Mackie, C. (2013). Improving measurement of
productivity in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *45*,
15-23.

Maurer, R. (2004). Making a compelling case for change. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, *27*, 33.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G., (2011). *Designing qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mehaffey, G. L. (2012). Challenge and change. *EDUCAUSE Review, 47*(5), 1-24.

Michael, S. O., & Holdaway, E. A. (1992). Entrepreneurial activities in postsecondary education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *22*(2), 15-40.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage

Mone, M. A., McKinley, W., & Barker, V. L. (1998). Organizational decline and innovation: A contingency framework. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 115-132.

Moody's Investor Service. (2010, September 22). Financing public universities in era of scarce state funding. A presentation to the NAHEFFA Annual Meeting, Jersey City, NJ: Author.

Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(3), 456-471.

Obenchain, A. M., Johnson, W. C., & Dion, P. A. (2004). Institutional types, organizational cultures, and innovation in Christian colleges and universities. *Christian Higher Education*, *3*, 15-39.

Ostrander, S. A. (2004). Democracy, civic participation, and the university: A

comparative study of civic engagement on five campuses. *Nonprofit and

Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *33*, 74-93.

Overton, B. J., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). Drucker could be right, but...: New leadership

models for institutional-community partnerships. *Applied Developmental Science*,

3(4), 217-227.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage.

Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (1997). Academic capitalism, managed professionals, and

supply-side higher education. *Social Text*, *51,* 9-38.

Roberts, A. O., Wergin, J. F., and Adam, B. E. (1993). Institutional approaches to the

issues of reward and scholarship. *New Directions for Higher Education, 81,* 63-

86.

Ruvio, A., Rosenblatt, Z., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Entrepreneurial leadership

vision in nonprofit vs. for-profit organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*,

144-158.

Schneider, B., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1996). Creating a climate and culture for

sustainable organizational change. *Organizational Dynamics*, *24*(4), 7-19.

Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university: Medieval to postmodern

transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*, 1-39.

Selingo, J. (Jan. 26, 2012). A disrupted higher-ed system. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Retrieved from: http://chronicle.com/blogs/next/2012/01/26/a-disrupted-higher-

ed-system/

Senge, P. M., Carstedt, G., & Porter, P. L. (2001). Next industrial revolution. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *42*(2), 24-38

Spanier, G. B. (1999). Enhancing the quality of life: A model for the 21st-century land-grant university. *Applied Developmental Science*, *3*(4), 199-205.

Sporn, B. (2001). Building adaptive universities: Emerging organizational forms based on experiences of European and US universities. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *7*(2), 121-134.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 571-610.

Sullivan, T. M., & Richardson, E. C. (2011). Living the plan: Strategic planning aligned with practice and assessment. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *59*, 2-9.

Taylor, A., & Koch, A. M. (1996). The cultural context for effective strategy. *New Directions for Higher Education, 94*, 83-86.

Taylor, J. S., de Lourdes Machado, M., & Peterson, M. W. (2008). Leadership and strategic management: Keys to institutional priorities and planning. *European Journal of Education*, *43*(3), 369-386.

Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education*, *48*(4), 483-510.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 510-540.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Sun, K. (2011). Breakdowns in implementing models of

    organization change. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *25*(3), 58-74.

Votruba, J. C. (1996). Strengthening the university's alignment with society: Challenges

    and strategies. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *1*(1), 29-

    36.

Walker, D. E. (1979). *The effective administrator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walshok, M. L. (2012). Reinventing continuing higher education. *Continuing Higher*

    Education Review, *76*, 38-53.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual*

    Review of Psychology, *50*, 361-386.

Welsh, J. F., & Metcalfe, J. (2003). Faculty and administrative support for institutional

    effectiveness activities: A bridge across the chasm. *The Journal of Higher*

    Education, *74*(4), 445-468.

Wildavsky, B, Kelly, A. P, and K, Carey (2011) *Reinventing higher education: The*

    promise of innovation. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.

WKU Board of Regents Minutes. (Jan. 31, 2003). Retrieved from

    http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/bor/2003/qtrly/2/

WKU Provost/Academic Affairs Report (n.d). Retrieved from

    https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=wku+provost+and+academic+affairs+re

    port

WKU DELO Annual Report. (2008). Retrieved from: https://issuu.com/wku-

    delo/docs/first-5-years

WKU DELO Annual Report. (2011) retrieved from: https://issuu.com/wku-

delo/docs/annual-report-2011

WKU DELO Annual Report. (2012). Retrieved from: https://issuu.com/wku-

delo/docs/annual-report-2012

WKU DELO Annual Report. (2013). Retrieved from:

https://www.wku.edu/delo/10yearreport.pdf

WKU DELO Annual Report. (2014). Retrieved from:

https://www.wku.edu/delo/documents/delo-report-14.pdf

Yin, R. K. (2010). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York: Guilford Press.

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Project Title: *Birth of a Powerhouse: How one university reimagined, restructured, and revived outreach.*

Investigator: Slone H. Cansler; scansler@murraystate.edu
270.889.8001

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign on the last page of this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:**
   The purpose of this study is to determine how administrators, leaders, and other change agents at WKU facilitated the process of developing a university outreach unit that would allow the university to fulfill its mission of enhancing responsiveness to the needs of constituents. The aim of the study is to bring to light key factors and practices that were part of the development process and the resultant structures that have helped DELO be successful.

2. **Explanation of Procedures:**
   I will meet with you to ask a series of 9 open-ended interview questions such as "How was the need for this particular kind of unit communicated to the larger university community?" to understand your perception of the change and development process that occurred during the formation of the unit. The interview process will last between one half hour and two hours.

3. **Discomfort and Risks:**
   There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

4. **Benefits:**
   As higher education comes under increasing pressure to meet a variety of diverse constituent needs as well as increased demands for accountability and efficiency, it is important to understand how administrators lead successful change and adaptation efforts and how outreach can be structured for innovation, flexibility, and sustainability.

WKU IRB# 15-444
Approval - 6/19/2015
End Date - 6/19/2016
Expedited
Original - 6/19/2015

5. **Confidentiality:**
    Participation in this research is voluntary. Your confidentiality and privacy will be protected throughout this research process. Research records and transcriptions from interviews will be stored securely and destroyed June 2018 in accordance with WKU IRB policy and federal regulation.

6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:**
    Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

_____   _____
Signature of Participant   Date

_____   _____
Witness   Date

- I agree to the audio/video recording of the research. *(Initial here)* _____

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT
THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY
THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Paul Mooney, Human Protections Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-2129

WKU IRB# 15-444
Approval - 6/19/2015
End Date - 6/19/2016
Expedited
Original - 6/19/2015

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Project**: Birth of a powerhouse: How one university reimagined, restructured, and revived outreach.**

Date:
Location:
Participant:
Participant Title:

The purpose of this study is to determine how administrators, leaders, and other change agents at WKU facilitated the process of developing a university outreach unit that would allow the university to fulfill its mission of enhancing responsiveness to the needs of constituents. The aim of the study is to bring to light key factors and practices that were part of the development process and the resultant structures that have helped DELO be successful.
I am interviewing people who are both current and former employees of WKU who are or were closely affiliated with the development process. University leaders, administrators and staff members are participating in the study. The data collected as part of this study will be kept confidential and private and you will not be identified by name or title in the study. The interview could take approximately one half hour to one hour.

Questions

Need and Value
1) During the planning and implementation stages, in what ways did university leaders and other change agents envision the ways that a new outreach unit would benefit WKU?

2) How was need for this particular kind of unit communicated to the larger university community?

3) In what ways was the new outreach unit supposed to improve what WKU did and how it did it?

Sharing and Clarifying Vision
4) How was the vision for DELO communicated so that it was clear and understandable?

5) Explain what you think was the most effective and important strategy that was used to gain support for the DELO vision?

Structural components

6) Explain what you perceive were the priorities of change agents as they designed the structural framework of the DELO unit.

Leadership Role
7) What was the role of university leadership such as the president, provost, and other key administrators in the exploratory, planning and implementation stages of DELO?

Sustainability
8) What do you believe were the processes or practices that were put in place, from the beginning, that were most instrumental to the long-term success of DELO?

9) What do you believe will be the key to the continued success of the DELO unit?