

## Contents

[Exploring New Territory in the 1991 Program by Susan A. Mohrman](#)

[The Empowerment Process by Robert E. Quinn & Gretchen M. Spreitzer](#)

[Books by Members](#)

[How to Assess Organization Culture: A Rejoinder to a Response by Edgar H. Schein](#)

[Sound Ethical Reasoning in Business by Robert R. Blake and Anne Adams McCanse](#)

[University Change Agents: What Are You Doing to Change Your University? by D.D. Warrick](#)

[Caucuses to Meet in Miami: New Forum for Academy Members](#)

[Announcing the 1991 Careers Division Pre-Conference Workshop on Professional Development](#)

---

## EXPLORING NEW TERRITORY IN THE 1991 PROGRAM

*by Susan A. Mohrman, Program Chairperson*

The Academy of Management meeting will be held in Miami, August 11-14. In keeping with the Academy theme of "International Dimensions of Management", this year's ODC program brings together presenters from many continents. In a showcase session co-sponsored by the International Division and chaired by Luke Novelli, we'll be hearing from representatives of Chile, Czechoslovakia and South Africa about the change challenges faced by organizations in countries that are in the midst of far-reaching transitions. In a symposium organized by Rupe Chisholm and Max Elden, we'll have the opportunity to think about the potency of our action research tools and techniques in diverse international settings.

Our program will start out with a symposium chaired by Peter Frost that examines organizations as "spiritual settings." It ends with another, chaired by Howard Schwartz, that looks at the "dark side" of organizations. This combination will stretch our perspectives from the heights to the underbelly, with a host of meaty issues in between. Aneil Mishra and Gretchen Spreitzer have organized a symposium that reports the University of Michigan research on the changing roles of middle managers. A session jointly sponsored by the Technology and Innovation Management Division looks at the interconnection of technology, organization development and design. Selection of

symposia was particularly competitive this year, as many well prepared proposals were received.

Many high quality papers were also submitted, and there will be four excellent paper sessions dealing with issues at the core of organizational development and change. Topics include strategic change choices and agents, schemas and frames, tension and diversity, and an interesting application of chaos theory to understanding cultural change efforts. One paper reports the results of a study that examined how O.D. is practiced in our largest firms. A session providing three alternative approaches to generating learnings from organizational interventions should provoke interesting debate about "how do we really know if we're making a difference?"

In a departure from tradition, this year we will not have a key note speaker. Instead, there will be a special session giving the members of the division a chance to examine the future of Organization Development. This session was organized by Bob Quinn. Members will be challenged with diverse viewpoints from Phil Mirvis, Rupe Chisholm, Bob Hinings and Jean Bartunek, and will be given ample opportunity to discuss, share and be creative. This session is an extension of the efforts of the division officers over the past two years to encourage the division to expand our horizons and ensure that we are stepping up to the challenges facing organizations as we approach the year 2000. The session is scheduled on Monday directly before the business meeting and will be followed by our social hour. We hope to see you there!

The business meeting will be especially important this year, as it will follow directly the participative session looking the future of the field. At the meeting you will be asked to give input regarding some Academy meetings issues, such as what meaning should be attached to the keynote speaker role. Should it become an official recognition of service to the field? How should that person be chosen? Also, what should be the role of the pre-conference workshops, and how should topics be chosen?

The best paper award will also be presented at that meeting. Congratulations to Darryl Roberts of Stanford University and Peter J. Robertson of the University of Southern California for their winning paper, "Positive-Findings Bias in Organization Development Evaluation Research: An Expanded Investigation." This is a thought provoking paper that captures the spirit of self-examination that is so important to our field.

Again this year, ODC will have a pre-conference workshop on "Varieties of Action Research: An International

Exchange of Views and Praxis." It has again been organized by Rupe Chisholm and Max Elden, who have been of great service to the division with their hard work and excellent leadership of this event. There will also be a post conference wrap-up session to stimulate further "international exchange", organized by R.J. Bullock. Individuals interested in attending the pre-conference session should pre-register by contacting Rupe at (717) 948-6052. Attendance at the post conference workshop is especially encouraged for those who attend the pre-conference event.

Again this year, ODC will sponsor a pre-convention doctoral student consortium in conjunction with the OB and OMT divisions. Jean Bartunek will serve as the ODC host for this event. Doctoral students must pre-register for this event.

Many thanks to the 45 division members who helped put the program together, serving as reviewers and as judges of best paper. Reviewers were: Achilles Armenakis, Frank Barret, Jean Bartunek, David Bednar, James Bowditch, Donald Bowen, Tony Buono, James Cashman, Teresa Covin, Tom Cummings, Joel DeLuca, Max Elden, Ronald Fry, Robert Golembiewski, Mary Ann Hazen, Gerry Ledford, Craig Lundberg, Barry Macy, Newton Margulies, Marion McCollom, Michael McCuddy, Christopher Meek, Luke Novelli, Walter Nord, Larry Pate, Ronald Purser, Bob Quinn, Tony Raia, Lee Robbins, Marshall Sashkin, A.B. Shani, Ronald Sims, Robert Steel, Daniel Swantek, Glenn Varney, Gordon Walter, Charles Wankel, Don Warrick, and Richard Woodman. The judges of best paper this year were Achilles Armenakis, Peter Frost, Larry Greiner, and Monty Mohrman.

Thanks to those of you who submitted your work, which is the basis for what should prove to be an interesting and engaging program. I look forward to seeing all of you in Miami.

## **THE EMPOWERMENT PROCESS**

*by Robert E. Quinn & Gretchen M. Spreitzer*

It is no longer possible to maintain the illusion that the world is a stable and predictable place. The constancy of change is now so apparent as to be obvious to nearly everyone.

In this world of constant change a dilemma arises. While individuals are becoming increasingly burned out, organizations are striving to cope with ever increasing levels of competition. In turn the organizations are calling for

more leadership and innovation from those very people who feel they have ever less energy to give.

For many organizations the answer to this dilemma is empowerment. The problem is few organizations know how to empower their people. In the end, the command, "Be empowered," is a disempowering act. A key question is how to successfully empower the workforce.

## A Process for Empowerment

A process of large scale change and individual empowerment is currently being undertaken at a Fortune 10 company. The process is taking place through a radical approach to middle management development. Instead of focusing on maintaining equilibrium and stability, the program stimulates the capacity for transformational behavior. The program's objectives are to stimulate individual paradigm changes and to empower individuals to take charge of themselves and to champion change. The program helps managers learn how to live with ambiguity and uncertainty. Rather than prescribing action, the program encourages the managers to assess a given situation and to think for themselves, take risks, and try new behaviors. These transformational elements are then put into context (i.e. aligned) through an elaborate sharing and discussion of the company's strategic plans. A comprehensive description of the program is provided in Quinn, Sendelback, and Spreitzer (1991).

## Lessons Learned

A number of important lessons have been learned in our work on this project. These have to do with three issues: the barriers to self-empowerment; strategies for self-empowerment; and the actual process of self-empowerment.

Barriers to empowerment. From a series of interviews, surveys, and factor analyses, five primary types of barriers to self-empowerment were found to exist: (a) a lack of strategic vision and mission, (b) an inevitability of organizational conflict and consequently low commitment, trust, and teamwork, (c) a bureaucratic, top-down organizational culture, (d) personal constraints (i.e. times), (e) the disempowerment of co-workers. Most would agree that these barriers are common to large organizations. As a result of these barriers, middle managers report feeling highly disempowered and constrained. Mandating empowerment within this context would only increase their sense of disempowerment.

Strategies for empowerment. Through their involvement in the program, the middle managers develop personal action plans for overcoming these five barriers. They also develop strategies to facilitate their own and others' empowerment. Once again through a series of interviews, surveys, and factor analysis, four types of strategies for self-empowerment were found to exist. First, the middle managers described strategies for redefining self and environment. For example, one manager described a strategy whereby he made a conscious effort to reframe threatening situations as potential opportunities. Second, the middle managers articulated strategies for challenging organizational mindsets by bringing up new ideas and questioning consensus. One manager described how in her staff meetings she designated one member of the group to be a devil's advocate, continuously challenging the group to challenge the way that things were done in their unit. Third, the middle managers revealed strategies for building trust and commitment among their co-workers. Many managers discussed the importance of breaking down "chimneys," or cross-functional barriers. Finally, they shared strategies for circumventing organizational constraints -- bypassing the traditional, hierarchical approval process and ignoring budget constraints. This last set of strategies is seen as a truly radical response.

A process of empowerment. The process of empowerment is illustrated in the accompanying figure. The primary objective of the program is to stimulate deep change. This deep change begins with the perception of self. The program serves as a stimulus for the managers to think about how they can reframe their perceptions of themselves and their work role. As one manager described, "The program forced me to reevaluate my core values, goals, and methods of operating. I made a conscious effort to become aware of my paradigms and then expanded my own and other's mindsets toward change." This first stage of the empowerment process involves an in depth personal evaluation and cognitive reframing which allows the middle managers to see themselves and their environment through different lenses.

As a result of this redefinition process, the individuals perceive themselves and the organization in new light. This fresh interpretation is then accompanied by new approaches to old problems. In this stage of the empowerment process, the middle managers initiate new patterns of action. They experiment with out-of-the-box thinking and behavior. They take risks, try unorthodox methods, and are more creative and innovative. Old habits tend to be broken, and many times action is taken without going through traditional channels. There is greater trust in oneself and reliance on intuition and courage.

In this stage the managers often have dramatic stories to tell about their new patterns of action. For example, a loan approval process in the corporation's credit office, was reduced from five days to two days by an expensive consulting team. A manager with a new mindset, single-handedly attacked this same issue and reduced the process to four hours. In most cases, these new patterns of action are second-order or revolutionary changes.

The new patterns of action are many times reinforced by the managers' superiors. However, in some cases, the managers' new patterns of action are not supported or nurtured by their superiors. As a result, these managers become disenchanted with their new paradigms and regress to their previous behaviors. In cases where the new patterns of action are reinforced, the managers reflect on and learn from their new experiences. Where the new pattern of action was successful, the manager draws on that success for future action. In cases where the new pattern of action was not successful, the manager learns from his or her mistakes and grows and develops. In this stage of the empowerment process, individuals recognize the importance of a continuous learning mindset and the need to remain flexible and adaptable in order to be responsive to a changing and ambiguous environment.

In the process of empowerment, managers become more self-confident and energized, and the energy is transmitted to those around the empowered manager. The managers describe how they nurture and coach others to become empowered. They report more communication with their colleagues, more social support, and more corporate citizenship. In this sense, the process of empowerment is synergistic. It draws individuals together to higher levels of effort.

As empowered individuals interact with one another, they develop new perspectives and have new experiences. For example, the managers describe how they share success stories and help each other diagnose situations to develop appropriate strategies. In addition, they build networks to expand their power base in the organization. These new perspectives and experiences then stimulate the managers to again re-define self and role. The process is thus reinforced.

In summary, the process of empowerment is regenerative and deviation amplifying (Weick, 1979). It is dynamic and cyclical. It is transformational at multiple levels. It begins by transforming the sense of self. The individual tries new behaviors and develops a continuous learning mindset. Self-confidence increases. The empowered individual, then, works to draw others into the process, and that they too become empowered. The result is an empowered workforce



in a more responsive and effective organization, which is better able to adapt in a world of constant change.

## References

Quinn, R.E., Sendelbach, N.S. and Spreitzer, G.M. 1991. Education & Empowerment: A Transformational Model of Managerial Skills Development. In J. Bigelow (Ed.) Insights into Managerial Skills. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Weick, K.E. 1979. The Social Psychology of Organizing. New York: Random House.

## BOOKS BY MEMBERS

Frankel, Mark S., Ladenson, Robert F. & Gellermann, William. (1990). Values and Ethics in Organization and Human Systems Development: Responding to Dilemmas in Professional Life. Jossey-Bass.

Gillette, Jonathan & McCollom, Marion. (1990). Groups in Context: A New Perspective on Group Dynamics. Addison-Wesley.

## HOW TO ASSESS ORGANIZATION CULTURE: A REJOINDER TO A RESPONSE

*by Edgar H. Schein*

In the Winter, 1991 ODC Newsletter, McCoy and Tucker take exception to a number of assertions I made in the Summer, 1990 newsletter. In the spirit of clarification I would like to examine each of their points to see whether or not we can reach some conclusions about this murky issue.

1. "Schein maintains that the dimensions of culture are not well defined" (p. 4). I do believe that at this stage of our knowledge the dimensions of organizational culture are not well enough defined to warrant quantitative measurement. McCoy & Tucker take exception on the grounds that they have studied "over 50 leaders and managers in a wide variety of organizations to identify what, if any, dimensions of culture could be generalized across organizations." (p. 10). They say that they found some salient and relevant dimensions, operationalized them, tested them in new sample of over 100 organizations and found 13 to 18 relatively stable and universal dimensions

having both salience and relevance.

Unfortunately all of their research results and data are buried in three papers presented to various meetings in 1988 and 1989. I would have appreciated being sent some reprints before being reprimanded for not noting some research that has never been published and, therefore, could not possibly have been evaluated by me. Incidentally, I have identified a number of common dimensions in my book, and have reviewed dimensions found by others such as Hofstede, but I feel that commonness does not guarantee relevance or salience, so we need to know how McCoy and Tucker determine whether their 13 to 18 dimensions will be salient and relevant to a company that has never been studied before (Schein, 1985; Hofstede, 1980).

2. "Schein's second conclusion is that culture is inscrutable and unreportable by individuals; that individuals are not 'sufficiently in touch' with culture to report on it." (p. 4). I said nothing in my note about inscrutability, but I did assert that the questionnaire approach "assumes that individual respondents answering the questionnaire are sufficiently in touch with their own deeper cultural assumptions to give accurate data" (p. 4). Perhaps McCoy and Tucker can provide some data that the assumption is warranted. I did not say it is impossible, I only identified the assumption that the questionnaire approach rests on. On the other hand, I have strong data from my own consulting on culture that if I compare individual interviews with group interviews, the key dimensions of culture surface far more rapidly in the group context.

This makes sense, given that culture is ultimately the assumptions that organizational members share. To infer those assumptions from individual responses requires all sorts of assumptions about the meaning of words, the similarity of response biases across individuals, and the ability of the individual to differentiate in him or herself what is cultural and what is idiosyncratic. In a group context one sees very quickly what things are shared and what things are not. And it is the shared material I am after if I am studying culture. Perhaps McCoy and Tucker are studying individual attitude dimensions and then are calling these "culture."

3. "Schein's third assumption is that 'the notion that we can change cultural assumptions is absolutely utopian at best' (p. 5). Schein says that those of us who have empirically constructed culture instruments are 'trivializing' and 'perverting' OD. In contrast it might be said that the assumption that culture can't be changed is the ultimate trivialization and perversion of OD. Without the potential for change, OD has no reason to exist other than as a



knowledge gathering activity." (p. 11). On the matter of the changeability of shared underlying assumptions, I am reporting what my data tell me. I stand ready to be convinced if someone will show me how a given organization has gone about changing its basic shared underlying assumptions successfully. The only cases I have encountered come from turnaround managers who tell me that in a ten to fifteen year time frame they were able to change shared assumptions, and, as I indicated, this usually involved replacing most of the old culture carriers and enormous human pain in the process. A fairly well known example is Procter and Gamble's redesign of their plants, which started in greenfield sites in the 1950's and was not completed in their unionized plants until the 1980's.

On the matter of the role of OD, I am not aware that the existence of OD has ever been linked to its ability to change culture. I thought that OD was an effort to make organizations more effective, and nowhere has it yet been established that culture change is a necessary condition for effectiveness. Naive claims by management writers have been made about "good" or "strong" cultures, but as social scientists we should know better. Is French culture more effective than Spanish culture? Can France not hope to be more effective unless we can change their culture? What is being claimed here by McCoy and Tucker?

To get back to the argument. I said that the assumption that one can measure and change culture with the aid of questionnaires is utopian. I stand by that. If the authors read my book they will find 10 or more mechanisms by which cultures do change, and many of these mechanisms can be "managed." So of course I agree that logically culture is changeable. The issue, rather, is the role of psychometrics and questionnaires. At the end of their response McCoy and Tucker reveal what concerns them, as it should. They have spent years developing The Survey of Organizational Culture which "demonstrates at least reasonable levels of psychometric adequacy. Perhaps more important is the fact that the people who use it report that it is quite realistic and useful in their organizational decision making." (p. 11). More power to them but change the label. It is evidently a useful tool to help decision making. I do not hear the authors claiming that it is useful in measuring or changing culture. They are probably measuring climate or various behavioral artifacts that reflect the culture. Having never seen the instrument I can only speculate. But unless they want to define culture at the surface level and never check what the underlying shared assumptions are, they should not claim to have a culture survey. If they do get around to checking for shared underlying assumptions, they will quickly discover why I take the more humble approach to this complex phenomenon we call "culture."

As a final point I want to raise what may be a complex epistemological issue. Should one criticize and make

counterclaims on the basis of unpublished materials? I found myself stimulated by the dialogue and the conceptual issues raised, but I was angry and offended that McCoy and Tucker felt free to challenge my assumptions and to act wounded that they had not been "recognized" when they have not revealed their own data base or approach. It sounded like they were saying "Schein you were wrong because we can do what you say we can't do." Is that a sufficient basis for scientific dialogue?

Hofstede, G. Culture's consequences. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage, 1980

Schein, E.H. Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

## **SOUND ETHICAL REASONING IN BUSINESS**

*by Robert R. Blake and Anne Adams McCaule*

Ethics is at the heart of any organization. Organizations earn reputations for excellence by acting in accord with ethical commitments to provide high quality products and services, on-time delivery, dependability, reliability, guaranteed service, and more. This is the company with low turnover and high morale. People are proud of their employment. Others stand at the gates, hoping to join the ranks as new hires. This is the company with a golden reputation, both for the product and service it offers and for the fair and equitable manner in which it treats its members from the top of the hierarchy to the lowest position.

This ideal description is a goal toward which many companies strive; the actual realization of it is much less common. Almost everyday we hear a new report demonstrating ethical breakdown in the conduct of business affairs by some major firm, and this is only the tip of the iceberg. Examples include the use of insider information to gain unfair advantage in the stock markets, companies overcharging on government contracts, rampant bribery and corruption to maintain old markets and to gain entry into new ones, falsifying data to make it appear that quality standards are being met when in fact they are not, rationalizing environmental hazards as a way to maintain competitive edge, to the detriment of the consumer and the employee alike--the list is endless.

On the individual side, we see an ever diminishing loyalty to the organization for which one works. We've entered an age with an increasingly mobile work force that hops from organization to organization at the bidding of a headhunter

in search of "What's in it for me?" Even among the steady corps of organization memberships, we have witnessed a rise in white collar theft where use of the organization's resources for personal gain is rationalized as "part of my just compensation." This includes padding of expense accounts to more covert lying and stealing.

The development of sound ethical practices becomes a realistic possibility when those who hold positions of leadership at all levels acquire an understanding of 1) how ethical reasoning changes as individuals mature; 2) how organization culture supports or inhibits the practice of sound ethics; and 3) how to strengthen and reinforce decision making that supports highest standards of ethical reasoning and conduct.

The problem can be looked at from two different angles. The first deals with internal motivations that cause a person to make ethical or unethical choices when presented with a dilemma. Three main influences are involved. One is reliance on authority, following what bosses have identified as sound or unsound as the basis for guidance. A second involves ethical solutions aligned with the thinking of one's current membership group(s). A third is grounded in principles that have demonstrated applicability across cultures based on different economic and political systems, different religions, and different approaches to education.

These three influences, or stages, can be viewed as an upward progression with ethical action becoming more complex as one's thinking evolves over time. The height of attainment is achieved when an individual comes to rely on internally-anchored principles of justice, equity, truth, and fairness. The person operating at this highest stage has incorporated the sound aspects of the previous stages and therefore operates from a truly integrated perspective.

The other consideration is the organization, or the environment, in which the individual seeks to make ethical choices. People do not operate in isolation; they are enveloped by organization ideology that may temper and even negatively influence the manner in which decisions are made.

How bosses as representatives of the corporation deal with ethical problems created beneath them is important to the soundness of decisions reached. Does the boss confront an ethical infraction of a subordinate? Or does the boss ignore it and "give it the wink" since "everyone else is doing it anyway?" Does a boss even go so far as to protect a favored report from challenge below despite the lack of ethical conduct by that subordinate?

The answers to these and similar questions depend largely on the organization climate at the top and whether or not managers and supervisors at all levels feel they will be supported by higher levels in the actions they take. It is unlikely that ethical infractions at lower levels will be confronted if the feeling exists that higher levels silently endorse these deviations. It is even more unlikely that lower levels will confront ethical transgressions known or suspected to be occurring at the top.

The ethically sound choice can be simple when nothing personal is at stake. Then it is easy to philosophize and decide on the "right" thing to do. It is more difficult when two conflicting values hang in the balance. What does a CEO do when corporate survival is at stake? Does truth win over dishonesty in the face of intense competition? Does corporate gain prevail over social responsibility?

Actions motivated by self-interest can and do clash with the ethical component in business decision making. Similarly, the conflicts between economic demands and human "rightness" must be faced. Modern life is deluged with such conflicts. They appear and reappear on the horizon. In the face of this value clash, our reasoning tends to be blurred. Consider the dilemma below and answer the question which follows.

"Sam and Bill work in the same company. They have been life-long friends. In fact, they live near one another and carpool together.

Bill has been and continues to be Sam's loyal supporter in ways that have advanced Sam's career by giving him greater opportunities to serve the company and in this way to rise up in its ranks. Sam is deeply indebted to Bill.

Sam goes to a trade association meeting as a company representative and overhears a conversation involving a competitor. During this conversation, the competitor makes it known that he has been fed trade secrets by Bill, and the competitor's company has benefited financially from this inside source of information. If this information were to be known in the company, Bill's career would be ruined.

Bill's behavior produces an ethical conflict for Sam. If Sam reports Bill, it puts him in a bind between what is ethically right for the company and the bonds of confidentiality between friends. If he fails to report this behavior, he may keep a friend but he puts the company at financial risk. Furthermore, condoning this behavior in one instance sets

precedent for it to occur on a widespread basis.

Should Sam report this information to the company? If so, in what manner; and, if not, why not?"

Learning how to resolve such dilemmas in a sound way is at the heart of business ethics. Having a framework for understanding how to choose between two equally desirable outcomes makes it more likely that sound decisions can be reached. Additionally, this ability to make wise choices leads to a renewed sense of personal integrity and self-confidence within the decision maker. Under such conditions, the corporation can place greater trust in the decisions made by its members, knowing that they serve the long-term best interest of the business and promote sound human relations and individual fulfillment.

## **UNIVERSITY CHANGE AGENTS: WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO CHANGE YOUR UNIVERSITY?**

*by D.D. Warrick*

Organizations around the globe are in a state of transition struggling to adapt and compete in an environment characterized by fierce competition and a dizzying rate of change. The best organizations have responded by making the transformational changes necessary to be world class. Universities are not exempt from the pressures to adapt to a rapidly changing environment. In the United States, the educational system is under fire for not delivering the expected results and not keeping us competitive in the world market place. Universities, in particular, are being challenged to be more relevant, forward looking, and client centered. To meet these challenges, most universities will need to make transformational, or at a minimum, incremental changes. With these thoughts in mind, permit me to pose three questions:

1. Has your university adapted to today's changing environment by making the necessary transformational changes?
2. What are you personally doing to help your university make the necessary changes to adapt and compete?
3. What would happen if all of the members of the Organization Development and Change Division of the Academy of Management committed to being University Change Agents?

Changing A University

A colleague of mine once commented, "Changing a university is a lot like trying to move a cemetery!" While some might expect universities to be the role model for change and innovation, many would be better described as the role model for resistance to change. However, with increased competition for students and resources, the times are ripe for change and some universities are responding. A number of universities such as Columbia, the University of Colorado, and the University of Kansas has programs to place a stronger emphasis on quality teaching. In schools of business, the University of Texas recently vaulted into the top twenty business schools due largely to a major overhaul of their MBA program that included wide-spread student involvement in the change process.

### A Window of Opportunity Strategy for Change: A Case History

In 1985 I received an interesting challenge. Throughout my academic career, I have been actively involved as a Change Agent in a variety of organizations. A student of mine who was aware of this involvement inquired, "What are you doing to be a Change Agent in the university?" I had great difficulty thinking of anything and committed to begin practicing what I preach and teach in my own organization. It was clear that a transformational strategy was not possible so I began looking for "windows of opportunity" to at least seek incremental changes. Let me cite a few examples of what has occurred since I began this adventure and encourage others to pursue a similar journey. The examples will be briefly stated due to limited space. However, each were milestones for each of us who were involved as well as for the university.

### Collaborative Strategic Planning

The chair person of the University Strategic Planning Committee approached me about how to involve more people in the planning process. My colleague Bob Zawacki and I used this opportunity to design and facilitate a Strategic Planning process in which all interested members of the university community were involved. It would be an understatement to say that trying to orchestrate large meetings that included university administrators, Deans, faculty, staff, and students was a challenging and exhilarating experience! The participants helped develop the Strategic Goals for the university, prioritize the Goals, and develop plans for reaching the goals. The process is now in its fourth year and has developed a much stronger sense of purpose and collegiality throughout the university.

### Change Champions



The next opportunity occurred when the Staff Council Staff Development Chairperson met with me to explore his vision for Staff Development. At this time in 1987, the university had never had a formal Staff Development program. Once again my colleague Bob Zawacki joined me in designing a program and also participated in several training sessions. In a session I was presenting on Change Management, one of the staff members said, "Why talk about how to manage change? Let's do it!" The other participants concurred, and we turned the remainder of the session into a planning meeting that was to be the first of many meetings to strategize changes. In the meeting, six people volunteered to be Change Champions (champions of needed changes) and others volunteered to be Change Supporters (supporters of the changes and Change Champions). My job was to be a Change Agent (specialist in managing change) who would train Change Champions, organize and facilitate various projects and meetings, and serve as a coach on others. We now have a full time Staff and Faculty Development Director, an Annual Staff Development Day, and offer numerous Staff Development activities throughout the year. Some of the Change Champions have become so skilled that I have invited them into my graduate OD class to share what they have done. I am extremely proud of these courageous risk takers from all levels of the organization and am delighted that many of them have received a variety of awards for their efforts. They have left a lasting impact on the university.

## Organization Excellence Workshop

One of the ideas that came out of the Staff Development sessions was to have an annual Organization Excellence Workshop. A half day session was held with representatives from all parts of the organization. The goal was to explore possible improvements in the university. A task team followed up on the ideas generated in the workshop and presented a prioritized list of recommendations to the Chancellor. Follow-up teams pursued the changes the Chancellor agreed to. From this time forward, the Chancellor and/or Vice Chancellor participated in most change and Staff Development activities and have been very supportive.

## Developing A Team Building System

In an effort to improve teamwork throughout the university, we organized another meeting of all interested persons to develop a Team Building System that anyone in the university could use to improve teamwork. The result was a seven page booklet that provided a Step-By-Step Process For Team Development including several questionnaires

to evaluate team strengths and opportunities for improvement. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor both volunteered to be the first teams to use the system for Team Building. While I facilitated these two sessions, trained Change Champions and some of my graduate students have facilitated all other sessions. These sessions have resulted in significant improvements in several departments and teams throughout the university.

## Service Excellence Program

I used a graduate class in OD to develop and administer a survey to evaluate how students perceived the services provided by the various academic and support departments in the university. The students then invited representatives from all of the departments to an Action Planning meeting in which the students made a presentation on service, provided the results of the survey for the university and led mixed groups in an exercise to explore potential service improvements in the university, and then provided the results for each department followed by department sessions to explore department service improvements. A year later, we organized a formal university sponsored on-going program called "Q-TIPS" (Quality Training In Professional Service). The program is designed to provide training in service excellence and seek improvements in service. The Q-TIPS Task Force with its various subcommittees has grown to twenty five members representing all levels of the university.

## Conclusions And Observations

Perhaps these examples of some of the change efforts our university is involved in will stimulate thinking about possibilities you can champion in your own university. If you accept the challenge to be a Change Agent in your own organization, be prepared for an exhilarating and often discouraging adventure. At our university, I believe that morale, professionalism, and innovation is at an all time high. However, there are parts of the organization that refused to get involved. We have top level, and for the most part, bottom level support but minimal support from Deans and sporadic support from faculty members on projects they are interested in. There can also be personal costs. While the university may appreciate your efforts, your efforts are not likely to be valued on your annual review and will probably cost you if the investment in time detracts from your research. Are you still willing to accept the challenge? Your university needs your expertise as a Change Agent. Imagine what an impact we could have if all of our members committed to being University Change Champions!

## CAUCUSES TO MEET IN MIAMI: NEW FORUM FOR ACADEMY MEMBERS

At this year's annual meeting in Miami, an opportunity will be provided for informal "caucuses" to meet to discuss issues or topics of special interest. This new feature has been initiated by the Board of Governors at the recommendation of its Long Range Planning Committee, with the aim of providing Academy members who have common interests or concerns a convenient forum to meet and share ideas. In general, the caucus mechanism is seen as a way to enhance the organic, evolving nature of the Academy's structure.

A caucus is a group of Academy members who share a topical interest, a professional concern, or some other affinity. A caucus might eventually spawn a new interest group, or it may simply allow increased contact among caucus members; a caucus might meet for several years, or it might meet just once. A caucus must be open to all Academy members, even though it may focus primarily on the interests of a subset of members.

Caucuses will be assigned a meeting time and place in Miami. Tentative plans call for caucuses to meet in subdivided Fontainebleau Hotel Ballroom on Monday evening, August 12, from 6:30 - 8:00 p.m., thus avoiding conflicts with symposia and paper sessions. Caucuses will be prominently listed, along with meeting times and locations, in the registration packet in Miami.

To qualify for listing, a caucus organizer must submit a caucus name, a one- or two-line description of the special interest or focus of the caucus and the printed names and signatures of five additional Academy members who support the convening of that caucus. Caucus proposals must be received by June 10, 1991.

Submissions will be reviewed by the program chair and caucus coordinator for adherence to these nominal guidelines. Ed Ottensmeyer (Clark University) has agreed to serve as caucus coordinator for the Miami meeting. Please send proposals to him at: Ed Ottensmeyer, 1991 Caucus Coordinator, Academy of Management, Clark University/Graduate School of Management, Worcester, MA 01610-1477. If you have further questions, please direct them to Ed at (508) 793-7463.

Come spend your lunch hour with 2 Academy of Management presidents and discuss HOW TO GET AHEAD IN ACADEME. Jan Beyer, current president and Kay Bartol, president in 1985, will speak briefly about their

experiences. An open discussion will follow. the Academy-wide Committee on the Status of Women is sponsoring this event.

-Time: Monday, August 12th, 12 noon to 1:00 pm.

-Place: Look for the announcement in the program.

-Bring: Your lunch, your questions, your experiences!

Everyone is invited. If you'd like more information, contact Frieda Reitman (914) 773-3715).

## **ANNOUNCING THE 1991 CAREERS DIVISION PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

You are invited to participate in the Careers Division pre-conference workshop to be held prior to the Academy of Management meetings on Friday, August 9 (evening only) and Saturday, August 10, 1991. This workshop will focus on professional development for faculty members. The first sessions of the workshop will be open to doctoral students and new faculty members doing research, teaching, or having an interest in careers issues. These sessions will focus on the job search process and socialization into the role of faculty member. The remainder of the workshop, with continued participation of the doctoral candidates/new faculty, will be open to all members of the Academy. These sessions will focus on the research process and professional development (e.g., role of discussant, reviewer).

Please see the full Academy program for explicit details about the workshop.

If you have any questions feel free to contact the pre-conference co-coordinators: Suzyn Ornstein (617) 573-8374 or Lynn Isabella (804) 924-4818.