

Overall framework seems useful, but changing a project from one quadrant to another may not be useful.

But if you have a project that empowers individual but exclude environment and structures it will not be as effective. How can you take one that is in one quadrant, and expand it.

Yes, you do have to attend these in research or intervention. But can you do all it at once?

To the extent teams are involved it does address organizational factors. E.g. if there is a team, there are colleagues who have same approach.

In the end you only change individuals, group change is change by individuals.

Successful projects provide support to help change. Gave publication support to build up currency and capital of environment, but change still comes from individuals.

How do you make change work within constraints and values of institution? You may not change these directly but you take them into account. If you lay out model you have to figure how these factor into model. This is a shortcoming of description that you have to take these into account.

There is good research only in quadrant and some good research that cross quadrants at once, or address them sequentially and then put them together. Example, CST is setting up organizational change from scratch and dramatic.

Also idea of revolutionary change and just say no to constraints. We are going to try to radically bust thru constraints. Some changes are like this, but still you still have to fit into overall institutional constraints. You always have some thing you will not change.

Remember that the Henderson analysis is a description of where the literature is. Maybe it is not easy to apply this analysis to existing projects. Although it might not be as inductive as they say. Not clear why they chose those themes, they must have had reasons for getting to categories. Maybe they should not be as "tight" in their "sense-making" and coding decisions as they did. They maybe should not abandon certain perspectives. And why leave out literature on student learning? This was only about how change happens to faculty, and you have to have start somewhere. This has generated a lot of discussion. It still might have been useful to draw connections between student learning literature and faculty change literature. The organizers have done a lot of work and they are looking for feedback on their organizational scheme to understand faculty change.

One good thing about two dimensions, which allows you to ask some questions. You can ask which end of each dichotomy is more effective, and clearly shows that there are not interactions between certain segments.

Social systems have interacting parts and changing individuals is different from changing groups.

But to some the boxes do not make sense. Maybe a continuum descriptive would be better. But remember than one of their questions was how the different groups HER etc, are working on these problems. It does look like different research groups do approach projects across the board of quadrants.

Also, how does this work of Henderson et al, relate to what we heard from Andy and Nosh.

One useful way to think of things is that problem solving often focuses too early and does not stay flexible long enough. To aid future change projects lay out more options for change agents. This is where andy and Noshir are relevant. If we had a network like described by Noshir we could know more clearly what others are doing.

Example bring in people who are doing change to help effect change. This is hard because we do not know who is doing what. Networks are not built and known yet. We are working with sliderules on networking and now he have computers, but there is still a lot of good work out there. But now we are trying to expand beyond core group of people devoted.

Change efforts take a lot of intensive effort. The help of the computer is that it speeds up the effort. It could be orders of magnitude easier to figure it out – but then now we have the information you have to decide what to do with it.

This analysis did identify these three research groups – SER, etc – that could help us to find relevant literature using key word searches.

What is missing here is an international perspectives. For example, there are communities in UK Australia etc. One small connection can lead you to these connections, but its hard to find them systematically.

You might run out of time to use all the links that computer networking can provide but it might let you be more thoughtful.

It is striking that the different groups are speaking different languages. Does this typology help us to have conversations? Does this help us in education folks vs discipline folks have conversations.

It was hard to discuss how individual projects and fit them into the model. Is this is a good test of the categorization model? How useful is it to categorize existing projects, but would it help us to do future things? Can it help one to go from example moving from one quadrant to another. Would you want to use the lenses of Andy's work to view this? Andy's work is how do you make change happen that is part of a huge literature on that. That does not seem to be there in the Henderson model. For example, there are bmgmt models that say shared vision has to be arrived at first. Henderson framework seems orthogonal to the literature Andy summarized.

Does this mean that change agents are timid in education than in business? Our approaches to change are timid by comparison, and narrow. If you can really fit in only one of these boxes it sure might not work.

Question for Carl and funding- would a proposal that used different approaches and assess all of these would this be valuable? Carl as funder does not care which but assessment is necessary and knowledge research literature that supports each approach is necessary. If the faculty are convinced they want to make things happen it will work at some level if there is support.

Book about Leadership Without Easy Answers is a good treatise on emergent change when there are not clear models.

Kotter says you have to get everyone to the shared vision that the problem is important and then you can move from there, but not until.

What about individuals vs environment, and prescribed vs emergent? What is the grain size here on the axes. At some level some things are always prescribed and some things are emergent. What is the continuum here? There is always some of both and may vary across time? Same with individuals vs structures, environment. This is one reason to be reluctant for categorization.

Example from macro-sociology. Looking at individuals in departments in university in state politics, etc. All of these things in the end have an impact on individual. For example performance funding in Tennessee was intended for policy to change university structures.

Need more complex conceptual categorization scheme to effectively get to change agents to be functional. Need a way to figure out what the key leverage points are. But this can leave the change agent with something too complicated. But maybe you do this implicitly or explicitly and folks need help, but people do this anyway. STEM researchers need to help change agents do “environmental scans” to figure out what and where change needs to happen. Institutional assessment process needs to be done. Noshir’s networking approach would help here. Often people launch into projects without knowledge factors that will be important or what everyone else is doing. If you know you should be queerying a complex environment. Maybe a “checklist” would be useful of things or factors to take into account. Make the abstract and complex situation more usable. For example, if you just say “context matters” what does that mean and what to do with it. Need to be more explicit. Need to catch which factors matter and how much. Systematically characterize them so they are useful.

Applied social sciences such as how we do education is harder science than so called “hard” science. Now we can easily measure things in hard sciences now but when they were first discovered they were not easy to measure. In social sciences it is less mature and measurements are not well established, formulated well etc.