



SCALING AND SUSTAINING CHANGE AND INNOVATION

LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE TEAGLE FOUNDATION'S
"FACULTY WORK AND STUDENT LEARNING" INITIATIVE

By Adrianna Kezar
Professor, Rossier School of Education
Co-Director, Pullias Center for Higher Education
University of Southern California

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This guide distills key lessons learned about scaling and sustaining innovation from ten projects involved in the Teagle Foundation's "Faculty Work and Student Learning in the 21st Century" grant initiative. The grants were awarded in 2012-2013 to consortia and collaboratives of colleges (not formally a part of a consortium) as part of this initiative. The key focus of these grants was: how can and should faculty work change in response to the changing conditions—indeed, the changing nature—of undergraduate liberal education? And, how can liberal arts colleges maintain a quality, high-impact learning environment within a changing and challenging environment that requires innovation? The grants generally focused on ways to use technology and alter faculty roles/work in ways to address external challenges and maximize new concepts.

This guidebook aims to help campuses overcome common barriers as they embark on significant initiatives and provide a blueprint for a smoother pathway through the complex process of change.

The report has four main sections:

- I. [Key lessons for innovation](#) in technology and faculty roles in liberal arts colleges
- II. [Change models and approaches](#): What it takes to scale and sustain innovation
- III. [Consortial and multicampus work and leadership](#)
- IV. [Campus leadership](#) to scale and sustain innovation

A few highlights of the lessons learned are below.

For technology-oriented innovations:

In addressing technology innovations, framing the change is particularly important as there are many who are leery of the intentions behind using technology. Starting with a political approach/understanding is important. Additionally, technology changes work best when implemented in a systemic way that attend to human resources, infrastructure, incentives, and data/information needs.

1. Frame the initiative in a way that alleviates fears and helps faculty to understand the opportunities of online or hybrid programs.

2. Survey your campus to find out about ideas for integrating technology aligned with the campus mission.
3. Think through how to develop a common technology infrastructure.
4. Explore and use the many free apps and tools available to reduce costs.
5. Create cheat sheets about tools so that faculty adoption is easier.

For innovations related to faculty roles:

Faculty roles proved extremely difficult to innovate around. Faculty roles require not just a systemic approach, but awareness of the difficulty in altering deeply held norms around faculty work. Altering such norms requires senior leaders to be involved in helping shepherd through the change. Yet, leaders found ways to make progress through the following strategies.

1. Success in altering faculty roles depends on how closely aligned the new expectations are with existing mission.
2. In order to institutionalize changes around faculty roles, campus leaders needs to reconsider the hard-to-address issues of workload, department/ discipline home, and promotion and tenure guidelines.
3. Campus leaders need to pair changes in faculty roles with evaluation and rewards, which typically means involving senior level administrators.
4. It helps to work collaboratively across academic departments/units so changes are more seamless across the institution.

In addition to specific recommendations related to innovation and change in technology and faculty roles, the report offers many lessons related to scaling and sustaining changes. A few are summarized here but many more are offered in the full report:

1. Faculty learning communities are valuable mechanisms for sustaining and scaling change.
2. Individual faculty diffusion models alone do not work well, particularly for achieving scale.
3. Be aware of and examine your theory of change; learn from the organizational change literature.
4. Moving from a pilot to a change project requires intentional shifts in leadership.
5. Create a plan around scale.
6. The consortium can be a valuable hub of learning and ongoing communication.
7. Consortial leaders can harness multiple constituent groups for innovation and gain the trust of each of these groups.

8. The bolder the idea, the more need for communication.
9. Consortia can create a safe space for experimentation.

Finally, an appendix with a list of [resources on organizational change](#) as well as [grantee-developed resources](#) from selected projects is included for your reference.

INTRODUCTION

In this report, we review key lessons learned about scaling and sustaining innovation from 10 projects involved in the Teagle-funded initiative, “Faculty Work and Student Learning in the 21st Century.” The key focus of these grants was: how can and should faculty work change in response to the changing conditions—indeed, the changing nature—of undergraduate liberal education? And, how can liberal arts colleges maintain a quality, high-impact learning environment within a changing and challenging environment?

Ten grants were awarded in 2012-2013 to consortia and groups of colleges (not formally a part of a consortium) as part of the initiative. The Request for Proposals for the initiative asked institutions to consider what the changing nature of liberal education—increasingly defined as the development of intellectual and personal capacities, and increasingly shaped by a tough economic climate and by the continuous emergence of new online technologies—means for how colleges and universities and their faculties in the arts and sciences educate undergraduate students. In turn and more specifically, what do these forms of change mean for the nature of faculty work and professional responsibilities in the 21st century?

The grant initiative addressed several themes that have emerged from previous work that the campuses have engaged in as well as new developments in higher education: emerging insights from the cognitive sciences about how students learn, the widespread adoption of technology in undergraduate education, and the changing conditions of faculty life such as the need for more collaboration.

The grants were mostly awarded to consortia and a few to groups of campuses. We know very little about how consortia can lead change, so these projects helped in understanding this important question. Many of the lessons distilled below focus on the issue of how consortia or groups of campuses can support individual colleges in change, as well as respond to national change efforts to meet the challenges presented by an increasingly complex environment.

[Brief capsule summaries](#) of the funded projects follow below.

Section I offers some special considerations for initiatives aimed at (1) [technology](#) and (2) [changing faculty roles](#).

Section II offers [broad lessons about scaling and sustaining innovation](#) that apply to any change processes led by consortia.

Section III reviews important [insights about consortial leadership](#) to foster scaled and sustained changes.

Lastly, Section IV describes [lessons that individual campuses offered about leadership](#) for change.

CAPSULE SUMMARIES OF FUNDED PROJECTS

A brief summary of each project funded under the Teagle Foundation's "Faculty Work" initiative follows.

1. **Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges (COPLAC):** This project facilitated development of a new model for supporting undergraduate research, one that allowed an undergraduate at one of COPLAC's 28 member campuses to carry out an undergraduate research project under the guidance of a faculty member at another campus via electronic technologies. This model has the potential to open up multiple areas of disciplinary expertise that are not available to undergraduate researchers at individual member colleges, and effectively offer students the range of faculty expertise more commonly associated with a large research university. This project demonstrates the benefits of reconfiguring faculty work to share expertise across campuses, modeling a financially viable way to maximize educational opportunity for students.
2. **Independent Colleges Enterprise (ICE):** This project worked to create a model for blended electronic and face-to-face course delivery that could be shared across eight member colleges. The project relied on two key strategies: (1) sharing faculty appointments for teaching in two areas and (2) blending electronic and face-to-face instruction to make this sharing feasible. Rather than duplicate this offering at each college, the new instructor consulted with representatives of the mathematics departments of participating institutions as she or he designed and offered the new course that was offered electronically to students at all institutions. This centralized instruction was supplemented by a "local facilitator" on each campus who would work with students face-to-face. The participating institutions assessed these course offerings rigorously through modified versions of traditional student evaluations, other modes of instructor evaluation, and direct assessment of student learning.
3. **Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA):** The project gauged the environment of support for teaching and learning at its 13 member liberal arts colleges, built a community of interest among faculty seeking to enhance teaching effectiveness, and laid the groundwork for a consortial center of teaching and learning that can augment the support available to faculty members on their own campuses. The campuses hosted colloquys and convened faculty interested in promoting evidence-based pedagogies.

4. **New York Six Liberal Arts Consortium (NY6):** The Project created intercampus partnerships through use of blended learning. Through an RFP process, the provosts on each campus selected projects that utilize one of two blending techniques: (1) one that targets comparable classes on two or more campuses, with a faculty member on each campus leading the course discussions with his/her students, and all classes utilizing common online elements; (2) another that enables faculty to develop a blended learning course that will be offered across two or more campuses, but which is not team-taught. The New York Six will develop technology-supported instructional models that can be replicated or modified for faculty use in a wide range of disciplines.
5. **Southeastern Pennsylvania Consortium for Higher Education (SEPCHE):** The “Building Faculty Capacity for 21st Century Teaching” project is a faculty-led professional development model expanding evidence-based practice across the eight member institutions. Over 18 months, through 41 faculty-created projects, seven consortium-wide faculty development sessions, and additional workshops held within institutions, faculty conveners were able to reach two-thirds of full-time faculty across six institutions. The findings suggest that integrating the model into existing faculty development structures is key to yielding the broadest exposure and deepest adoption; a combination of faculty incentives and institutional supports advances sustainable faculty participation; and, regular discussions involving leaders with an external advisor maintains critical leadership support and focus.
6. **The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U):** Teams from nine residential liberal arts colleges in Massachusetts and New York developed long-term plans for building and sustaining self-renewing faculty leadership for the cumulative aims and outcomes of integrative liberal learning across the curriculum. To that end, the teams in the Faculty Leadership for Integrative Liberal Learning project: 1) developed a document “Principle and Practices” to guide integrative learning for today’s students; 2) identified and strengthened best practices for fostering student’s integrative learning; 3) created or strengthened models for faculty leadership and oversight of integrative liberal learning; and, 4) developed and published campus case studies in AAC&U’s Peer Review to share promising practices for and new lessons about integrative learning with the broader higher education community.
7. **Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM):** The project worked with 14 member institutions to restructure introductory courses so that they more effectively develop students’ higher order thinking, and re-structure faculty work to ensure the sustainability of these courses.

Research on learning demonstrates the value of teaching students higher order thinking skills such as critical thinking and problem solving, rather than just content knowledge, and doing so from the beginning of their college careers.

8. **Imagining America:** This project operationalized the concept of civic professionalism—to foster in both faculty and students a commitment to bringing the formal academic training that we all identify as the primary mission of colleges and universities into the "real world," and doing so in a way that serves the public good. A subset of six Imagining America members - Auburn University, Drew University, Macalester College, Millsaps College, Syracuse University, and the University of Miami - implemented programs that make civic professionalism a reality on their campuses.
9. **New American Colleges and Universities (NAC&U):** This project aimed to meet three interdependent goals: 1) To improve and individualize the evaluation of faculty work so that it takes into account professional development aimed at enhancing faculty expertise in teaching and learning; 2) To develop new holistic models for departments that will help them align with the student learning-focused mission of the institution while addressing the specific changing needs and interests of faculty members and the department; and 3) To expand the NAC&U focus on integrating professional studies and liberal arts. A subset of the 23 member campuses developed key publications that capture what holistic departments, revised evaluation, and further integration of professional studies and liberal arts can look like.
10. **The Associated Colleges of the South (ACS):** This project on blended learning supported a range of experiments in flipped classrooms, collaborative courses, and the evaluation of blended course delivery at the 16 member institutions, producing some intriguing examples of how online learning can enhance academic programming while increasing efficiency. The grant also helped create a lively information exchange program which included webinars featuring innovative projects from around the consortium and sixteen case studies in digital collaboration and blended learning developed jointly with the National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education.

SECTION I

Key Lessons for Innovations in Technology and Faculty Roles in Liberal Arts Colleges

As you can see from the [capsule summaries](#) of funded projects, grant recipients addressed various issues regarding technology and faculty roles.

Technology innovations are important as liberal arts college need to remain competitive, and technology offers the potential for campuses to share faculty through mentoring, to jointly offer courses, to add additional curricular offerings, to reach more students, and enhance learning for students by adding additional resources and materials. In addressing technology innovations, framing the change is particularly important as there are many who are leery of the intentions in using and potential of technology. Starting with a political approach/understanding is important. Additionally, technology changes work best when implemented in a systemic way that attend to human resources, infrastructure, incentives, and data/information needs.

Altering faculty roles also offers many potential benefits in maximizing faculty efforts in areas to meet institutional missions around civic engagement or community based research; to adopt new approaches to teaching/learning (e.g., evidence based teaching practices, integrative learning, hybrid courses); and to take on additional responsibilities such as undergraduate research. Faculty roles require not just a systemic approach, but awareness of the difficulty in altering deeply held norms around faculty work. Altering such norms requires senior leaders to be involved in helping shepherd through the change.

This section describes some of the key considerations for change related to technology and faculty work.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR TECHNOLOGY REFORMS

In some ways, considering and implementing new ideas around technology were easier than faculty roles as there is no set way technology has been used in higher education, and this allowed for more freedom of thinking. Below are some strategies in response to key challenges to consider:

A variety of campuses had faculty members who feared that using online learning would turn their campus into a University of Phoenix.

1. *Frame the initiative in a way that alleviates fears and helps faculty to understand the opportunities of online or hybrid programs.*

A variety of campuses had faculty members who feared that using online learning would turn their campus into a University of Phoenix. They worried about their identity in using these new modes of delivery. Different levels of comfort with the online environment emerged as a barrier in several of the projects. Consortia leaders at NY6 and individual campus leaders were able to frame the message about how technology would expand and enhance program offerings and opportunities for students and the campus without changing their identity. They also emphasized how they would be maximizing technology to offer a stronger, rather than inferior, education. Different campuses working together may have different levels of comfort with the online environment, particularly moving beyond hybrids to fully online courses. Working to alleviate concerns about all online courses is critical to helping institutions working across a multi-institutional project to collaborate more effectively.

Example of successful framing: Demonstrate how faculty are already using technology

Consortium and campus leaders used existing, everyday uses of technology to demonstrate that their projects were not such a dramatic alteration of existing practices. They noted that many faculty were already using Blackboard, online resources, and social media, demonstrating how a hybrid or online course was not such a dramatic extension from their existing practice.

Example of successful framing: Demonstrate an attention to balance between standardization and customization

Technology initiatives often involve needing to think through and establish common learning goals across campuses if a course is going to be offered online or in hybrid form at multiple institutions. Many consortial technology projects involved the development of common learning goals across campuses when sharing an online course or a model like undergraduate research. There is a tension in that technology tends toward more standardization of work, whereas liberal arts colleges often want to have their unique niche and approach. Several projects were waylaid by fears of standardization; campus leaders need to anticipate this challenge. They can create more buy-in if they have discussions about the appropriate amount of standardization and customization up front.

2. *Be attentive to differences in approach by discipline, institutional type, and institutional culture.*

Projects that were more successful with integrating technology honored differences among different disciplines and within the context of a liberal arts college. Campus participants discussed the need to allow campus-based projects to vary their approach based on discipline and not try to institute any generic model for integrating technology. For instance, humanities faculty might want more chat room space, whereas science faculty may want more simulations. Project leaders noted that many resources focused on technology tend to have only large campuses in mind. As a result, the [National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education \(NITLE\)](#), as a technology initiative aimed at liberal arts colleges, was seen as a helpful resource. ACS produced a series of [case studies](#) to highlight how the unique concerns of liberal arts colleges like maintaining a small class feel and building strong relationships with students could be addressed. Lastly, different institutions have unique contexts, so consortium leaders allowed each campus to develop its own approach based on its resources, existing equipment, mission, and goals.

Projects that were more successful with integrating technology honored differences among different disciplines and within the context of a liberal arts college.

3. *Survey your campus to find out about ideas for integrating technology aligned with the campus mission to understand needs and generate buy-in.*

Faculty felt much less threatened about technology when they had input into the process of making decisions, or at least when they had input on decisions related to technology initiatives. A number of campus participants conducted surveys in order to understand needs, concerns, and even attitudes about technology. These data were then used to inform choices about infrastructure, as well as the need for communication and discussion about the initiative to address concerns and build capacity so that technology could be successfully incorporated into the educational experience. Also, given that choices around technology often cannot be easily undone as the infrastructure is expensive, surveys ensure a more thoughtful approach.

4. *Survey faculty members about their skills in using technology so appropriate professional development can be put in place.*

The grant-funded projects often discovered that faculty had extremely varied expertise with regard to technology. Therefore, it is important to survey faculty about their level of experience and expertise. Some campuses assumed more or less knowledge among faculty about technology than actually existed. When they assumed faculty knew more, they did not provide enough skills training to have a successful implementation. When they assumed less knowledge, professional development tended to bore people and create frustration. Often, the faculty members involved in the initial pilot projects have significant experience with technology, but scaling up the initiatives made considerations of professional development very important. For instance, ACS institutions used surveys to accurately anticipate professional development needs and to design multiple kinds of sessions for faculty at different levels.

5. *Build relationships across key staff/faculty.*

Campuses can enhance their technology initiatives by bringing together informational technology staff, administrators, and faculty early on to develop relationships and have conversations. For instance, NY6 brought together these groups three times prior to implementation to develop collegiality so that technology staff could have input on faculty course development and faculty could create relationships with technology staff to support successful course launches and continued to bring them together regularly during implementation. Other campuses that did not develop these relationships often found that the IT staff were not available when faculty needed them or that faculty designed courses without the appropriate input from technology staff.

6. *Try not to underestimate infrastructure needs.*

Almost every campus with a technology initiative found that infrastructure issues presented challenges, whether they be different learning management systems, campus registration, varying technology availability within classrooms, or limited professional development. Campuses need to think through the right team (that includes instructional technology staff, administrators who need to make resources available, and faculty using technology) to address the infrastructure issues upfront and standing support through instructional technology staff that is available to address infrastructure issues as the initiative rolls out. Too often, ignoring the infrastructure issues ended up

negatively impacting pilot projects. For example, one campus leader at an ACS institution noted: “We learned that if we ignore the infrastructure issues, it just comes back to haunt you—particularly when you want to try to bring something to scale.”

7. Understand and anticipate the difficulty in developing common technology infrastructure.

Projects spoke about the difficulty of getting multiple campuses to use the same courseware, which might save money and make working across campuses easier. ACS, ICE, and NY6 described how campuses utilize many different learning management systems. As one leader noted, “we are working with six campuses, and they have four different learning management systems and that makes it really complex. We are attempting to either purchase a single learning management system for the overall project or to get campuses to agree on a single platform.”

8. Create cheat sheets about tools so that faculty adoption is easier.

Many of the faculty involved in the technology initiatives were early adopters and they noted that scaling up initiatives would be very difficult unless campuses create “cheat sheets” that make the use of technology simpler. One such early adopter from ACS created a cheat sheet on various online applications that can be used to enhance the classroom experience by faculty within her institutional setting. She recognized that scale would be unlikely to occur unless she created tools for other faculty. Therefore, she used grant support to develop easy-to-use resources and tools. Moving from early adopters to the rest of faculty means having the right resources available.

9. Create cheat sheets for students in classroom as well.

Students are often not as technology-savvy as faculty expect. Faculty early adopters also noted that it was not enough just to create cheat sheets for other faculty, but that many of the students also lacked skills needed to be successful in a more technology-rich classroom. They emphasized the need to create tools that help students to better understand the technology that will be used.

10. Explore and use the many free apps and tools to reduce costs.

Liberal arts colleges may shy away from technology due to cost. Whereas some projects hoped that technology would lead to cost savings, often costs mounted as they sought to develop the appropriate

infrastructure. However, various campus leaders from ACS and NY6 talked about educating faculty and administrators about the many free applications and tools (e.g. [Blue Jeans](#)) available that can lower costs. Increasingly, there are learning management and communication systems that are free and these projects provided descriptions of such systems to encourage faculty experimentation and adoption.

11. Use existing technology resources.

Technology initiatives have many unique, complex challenges and so seeking out the many existing resources before beginning a project is needed. Several projects benefited from reviewing resources to help shape their ideas. For example, resources from [National Center for Academic Transformation](#) were used by several campuses in the ICE consortium as models. As leaders use resources, they should be aware that many were created for larger campuses, so they may need to be modified to meet the needs of smaller campuses.

12. Be flexible with campus policies.

It helps if campuses have more flexible or open policies about curriculum review, for example, so cross-consortial technology efforts can work. If campuses require a full curriculum review the first time a course is run, it will make collaboration across campuses difficult as others campuses that do not have that constraint will feel inhibited by these restrictive policies. Examining rigid policies and making mutually agreed upon modifications upfront encourages more collaboration across campuses.

13. Examine faculty incentives, promotion and tenure.

Incentives impacted implementation of technology and its eventual spread and scaling up. While many individuals on campuses are using technology, it is usually the early adopters and innovators that do not need any institutional support or incentives. Project and campus leaders talked about the struggle to move technology initiatives to a scaled effort unless promotion and tenure requirements reward faculty for the risk-taking and time it takes to get involved in utilizing technology to enhance their teaching. This finding about incentives, promotion and tenure links to the next section that focuses on faculty roles and the ways that innovations, in general, will be facilitated on campus if faculty roles are re-examined to support changes.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR ALTERATION IN FACULTY ROLES

Faculty roles proved extremely difficult to innovate around. Traditional roles of teaching, research, and service are dominant. In addition, teaching as a practice is highly solidified. Faculty work has been virtually the same for well over a hundred years and norms to support them are very strong. Thus, even projects leaders found it challenging to think beyond traditional faculty roles. They recognized then they would also face strong resistance to new ideas because of this difficulty in imagining new ways of conducting faculty work.

1. *Align role changes with evaluation and rewards – which means efforts need to involve senior administrators and faculty governance bodies.*

Many of the campuses involved in examining faculty roles noted the importance of pairing these efforts with a change in the evaluation and reward system. While the funded projects acknowledged the importance of this aspect of the work, only one successfully addressed the evaluation and reward system. Most campus leaders found this too daunting a task to complete, even if it was originally a part of their project goals. Others, once determining that it was an important part of altering faculty roles, just could not muster the support to work in this area. Many of the projects did not have deep involvement by senior administrators, particularly the provost, which is critical to changing faculty roles. One consortial leader describes this challenge: “Well, the provosts are all aware of what we’re doing, but they’re not integrated in the right way in order to help us actually address the issues of workload and rewards that would make this innovation feasible.” While most senior leaders across the projects were knowledgeable of the “general” work, they participated in projects at a more informational level, which meant they were unlikely to directly engage in discussions about changes in the evaluation and rewards. Having discussions upfront with leaders about the necessity of examining the evaluation and rewards processes when projects are aimed at faculty roles would benefit future efforts.

2. *Address difficult issues of workload, department/discipline home, and promotion and tenure guidelines.*

Altering faculty roles means having people reconsider areas that are typically off the table for discussion such as faculty workload, departmental arrangements or norms, and promotion and tenure. As noted above, most of the participants in these projects did not feel they had the authority or enough support from senior administrators to take

on these difficult issues. Many of the projects could work with a small innovative group to pilot an initiative like distance undergraduate research, civic professionalism, or an evidence-based approach to teaching and learning. However, to scale up and institutionalize a practice would often require alterations of workloads, considerations of credit for faculty teaching across departments, or revising the promotion and tenure guidelines. Therefore, projects are likely to remain in a pilot stage unless these larger institutional issues are addressed as they relate to faculty roles.

3. *Think more broadly than faculty development and consider organizational redesign.*

Rethinking faculty roles needs to be more than part of a faculty development effort and should be part of overall campus leadership discussions. Projects usually assigned the discussion of faculty roles within a Center for Teaching and Learning, which typically would not have the authority to examine the broader issues needed to alter faculty roles. Those responsible for faculty development need to have a more systemic view of the way they need to alter faculty roles and authority to make changes. Change agents in middle administration need to team with the senior administration to address larger issues of hiring expectations, evaluation, departmental management, and reward structures.

4. *Work collaboratively across units.*

Altering faculty roles happens much more easily if changes are being made across a series of different departments or are not isolated within a few. Faculty members are loathe to get out in front of other departments. Seeing an initiative as being integrated across a variety of departments made faculty feel more accepting of the innovation. For instance, the Imagining America project tried to work across several different departments, including political science, psychology, and communications, to ensure broader adoption.

5. *Align new expectations with the existing mission.*

Adopting new approaches to teaching and learning such as integrative learning, utilizing new research on learning sciences, or being involved in civic professionalism varied in difficulty based on how aligned the innovation was to current institutional mission and goals. For example, the AAC&U integrative learning project worked with institutions that had already made significant strides with integrative learning; it was already

aligned with their mission, and they thus had fewer issues with buy in, motivation and institutional supports, and rewards for the innovation. Similarly, with the Imagining America project, civic professionalism was adopted more readily by campuses that already had strong missions committed to civic engagement.

6. *Better support for teaching also requires attention to promotion and tenure and other policies.*

All of these pressures together mean that initiatives focused on supporting better teaching will have limited traction unless faculty are unburdened in some way from the increasing workloads.

Various campuses talked about the increasing pressures on faculty in teaching institutions to conduct and publish research. In addition, workloads have often gone up during periods of recession, increasing both faculty teaching loads and research expectations. Campuses have begun to rely more on adjunct faculty for teaching and raising service loads for full-time faculty. All of these pressures together mean that initiatives focused on supporting better teaching will have limited traction unless faculty are unburdened in some way from the increasing workloads. There is no room to think about improving teaching in the environments that have developed. While many of the funded projects have champions or faculty innovators based on a specific interest in pedagogy, scaling up is unlikely given the broader infrastructure—workload, rewards, and promotion and tenure remain unchanged. For instance, leaders from the GLCA project noted: “We had deep discussions about people’s commitment to teaching, but the incredible pressures around increasing committee work, teaching loads, and ratcheting up of research among institutions that don’t even have a research goal. Everything is becoming an add-on and it’s just hard to address.”

7. *Move from the mindset of faculty as independent contractor to being a member of collective, institutional action.*

One of the most important changes related to faculty roles is moving from the notion of being an independent contractor to being part of campus collective action. Almost all projects reported that one of the primary barriers to change is faculty not feeling connected to the institution and the projects that it undertakes. One campus participant described it this way: “We have to create a mind shift in the faculty to think about themselves as part of “we” and not just “I.” On our campus, you literally don’t have to interact with anyone—you can schedule your own classes, stay within your own department, in your own building, and be completely divorced from any of the institutional activity.”

Changing this mentality is important for altering faculty roles. It is perhaps one of the most fundamental barriers to all of the funded projects. In order to alter this individual mentality, leaders involved in the AAC&U campus talked about strategies: "It all has to begin when we are hiring. We need to set up expectations that people work together collectively. Then they need to be socialized in departments and the collective mentality fostered through evaluation processes. Certainly if we allow faculty to do their own thing and hope they will do more service after they get promotion and tenure, that model hasn't worked." Because this issue is such a critical challenge to engaging faculty in efforts to change as well as to consider alteration of their roles, the NAC&U project about creating collective departments and collective evaluation is a particularly important example for others to follow. In moving to more collective expectations, project leaders noted that change initiatives should be judiciously chosen so faculty are not overwhelmed with new work and responsibilities and that faculty should be engaged wisely so as not to overburden those who are willing to contribute more to the collective good.

Funded projects typically focused on the innovation, and only later realized they needed to think about broad-based implementation related to the innovation. There is a tendency to focus on the innovation itself (i.e., how can we make this technology work?) over the actual implementation. However, research demonstrates that it is better for leaders to examine their implicit/explicit change model up front and not to wait until engrossed in the implementation phase. The struggles that project and campus leaders encountered demonstrate the importance of not waiting to think about change. The advice above on innovations in technology and faculty roles will serve other campuses well as they move forward to address these important external challenges. This next section focuses on lessons that can be learned from grant-funded projects about understanding the change process.

SECTION II

Change Models and Approaches: What It Takes to Scale and Sustain Innovation

The funded projects provided a set of lessons about *how* to go about creating broad-based change—not just devising the innovation. As a result, much of this report focuses on ways to better support change initiatives led by consortia. It also addresses ways consortia can foster efforts on individual campuses, including factors to consider supporting in order to bring initiatives to scale and promote sustainability, thereby making the most of all the time and effort invested in creating and testing an innovation. A common theme across the recommendations below is the need to shift from a more “individual” and organic peer-to-peer dissemination model to a more intentionally structured approach to scale innovations. Second, there needs to be a more systemic approach that considers needed changes in policy, incentives, and infrastructure. And third, approaches to change need to be longer-term in scope – considering a plan for scale over time and one that anticipates barriers and facilitators.

One issue that emerged that is important for change agents to consider is whether making changes in the liberal arts context is itself considered an abandonment of mission. Implicitly, many leaders in the liberal arts colleges hold an underlying, often unacknowledged belief that innovation means forsaking the liberal arts, and the only way to maintain fidelity to the core values of the liberal arts is to resist change. Often the most important way to start discussion about innovations is to talk openly about how change does not have to mean moving away from the core mission or a shift in identity. Innovations can be made that support the liberal arts. Because many faculty do not acknowledge or recognize that their resistance is a result of a desire to stay true to the liberal arts, they often cannot understand why they are having difficulty embracing new ideas. Thus many people hold implicit beliefs that any change is a move away from or compromise to educational quality, rather than an enhancement.

A common theme across the recommendations below is the need to shift from a more “individual” and organic peer-to-peer dissemination model to a more intentionally structured approach to scale innovations.

1. *Learning communities are valuable mechanisms for sustaining and scaling change.*

A learning community is a group of faculty or faculty and staff that meets regularly to discuss a common topic or area of interest. Several

individual campuses and two consortia created learning communities to guide their project work. Learning communities provide a way for change to become part of an ongoing dialogue and help people to make sense of the change as it unfolds. Some consortia (e.g., Imagining America, SEPCHE) started by making use of learning communities where participants read common texts to educate themselves and discussed the proposed innovation. Learning communities helped generate greater buy-in among faculty for the work by helping them understand the innovation in much greater detail and what it meant for their work and role. Some project participants commented that spending the time reading and talking initially seemed like a waste of time but then their efforts took off quickly once implemented. One challenge with learning communities is not letting the energy peter out or letting the groups prematurely disband. One campus leader in the AAC&U project describes their experience with utilizing a learning community approach: "It's always been hard to get collective action but this time we tried the learning communities model and set up an expectation that change is not something that one or two faculty innovators do, but that departments do, working together to create change. Departments that are very different from one another set up learning communities, and it's really taken off."

Many project leaders and faculty spoke about collegiality formed across institutions (i.e., finding a faculty member who works on another campus, but is from a similar discipline or has the same passion). This type of connection was a major motivator for becoming involved with a change initiative and serving as a champion of change. As a result, learning communities at the consortium level can build and maintain momentum for change on the individual campuses.

Another way that learning communities fostered change was by serving as sites to model new behaviors or practices. As a leader within the SEPCHE project noted, "If you want to get more metacognitive skills, practice them; if you want more technology use, then the initiative should utilize technology in novel ways and the like." One participant captured what several people noted: "We really practice what we are trying to create in terms of change. You need to be the change you want to see. Modeling helps people learn."

Learning communities are also a departure from the traditional "individual faculty change model." Ample research evidence suggests that faculty members face challenges with disseminating and spreading innovations well on their own (Austin, 2011; Fairweather, 2001). Occasionally, individual diffusion works to achieve some spread, but

usually not scale, particularly in settings such as liberal arts colleges. Campuses involved in this project that made more progress on change moved away from individual peer-to-peer models of diffusion and instead used faculty learning communities. Some campuses adopted a mix of learning communities and peer-to-peer models. In any event, relying on the peer-to-peer model should be approached with caution by campuses attempting to scale their innovations.

2. *Move from an individual faculty development model to an organizational development model.*

Organizational development models suggest looking at what would make the desired behavior normative, rather than just the practice of a few. They emphasize examining the campus and ways it might be altered (i.e., incentives, new positions, rewards, professional development, resources) to support changes. Under the organizational development model, leaders work for change at the departmental or institutional level. One approach is to fund or organize projects into teams including both faculty and administrators, with the intent to connect people with different organizational roles and scale change. For instance, the GLCA project focused on building broader infrastructures to support the scholarship of teaching and learning among faculty through the creation of centers for teaching and learning on campus or new staff positions with the responsibility for overseeing this function on campus. The centers created colloquies – extended conversations jointly among faculty – to enlarge the circle and create a broader norm that good teaching is everyone’s work.

Connie Schroeder’s (2009) book *Moving from the Margins* is a very helpful resource to provide consortium leaders, faculty campus developers, campus leaders and others involved in innovation projects to shift their focus from individual faculty to a broader view of creating the infrastructure for change.

In some instances, individual faculty members in projects have gained national prominence and might be capable of influencing others in their disciplines. The individual faculty model (e.g., a peer-to-peer dissemination model) can lead to broader scaled up change, but the chances of success are not as good. One member of a project summed up the challenge of the individual innovator approach: “What typically doesn’t work to scale change is to send individual faculty off to a conference and get them excited about an idea and they return to campus to be an isolated innovator.”

3. *Test ideas broadly early on and have a representative planning team.*

Several projects involved a smaller planning team, often made up of campus administrators. These projects ran into problems later on during the implementation phase because faculty lacked interest or because they viewed the ideas as not being feasible or suited to address the challenge at hand. Developing innovations without faculty buy-in can end up costing institutions time and money. In order to alleviate this challenge, some consortia created small grant programs for faculty to propose and advance an innovation using approaches that were suited for the needs and demands of their campus or classroom. This tactic helped generate good ideas and faculty buy-in, but often lacked the necessary alignment with institutional priorities to scale the program, or the program was not widely of interest to the faculty. Consortia might benefit from creating a process whereby they survey faculty for interest and also form a broad-based planning team to brainstorm about key innovations to address a shared problem. Having an approach that was either too local or too removed from day-to-day practice created the danger of testing innovations that lacked resonance or buy in.

4. *Relying on relationships alone may not be a sound approach to creating change.*

Many projects relied on meetings that they hoped would bring people together in conversation, and build relationships that would sustain the project in the future. Certainly, relationships are extremely important for effective collaboration and can facilitate change. However, there is not much evidence and research to suggest that relationships alone can sustain and scale change over time. Therefore, in addition to building relationships, campuses need to develop longer-term strategies to sustain the preliminary work of these important projects. However, relationships were an important outcome of participating in these projects. For example, when a department chair or faculty member had difficulty deciding upon a next course of action, having a colleague on another campus to call and talk with helped to move the change forward. Therefore, relationships are certainly important for change, but relying solely on them as a way to sustain and scale change is unwise.

5. *Be aware of and examine your theory of change; learn about the organizational change literature.*

Leaders of consortia and multi-campus projects need to familiarize themselves with

Being more familiar with the literature on organizational change would help leaders anticipate barriers and take advantage of factors that are facilitators of change.

the basics of organizational change to help in planning their efforts. Almost all of the projects in the initiative described how their innovation eventually either hit some sort of barrier on campus (e.g., policies or practices that were unsupportive, faculty resistance) or discovered some facilitating factor such as an alignment with institutional goals. However, their experiences were always more haphazard and leaders felt like they had less control than they wanted. Being more familiar with the literature on organizational change would help leaders anticipate barriers and take advantage of factors that are facilitators of change. Below are some of the key highlights that emerged in this evaluation related to facilitators and barriers of change. The [appendix](#) to this report identifies some resources – literature on change – that can also help leaders be better stewards of the change process.

WHAT FACILITATES CHANGE?

1. *Align the initiative to a campus priority.*

Most change efforts fail because they cannot garner the attention of faculty, staff, or administrators on campus. One way to garner more support for an initiative is to align it with an existing goal. Campuses participating in the Imagining America project aligned their work on civic professionalism with existing community engagement work. This approach can also improve sustainability by helping to get senior level administrators on board. AAC&U's project chose institutions to participate that had already identified integrative learning as a major focus as a way to ensure there was alignment with an existing campus priority. AAC&U noted the most progress occurred on campuses where integrative learning was part of the mission or strategic planning efforts. As one campus leader noted: "This was already a major priority for us. In fact, our campus was applying for the Carnegie engagement classification and this provided us with another area to describe that helped us reach this classification. So the work of this initiative was a major priority for the Provost and many other academic leaders."

2. *Capitalize on passion.*

Faculty often get involved when the innovation is an issue that they care or feel passionate about. Many projects harnessed this passion to propel change. They ensured from

the very beginning that there were faculty on their campus who cared deeply about ideas such as hybrid classrooms, civic engagement, or new ways of teaching before crafting the initiative; they also ensured that faculty who had such a passion were part of the initial planning effort. This approach helped ensure that the project had a ready group of champions. AAC&U's project had a team of faculty who were passionate about integrative learning on each campus. In contrast, leaders who were not sure how faculty would respond to the project found that their efforts stalled out from the very beginning. A campus leader from the NY6 project noted that: "This has worked because faculty are enjoying getting to build relationships with people who share similar interests and care about expanding opportunities for students through online learning." In contrast, another leader noted: "We assumed there was more interest in hybrid classrooms than there turned out to be."

3. Draw benefits from shared leadership.

Many projects either had bottom up faculty support or, occasionally, top down administrative support. Few had support from both levels. As a result, projects either lacked faculty motivation and buy-in or the support from administrators necessary to overcome barriers. The SEPCHE consortium garnered both faculty and administrative support, which helped them reach and scale the effort to 176 faculty. In addition, the AAC&U project had campus teams made up of both faculty and administrators. AAC&U worked intentionally to create a shared leadership model. Whenever they felt administrators were taking over too much and asserting their authority, they helped rebalance teams. To highlight the intentional focus on creating collaborative leadership in AAC&U's project, several articles about how to successfully blend and balance faculty and administrative leadership were included in the Fall 2014 edition of AAC&U's publication, [Peer Review](#). Those seeking advice on shared leadership will benefit from the detailed lessons learned from this project.

4. Facilitate discussion as the initial phase of change.

Whether leading at the consortial level or campus level, discussions and brainstorming around an innovation is needed so that people can make sense of the change and

identify how it impacts their work and roles. The work of Eckel and Kezar (2003) demonstrates that a strategy called *sensemaking* is critical as the first part of change processes. Sensemaking involves processes (i.e., discussions, professional development) that help individuals understand what an innovation means personally for their roles and identity. Teagle project leaders typically started with discussions lasting a year or longer about the innovation; these discussions were most beneficial when they occurred in person. The GLCA project utilized colloquies that were held on different consortium campuses; these were extended conversations on the scholarship of teaching and learning and focused on improving the educational environment. These initial, broad-based conversations among many faculty resulted in tangible changes across most campuses that participated in the project, including the development of centers for teaching and learning on some campuses. Another good example of sensemaking was demonstrated in the AAC&U project. Faculty were already involved in aspects of integrative learning in various ways, but as they explored the topic more, they realized that they were not really doing deeply integrative work or doing it as intentionally as they had thought. Taking time to wrestle with what integrative learning really is helped them to change their practices in fundamental ways.

5. *Utilize existing infrastructure rather than creating something new.*

Projects were much more likely to feel an effort was sustainable when they had not created a new office, center, or another infrastructure to support the work. If they built the work into an existing center for teaching and learning, technology office, or faculty task force or committee, it was more likely to continue in the future because the new initiative could be integrated into day-to-day operations. Taking this approach also meant not having to go through the process of securing additional funding to create new infrastructure.

6. *Engage influential leaders and champions.*

Some consortia and campuses were able to draw upon influential faculty leaders to create change. They identified key people who could help convince others to consider becoming

involved. Leveraging these champions and supporting their efforts can help promote initial success. For example, several faculty who applied for ACS grants were considered legitimate innovators who others would follow.

7. Provide and rethink faculty professional development.

Those campuses that made progress provided professional development to build familiarity with and support for the adoption of technology and new roles. Consortial efforts that failed to meet their goals often assumed that faculty already knew what they needed to do. However, professional development is a necessary tool, particularly when a campus is trying to expand beyond early adopters and innovators in order to scale efforts. Because campuses often started their work with the early adopters, they lost sight of the fact that individuals who joined the efforts later on might need more information and support to get involved and up to speed. An example of professional development was provided by one project: “We had lots of faculty who did not know how to do IRB and that was slowing the process of getting them into assessing their courses. Once we realized this, I helped bring in professional development on IRB processes.” Several project leaders noted that it is a mistake to assume faculty already know about learning, student development, pedagogy, and similar topics, as they are not trained in this work. Often, going back to the basics is essential. Also, good faculty developers need to keep disciplinary differences in mind and be open to communication issues that might prevent learning.

8. Empower people to act, but also provide training in leadership.

Projects that gained more traction helped campus leaders to see their role as empowering faculty to lead and communicated that the door was open to bring forward concerns about barriers so they could be addressed. Consortia supported these efforts by encouraging faculty to communicate challenges, knowing they would be assisted in overcoming them. AAC&U’s project took the notion of faculty leadership to heart and made it the centerpiece; they knew faculty ownership was important, but they also needed faculty to know when to communicate challenges. They also helped faculty members to learn the skills of leadership. This

process was usually missing from most of the projects due to the belief that if projects merely empowered people to be leaders, they would know what to do. AAC&U's project understood that faculty do not always know how the campus operates and may not be knowledgeable about strategic plans, mission and vision, budgets, policies, or infrastructure issues. Faculty might be able to fulfill their roles in teaching without knowing the system, but they cannot be leaders without understanding the system. So, the AAC&U initiative focused on teaching faculty to understand the campus as a complex system and helped them understand what is required to act as change agents. The project also made the distinction between what faculty and administrators can do as leaders so that faculty could better understand and define their own roles. They also found that faculty do not consider themselves leaders but prefer the term 'facilitator' or 'collaborator'. This was important as using the term 'leader' made faculty resist taking on this responsibility.

9. Ensure lots of opportunities for engagement.

Change is much more likely to occur when multiple types of opportunities exist to for engagement, whether through workshops, virtual resources, brown bag lunches, or annual events. A combination of engagement opportunities allows innovators the chance to share ideas and check in from time to time. Through these many forms of engagement, the projects encouraged faculty to make sense of and gain ownership of the innovation. On one SEPCHE campuses, for example, forms of engagement included: faculty visits from other campuses to give seminars, taping workshops to serve as online resources, and participation in consortium-led events. Of course getting people to events can sometimes be a challenge, but campuses created an expectation of involvement by having senior leaders make this a priority.

10. Use data to support change.

Many projects used data collection as a way to start their change efforts. For example, in the ACS project, faculty were surveyed about their knowledge of technology and needs. AAC&U also collected data about progress on integrative learning on participating campuses. Then, data were used in workshops to help foster conversations based on data from

the involved campuses. This made discussions less abstract and more grounded in the experience of participants on campuses. Several of the technology efforts conducted surveys about views about and skills related to technology.

WHAT IMPEDES CHANGE?

1. Lack of appropriate infrastructure hurts change.

Particularly for technology-related initiatives, having the appropriate technology in classrooms, technology staff, tools, and other key infrastructure was needed in order for efforts to get off the ground. If faculty created technology-rich courses, but the appropriate infrastructure was not available, efforts faltered. Infrastructure is a critical element for all types of initiatives. At other campuses where projects focused on faculty roles, infrastructure meant a new position that could advance faculty development. In the GLCA project, for example, some of the colleges created a new Faculty Fellow for Learning and Teaching position to enhance development and support programs for faculty members; others created centers for teaching and learning that had not existed before.

2. Address promotion & tenure policies and rewards/evaluation structures.

Campuses that want to see changes in faculty roles and the integration of technology at scale, as well as for change to be sustained, need to examine and alter the structures that define faculty work. Most projects had aspirations to address these issues, but ended up deciding that it was too difficult or could not develop consensus across projects with different approaches and missions. In the end, those few projects that achieved scale and sustained change addressed evaluation, merit processes, or tenure and promotion to support the changes they were putting in place. One example from a project demonstrates how this issue can be addressed: “CAOs on our campuses put letters in faculty experimenters’ files that protected them from poor student evaluations in the promotion and tenure process.”

3. Facilitate workload and policy issues.

Campuses that lacked any senior leadership involvement typically encountered obstacles when it came to making necessary changes in faculty workload and policy. For example, COPLAC realized that offering undergraduate research through a consortium means developing a cross institutional policy around workload: How will a faculty member providing service for another campus be recognized in terms of their own campus workload? But the project did not have the right individuals involved to create a policy change of that magnitude. COPLAC involved a steering committee that had administrators, but often multiple individuals on a campus have to be involved for major faculty policy changes, including the provosts. Addressing tenure and promotion and workload usually means involving senior leaders in the change.

4. Minimize the impact of leadership turnover.

Campus teams experienced tremendous leadership turnover due to people leaving on sabbaticals, taking on new jobs, moving to different campuses, or having personal circumstances emerge that pulled them away. Many participants described the struggle of continuing to move forward when there is a constant need to educate newcomers and reorient others who have fallen out of the program for a period of time. It often felt like the work was starting all over again. Consortia leaders often took on the role of training newcomers so that beleaguered campus teams did not have to take on this responsibility. This is an example of how consortia can be very facilitative of the work.

5. Position or title can get in the way of creative thinking.

It is hard to be innovative if people are afraid that those in positions of power might harshly judge their ideas. In order to get around the impediments of titles or positions of authority, some consortia have practices that deemphasize hierarchy. For example, NAC&U does not put titles on name badges for events. They purposefully want to have people engage each other as equals and to stimulate brainstorming and out-of-the-box thinking. This ethic has also been integrated into campus-based teams as participants started to implement

similar practices of deemphasizing the importance of titles or positions.

6. Revisit your theory of change.

Many leaders noted that they had already known the importance of supporting bottom up changes and not being too top down from prior experience. However, as they moved their initiatives forward, the knowledge they had garnered was lost. A lesson learned is therefore: Stop and think back on what you know and have learned about change through experience or reading about organizational change (see resources in the [appendix](#)). Sometimes, in the rush of day-to-day work, we forget those lessons we have learned.

7. Consultants can help foster change.

Many projects utilized consultants to further their change efforts, particularly if they lacked expertise in key areas like assessment or needed a neutral party to help lead political or controversial discussions. Leaders noted the advantages and disadvantages of hiring consultants. The advantages are that they are perceived as neutral and not having an agenda. The disadvantage is that they might lack knowledge about the campus context and as a result be seen as less legitimate. If there are influential and legitimate people on campus, they were often preferred to help advance the innovation. But, many campuses realized they did not have the right set of individuals to make that possible. A few of the projects brought in consultants focused on change management. The NAC&U project teams described how a presentation by their change consultant was a watershed moment because it empowered them to see that they could create change through persuasion and discussion, that those who were resistant did not need to be a major focus, and that there was research and evidence to support their innovations.

8. Moving from pilot to a change project requires intentional shifts in leadership.

When working on a pilot project, leaders often do not consider long-term costs or sustainability. They are just trying to see if it works. But, even when a pilot succeeds, leaders often later discover they do not have the money or capability to sustain the effort. So, the attempt to innovate becomes a waste of time, which creates bad will among faculty who feel their time was not respected. There is therefore an important balance to strike—leaders need to do some hypothetical thinking about

the ability to maintain a pilot if it succeeds. If the money and capability to proceed do not currently exist, it might be best to wait. Thinking this through early is important.

9. *Create a plan around scale.*

Some projects noted they were developing a model that could be replicated, others developed case studies that could be used by others to promote change, some used peer-to-peer-mentoring (or train the trainers), and others created resources and rubrics that would assist other campuses with creating change. Without an approach for dissemination, achieving scale is unlikely. Most campuses did not achieve scale during the short time period of the grant project. Projects with a plan in place for scaling innovation developed by drawing on national examples or other projects are more likely to be on a positive trajectory. For example, ACS created case studies --based on its mini-grant faculty projects – that were distributed through NITLE. Imagining America created a rubric and framework around civic professionalism. AAC&U developed a principles and policies document and case studies to support others in their efforts to change. SEPCHE uses a peer-to-peer training model that developed individuals trained in an approach to metacognition that will lead to further scale when those who were trained teach others. They went beyond the individual faculty dissemination model in that trained individuals felt a responsibility to train and work with others. Many leaders on liberal arts campuses preferred a peer-to-peer model and one that builds in a responsibility to train others could work to train others to achieve scale. But, it only works if there is a plan and intention that they will continue to spread it, even after the grant funding has run out.

Without an approach for dissemination, achieving scale is unlikely.

SECTION III

Consortial and Multi-Campus Work and Leadership

All of these projects were part of consortial or multi-campus efforts. One of key lessons to emerge out of the projects was the way consortial and multi-campus projects can help facilitate important innovations like changes in faculty roles and the integration of technology. In this section are summaries of some of the important lessons learned related to consortial leadership, the value of opportunities for campuses to learn from each other, the power and safety of innovating together, the reach of consortia (that are often connected to other networks), and the new ideas that emerge when getting beyond one's limited individual context. One major take away from the "Faculty Work" initiative is that multi-campus work itself facilitates innovation. I use the term consortial leaders below, but all of the ideas also relate to leaders of multi-campus projects.

1. The consortium is a valuable hub of learning and ongoing communication.

Projects that make progress scaling and sustaining change learn from each other, and this learning was typically orchestrated by consortium. One campus might develop an effective way to communicate new faculty roles that can be shared with others; another campus may discover how information technology staff can better support faculty; on yet another campus, leaders might develop a template for faculty evaluations that garners a great deal of support. Consortia can play a key role in facilitating learning and change, but they need to see this as part of their role and execute processes for this to happen. Ideas originating through the "Faculty Work" initiative include: holding consortium-wide conferences and seminars on a regular basis, gathering teams at well-attended conferences, holding virtual meetings and webinars (of particular benefit after having some in-person meetings), and creating a consortium-wide learning community.

An example of sharing across the consortium that was conducted at SEPICHE demonstrates the value of learning across campuses: "One of our campuses had a good model for doing this by including all part-time faculty in an annual orientation where the metacognitive approach [to teaching] was presented. I brought this model to the other presidents and told them that they could use this model or develop another approach to a common problem. This is the way we intentionally share and learn across the project." Some campuses created ambassadors that went to other campuses to help promote learning. For example, GLCA used the approach of trained "Teagle Pedagogy Fellows" who visited campuses, helping to get the word out about their project on their own

campuses, but who also enhanced learning by presenting at other campuses.

Many projects described the challenge of only being able to have campuses meet and focus on projects at an annual, in-person meeting. This often hindered efforts to create an expectation of ongoing communication with project teams, which diminished the chance for bringing about lasting changes.

2. Combine campus based strategies with consortial efforts.

Projects that made good progress tried to help campuses to figure out strategies for institutional change, combining this effort with consortium events that could supplement and add to the ongoing work on campus. For example, SEPCHE had an annual workshop that faculty attended. The lessons learned through the workshop prompted individual campuses to create their own workshops and online resources to spread metacognitive teaching techniques even further; then campus leaders worked to alter campus policies and practices to support new teaching practices. Leaving campus teams to devise their own change strategies in isolation did not work well. Assuming campuses can effectively implement changes without guidance proved to be a faulty assumption in most cases.

3. Consortia can create a safe space for experimentation.

Many project leaders described the power of consortia as bringing together many campuses to innovate together, making experimentation less risky. For example, a leader within NAC&U noted: "Twenty campuses working together makes this kind of innovation work safely and can propel campuses to put in place what might otherwise be considered difficult innovations without the network of support." This finding suggests the value of a consortium when leaders within it can help to create a safe space for experimentation.

Many project leaders described the power of consortia as bringing together many campuses to innovate together, making experimentation less risky.

4. Optimize consortium focus and alignment.

Projects typically made more progress if they were well aligned with a long-term goal for the consortium, much the same as being aligned with campus goals. Some projects moved into different directions that were not a part of the consortium's historic work and often floundered. Others

moved in a new direction, but consortial leadership was able to establish a connection with past work that helped to frame it as part of the ongoing work of the consortium. Other consortia had projects that were clearly and strongly aligned with years of work, which tended to make the projects more sustainable and likely to continue into the future. As the GLCA project leader noted: “We are known for doing faculty development work, so this was a natural extension of our work.”

5. Use your networks to spread change.

Some consortia are very well networked with other groups. Their efforts to create change can be extended to many groups through these networks. For example, Imagining America is connected to Project Pericles, Campus Compact, Association of American Colleges and Universities, and other groups that share an interest in their work on civic professionalism. Another example is ACS working with National Institute for Technology and Liberal Education so their case studies can be accessed by other liberal arts colleges and thereby help spread the individual changes they supported among faculty to use technology in innovative ways in the classroom. These consortia and their leaders were likely to present at a variety of conferences that were part of their extended network. Project funders should seek out well-networked consortia for increasing their impact. The more consortia can create extended networks and funders can pursue consortia that are well networked, the more likely changes are to scale.

6. Be aware of challenges related to consortia or multi-campus projects with different institutional types.

In the past, consortia were largely made up of similar institutions. However, new configurations are emerging where institutions from different sectors are coming together around similar work like service learning or undergraduate research. As they do, leaders need to be aware that institutional differences can lead to miscommunication and difficulty working together. These new configurations will require spending more time up front to promote common understanding and setting up ground rules for working collectively. Therefore, innovation may not always be facilitated through consortia (or at least smoothly) if they have not worked through the differences that exist among different institutional types.

7. *Consortial leaders can harness multiple constituent groups for innovation and gain the trust of each of these groups.*

Projects that succeeded were able to work with several key leadership groups on campus at once: senior leaders, middle level staff (e.g. directors for centers of teaching and learning, librarians, instructional technologist), and faculty. But, without an awareness of all the groups that needed to be brought in, a tendency existed for consortial leaders to focus too much on one group that is often most engaged with the consortium: senior leaders. The projects that made the most progress moved beyond the individuals with whom they had the strongest ties and communication. Also, some of the consortia have made a concerted effort over the years to develop more programming for faculty so they become a trusted and known resource to them. This approach has helped with getting faculty-led initiatives off the ground. Where these relationships did not exist, achieving buy-in from among the faculty was more difficult.

A story told by a SEPCHE leader helps demonstrate the way trust between the consortium and campus leaders helps to facilitate change: "As a consortial leader, I need to be trusted by many groups and develop relationships. Until those relationships are built, lasting change in risk taking is unlikely to occur. For example, I went to the leadership this last week and told them that they need to work on the part-time faculty. I noted that they had good penetration in the full-time faculty but they needed to move on to part-time. If I hadn't built the trust of relationships with the campus leaders, it is unlikely they would have come on board so easily to the next level of commitment."

8. *Offer centralized consortial support.*

Individual faculty and institutions involved in the projects often commented about ways their consortium could better assist with their own efforts by providing centralized support for assessment and evaluation, drawing in campus leaders to help with infrastructure support, or providing resources or ideas for learning communities. Projects that made progress and were sustained tended to offer these resources. Those that made less progress often had participants who felt they needed more than just administrative management through the consortium. SEPCHE offered some evaluation templates, developed ongoing meetings for campus leaders, and suggested ways the peer-to-peer model might be translated for use on individual campuses. Sometimes, support came in the way of a consultant who provided leadership and guidance to keep the various campus teams moving

forward. NAC&U hired a consultant to shepherd the teams through their work. Campus teams really appreciated that someone was there to coordinate communication, guide conversation, arrange meetings, coordinate follow up and notes, hold people accountable, facilitate communication across different teams that had related but different goals, and even send brainstorming ideas and articles to prompt thinking. Taking this idea even a step further, the GLCA project is now proposing the consortium operate as a consortial-based teaching and learning center, providing a central support resource for campuses that do not have the ability to set up their own center and enhancing those campuses that already have a center by providing additional resources.

9. Demand accountability.

Projects that made more progress also had consortial leaders who demanded accountability through regular reports, checking in, ongoing communication, and other factors that kept project participants focused on goals and better able to communicate about barriers and

brainstorm solutions. Some consortial leaders worried about placing demands on individual participants or campus teams, but the individuals on campuses appreciated the direction setting and prompting. One participant commented: "It was good – having to report our progress, it made us meet more often, push toward goals, and share ideas that just would not happen unless we were pushed." Campuses involved with the AAC&U project noted, "we were pushed to be accountable by answering questions prior to meetings, reporting on progress, and not accepting: 'no I'm too busy to do this work for the initiative'." This led to meetings that were more focused because consortial leaders did not have to update people on different project initiatives as reports were already available, and they could really spend project time brainstorming. AAC&U leaders asked for not only written updates, but also regular phone calls to ensure the campuses were moving forward.

"It was good – having to report our progress, it made us meet more often, push toward goals, and share ideas that just would not happen unless we were pushed."

10. Understand differences: Not all ideas work across consortium campuses/initiatives.

Some projects worked well across different campuses, whereas others did not. As projects dealt more with specific curricular issues or faculty policies, it became more difficult to export an idea (even among similar institutions). Some projects dealt with this challenge by seeking to understand up front what were the common issues they could talk

about, breaking up campuses into working groups, or even providing more individual consultation on other issues. ACM realized that the courses that faculty teams were working to modify were very different (religious studies, chemistry, history), so they had a set of key questions around the critical thinking objectives that they focused on. When their discussions got to be too granular and could not be generalized, faculty got frustrated. So, it was the job of the consortial leaders to keep the discussion at the right level. Similarly, Imagining America recognized they needed to offer a more general rubric of civic professionalism as the different institutional types had to operationalize these ideas uniquely based on their campus mission/context.

11. Address logistics in working across locations.

Operating a consortium means working across different campuses and sometimes across different regions and time zones. Project participants described the challenges of setting up conference call times, depending on non-face-to-face communication for much of the time, and not being as responsible as they should be for visiting wikis and other shared communication sites. Meeting in person is important for promoting progress; consortia involving campuses located closer together can facilitate more frequent interaction. A face-to-face meeting up front is essential, although virtual meetings and communication can work better in later stages. In any case, consortial leaders need to plan for how groups will work across whatever distance exists between the campuses. This point about logistics may seem obvious or mundane, but it is a reality for consortial and multi-campus efforts that needs to be anticipated. Most consortial leaders noted that this is one of the downsides of multi-campus initiatives, but that the upsides are so important that this is merely something for which they need to plan.

12. Create a cadre of change consultants.

Many consortium-trained faculty became consultants for other campuses in the project. In fact, the notion of training a set of consultants within the consortium who could service all campuses after the grant

was over was seen as a way to sustain the change after the grant. Many campus teams commented that: “you cannot be an expert on your own campus, but you can on others.” The great advantage of the consortium is that there are now experts that can be drawn upon from other campuses whom others will listen to in ways they might not for change agents on their own campus. Several campuses had already

Savvy consortial leaders set out from the beginning to make “change consultants” out of project participants

invited a faculty member from another campus to give a talk to help in their efforts to change faculty roles or integrate technology. Savvy consortial leaders set out from the beginning to make “change consultants” out of project participants (perhaps not always telling them, but having that goal in mind) as they worked with faculty over the course of the project. Several consortia leaders talked about the importance of the project creating a “roadshow” that could go around to various campuses and help introduce the change and kickoff the necessary discussions.

13. Identify appropriate roles: Campus teams as experts and consortial leaders as facilitators.

Consortial leaders talked about the importance of framing their work as facilitators. In bringing together faculty and administrators from campuses, consortial leaders were careful to place themselves as guides for a group process and draw on the expertise from the various campuses. They often introduced literature, consultants, and ideas, but offered these resources merely as points of reference. Consortial leaders typically asked questions to try to broaden thinking without challenging or threatening people’s ideas. Because campuses often differed in their culture and policies, consortial leaders were careful to help frame discussions as providing a menu of options rather than specific guidance for campuses. In addition, they also saw their role as helping people think beyond their own individual campus to broader principles and exemplars. It is often hard to get people to think beyond their own specific campuses to more general policy ideas that might be offered; the role of consortia leaders was to facilitate that movement from the specific to the more general in order to develop ideas that could be helpful for campuses across the consortium. As the GLCA project leader noted: “The faculty are the designers of the ideas in our initiative, and I am the facilitator. I really think this is how it works best.”

14. Document progress to keep the momentum for change.

Some of the consortia collected updates to help campuses see their own progress. Also, at the end of many of the projects, they had teams develop either case studies or reports that individual campus participants noted helped them to see their progress and the value of being involved. Examples of products developed includes: case studies by ACS and AAC&U; model courses by ACM; policy documents by NAC&U and COPLAC; and a rubric of civic professionalism by Imagining America. These documentations of progress gave them renewed energy to keep moving forward, and they appreciated the consortium pushing them to

develop these products throughout the process and at the end. As a leader with GLCA noted: “We have learned that a central institutional priority can be met in more cost effective ways than is possible by the separate actions of institutions.”

15. As campus budgets get tight, consider consolidating supports through consortia.

Liberal arts colleges will continue to feel budgetary constraints and many understand that the key infrastructure for teaching and learning and faculty-related initiatives may be better pursued collectively through consortia. For example, GLCA is building on the momentum of its “Pedagogy Fellows” under the “Faculty Work” initiative and is now in the early stages of creating a consortium-wide center for teaching and learning that could reduce costs for faculty development for individual members while still making these resources broadly available.

Consortial leadership is absolutely pivotal to scaling and sustaining changes across multiple institutions. The projects in the “Faculty Work” initiative provide evidence that the consortial model for scaling change is a robust model with promise. The guidance provided in this section helps to best maximize this leadership for implementing important innovations on campuses.

SECTION IV

Campus Leadership to Scale and Sustain Innovation

While a few grant projects were solely located at the consortium level, most projects involved change processes at individual campuses. As a result, the “Faculty Work” initiative has contributed important information about how campus leadership can support innovations at their home institutions. One critical lesson is the need to create broad leadership – at the grassroots among faculty, in the middle among deans and department chairs, and with senior leaders to provide support. While broadening leadership, the challenge of collaboration needs to be thoughtfully addressed, and developing leadership skills among leaders at different levels can help overcome the challenges presented in collaborating, particularly among bolder ideas where more conflict or tensions might emerge. Literature on key innovative ideas can help provide a common ground for collaboration and such readings are highlighted below.

“We know faculty buy-in is important, and we thought we had it but only later did we recognize that we did not. Buy-in is more than people saying they will participate, but also means helping faculty to really understand what the initiative is about and checking in whether that understanding is there.”

1. *Ensure bottom-up interest and motivation.*

Most projects recognized that in changing faculty roles and using technology, they needed to attain faculty buy-in. However, knowing when buy-in has been successfully attained is not always easy. One leader from ICE describes this challenge: “We know faculty buy-in is important, and we thought we had it but only later did we recognize that we did not. Buy-in is more than people saying they will participate, but also means helping faculty to really understand what the initiative is about and checking in whether that understanding is there. Once the project started we discovered they did not know the distinction between an online vs. hybrid classroom. Because the faculty were not fully aware of the direction, once they saw that the course was fully going online, they became fearful that their jobs were going to be taken away from them, and they would be replaced by computers.”

The SEPCHÉ project describes their success in engaging faculty on an ongoing basis by informally talking with faculty, as well as surveying them: “This last spring I surveyed the faculty and got 140 responses that I pulled together to help frame our upcoming gathering and understand challenges, concerns and successes.” Having mechanisms like surveys to check levels of understanding are useful.

Also, campuses found that having faculty invite their colleagues to participate was the most meaningful form of engagement. As the GLCA leaders noted: “We made certain the invitation came from a faculty colleague to another faculty member for the Campus Colloquies. That developed buy in.”

2. Involve senior leadership.

A few projects struggled as senior leaders stepped away once the projects were underway. Examples of commitment among senior leaders often included showing up occasionally at key events, talking about the initiative at convocation or other key campus events, and checking in about project goals. At NAC&U, consortial leadership worked directly with the provost at each of the campuses to inform them about the work of the project and ways that they could support their campus teams from time to time. That kind of direct intervention was noted by campus teams as being helpful in ensuring they would be successful. Nevertheless, this sort of involvement was not always present. One participant commented on this struggle: “I understood the overall initiative was to create institutional cultural change but it wasn’t structured to do so. Leaders need to be in the room with faculty, but that didn’t happen. There was no way to change curricular or faculty roles given the lack of involvement of senior leaders. Without them, sustainability and scale are just unrealistic.”

Yet other campuses experienced problems because the initiative was perceived as being too top-down. There needs to be a balance; senior leaders should be included, but in the right ways. One consortium leader described how being perceived as too top-down can lead to difficulties, requiring leaders to scale back and find the right balance: “Deans and provosts were leading the grant project, but then they felt they should step away because the faculty were becoming more and more resistant. The faculty found the way leaders were presenting the project as too grandiose and too far-reaching, and they needed to parse it down. They described it as too frightening and transformative. We had to take out language about cost savings and ensure that all courses went through shared governance. With significant reframing, we were able to move forward.”

A disconnect can also exist between senior leaders who create priorities for consortia and the faculty on campuses. COPLAC leaders thought distance undergraduate research would be a strong fit and priority, but found garnering faculty participation challenging. Consortium leaders need to reach out to campuses to make sure the priority is shared.

3. *Use mid-level institutional leaders to promote change.*

There are a few people on campus who have insight into the conversations among administrators, the trust of the faculty, and day-to-day knowledge of faculty life. Such individuals, directors for teaching and learning, for example, were very helpful in maintaining forward momentum because they understood the challenges faculty faced and could translate those challenges to institutional leaders in order to gain the necessary resources or support to overcome barriers. Many projects noted that success on varying campuses depended on who was leading the change on the individual campus. Campus efforts led by a mid-level institutional leader were generally more successful than those led by a faculty member. Certainly there were exceptions, but having a person with greater authority and autonomy to act helps. GLCA targeted center directors or helped create such positions; AAC&U included center directors and deans.

4. *Develop faculty leadership, change, and organizational skills.*

Faculty members were much more effective in creating broader and sustainable changes if they developed some of the basic skills related to leadership and change. They often felt more comfortable calling it 'organizing' or 'helping people to collaborate'. A faculty leader in the GLCA project described how valuable the sessions that focused on helping faculty to organize were: "In terms of organizational skills, each of the pedagogy fellows had to organize a number of workshops on our own campuses, work with different constituencies, communicate our findings to larger audiences and, eventually the whole campus, and reach out to encourage others (i.e., going beyond the "usual suspects") to participate. I actually think that these skills are some of the most important we have gained: learning to talk effectively and not disrespectfully to those in the faculty who may not be 'on board' with some emergent trends in pedagogy, for example, is a real skill." As noted earlier, the AAC&U project also aimed to develop faculty leadership and discovered this was key to implementing their innovation and sustaining it over time. An example of a formal faculty leadership program is AAC&U Project Kaleidoscope's Summer Leadership Institute.

Faculty members were much more effective in creating broader and sustainable changes if they developed some of the basic skills related to leadership and change.

5. *Anticipate the challenge of collaboration.*

Campus leaders who recognized that collaboration (usually necessary for creating innovations) is not easy and were careful in developing a response to the challenges often went through the change process more smoothly. As one person commented: “I did anticipate cross-institutional work would be difficult because of the bureaucratic structures that prevent collaboration, but it was still frustrating to work against. One of the big inhibitors to creating innovations in faculty roles is the lack of ability to list courses in multiple departments and how to deal with teaching loads.” Campus leaders asked for more guidance to be able to navigate organizational silos that prevent innovation. We know that departments often work in isolation, that student and academic affairs often do not communicate, and that policies are uneven. For a resource on how to facilitate collaboration, please see Kezar & Lester’s (2009) *Organizing for collaboration in higher education: A guide for campus leaders*. In the [appendix](#) to the report, we list a few other helpful resources related to collaboration as well.

6. *The bolder the idea, the more need for communication.*

Leaders on campuses and at the consortia learned that even as they felt the ideas in the initiative were understood, over time they would discover misunderstandings. They often thought that after the first year or so, communication about the idea could cease, and they could move on to focus on implementation challenges. However, they discovered later that they needed to keep communicating what the change was even several years in. One leader of the ICE communicated this idea: “I learned that I need to communicate more, be more concrete, reiterate messages in different ways, repeat constantly and have a constant reminder of the vision for the project. It can never be enough.”

7. *Use literature to foster understanding of the innovation.*

Projects that were more innovative and on the cutting edge utilized literature on changing faculty roles or technology to inform their efforts. Project leaders talked about reading William Sullivan’s work on *Civic Professionalism*, John Braxton’s *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer’s Four Domains*, and KerryAnn O’Meara and Gene Rice’s work, *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered*. Delving into the literature helped broaden ideas that were brought into the project. For example, NAC&U’s original proposals around faculty evaluation closely mirrored current practices of student evaluations, but by examining publications about learner-centered education, they moved to learner-

centered forms of evaluation of faculty. Please refer to the [appendix](#) for additional resources.

8. Consider appropriate incentives.

Most projects felt that offering incentives in terms of seed money or stipends can be helpful to provide motivation for change, but all agreed that most faculty participated out of interest and that the incentive was a minor component. All project leaders agreed that relying only on incentives to motivate behavior would mean the change would likely not be sustained. Incentives were used to help innovators with money to make revisions, but it was expected that the sustainability of the revised course or approach be based on internal motivation. Many project participants mentioned how faculty did not even utilize or draw on financial incentives that were offered. For example, COPLAC only offered \$800, but found this modest amount more than enough to incentivize the activity; some faculty did not even draw on these funds. NY6 and AAC&U also offered modest stipends for involvement.

A member of ICE made a helpful comment about incentives: “It is important to start with faculty champions who are already internally driven to use technology to change their courses, and then offer some release time and a stipend if they were to meet certain goals. As more faculty get involved, more incentives are likely needed. But we would not use incentives to drive interest because incentives won’t drive faculty towards technology and wouldn’t be sustainable.”

Many other valuable lessons related to campus leadership were also noted in the section on scaling and sustaining innovations above. These should be referenced when considering some of the issues encountered by individual campuses.

Conclusion

The collective lessons learned across these important projects are important for the viability of our diverse higher education system. The ability to evolve and innovate in order to adapt to new circumstances and technologies is important for preserving the integrity of the liberal arts. Liberal arts institutions have evolved in the past and will continue to do so; these campuses' experiences suggest some important ways that this can be done as we continue to change.

Working through consortia and teams of campuses can create powerful learning communities that help to spread and scale change. In order to optimize this learning, projects need to be carefully structured, and leadership needs to be in place to facilitate the process. Because consortial leadership is so critical, this guide provides advice for future projects to help structure these opportunities for learning and innovation.

Campuses should be encouraged to build on existing knowledge about change while also customizing it for their context. Some campuses in these projects found a comfortable middle ground where they survey individuals or lead discussions to find out ways they can customize strategies of integrating technology or altering faculty roles to their campus context. Hopefully, the lessons offered through the grant projects will offer a path for campuses in the future.

Bibliography

Austin, A. (2011). Promoting evidence-based change in undergraduate science education. Washington, D.C.: National Academies National Research Council.

Fairweather, J. (2009). Linking evidence and promising practices in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) undergraduate education. Paper for the National Academies National Research Council Board of Science Education. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/attachments/117803/public/Xc--Linking_Evidence--Fairweather.pdf

Appendix

Resources on Organizational Change

General resources

- Bergquist, W. (2007). *The six cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Curry, B.K. (1992). *Instituting enduring innovations: Achieving continuity of change in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University.
- Eckel, P., Hill, B., Green, M. & Mallon, B. (1999). *Taking charge of change: A primer for colleges and universities*. On Change Occasional Paper 3. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Hearn, J.C. (1996). Transforming U.S. higher education: An organizational perspective. *Innovative Higher Education*, 21(2): 141-54.
- Kezar, A. (2013). *How colleges change*. New York: Routledge.
- Eckel, P. & Kezar, A. (2003). *Taking the reins: Institutional transformation in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: ACE-ORYX Press.
- Eckel, P. & Kezar, A. (2003). Key strategies for making new institutional sense. *Higher Education Policy*, 16(1), 39-53.
- Kezar, A. & Eckel, P. (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.
- Kliwer, J. R. (1999). *The innovative campus: Nurturing the distinctive learning environment*. Phoenix: The Oryx Press.
- Peterson, M.W., Dill, D.D. & Mets, L.A. (1997). *Planning and management for a changing environment: A handbook on redesigning postsecondary institutions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D. & Dolence, M.G. (1997). *Strategic change in colleges and universities: Planning to survive and prosper*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schroeder, C. (2009). *Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Slowey, M. (1995). *Implementing change from within universities and colleges: Ten personal accounts*. London: Kogan Page.

Resources related to faculty roles

Braxton, J., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2002). *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains*. ASHE-ERIC Report, 29(2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/John Wiley Periodicals.

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*. New York: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2013). Four cultures of the new academy: Support for non-tenure track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 84(2), 153-158.

O'Meara, K. & Rice, E. (2005). *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sullivan, W. (2004). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W.G. & Rhoads, R.A. (1993). *Enhancing promotion and tenure: Faculty socialization as a cultural process*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 6. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Resources related to leadership

Bensimon, E. & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kezar, A. & Lester, J. (2011). *Enhancing campus capacity for leadership: An examination of grassroots leaders*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kezar, A. (2007). Tools for a time and place: Phased leadership strategies for advancing campus diversity. *Review of Higher Education, 30*(4), 413-439.

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Rethinking leadership practices in a complex, multicultural and global environment*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Lucas, A. F. (Ed.). (2000). *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Learning for change and innovation

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2005). Higher education as a learning organization: Promising concepts and approaches. *New Directions for Higher Education, 131*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collaboration for change

Kezar, A. & Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing for collaboration in higher education: A guide for campus leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A. (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., Hirsch, D., & Burack, K. (Eds.). (2002). *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment*. *New Directions for Higher Education, 116*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Selected Grantee-Developed Resources

Associated Colleges of the South's [Making the Connection: Six Case Studies of Technology and Collaboration in Liberal Arts Institutions](#) features case studies in blended learning, digital collaboration, and the liberal arts.

American Association of Colleges and Universities' work on integrative liberal learning appears in the Fall 2014/Winter 2015 issue of [Peer Review](#).

New American Colleges and Universities (NACU) has produced two monographs to date on new structures for faculty work and holistic departmental education.

- Hensel, N.H., Hunnicutt, L., & Salomon, D. (Eds.). (2015). [Redefining the Paradigm: Faculty Models to Support Student Learning](#).
- Sullivan, William S. (2016, forthcoming). *The Power of Integrated Learning: Higher Education for Success in Life, Work, and Society*.

Southeastern Pennsylvania Consortium for Higher Education (SEPCHE) has produced [resources for faculty](#) to develop their capacity to draw on research in cognitive science, particularly metacognition, when they engage their students.

Mission

The Teagle Foundation works to support and strengthen liberal arts education, which we see as fundamental to meaningful work, effective citizenship, and a fulfilling life. Our aim is to serve as a catalyst for the improvement of teaching and learning in the arts and sciences while addressing issues of financial sustainability and accountability in higher education.

Strategy

The Teagle Foundation supports innovation in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment with an eye towards combining improvements in quality with considerations of cost. As an organization engaged in knowledge-based philanthropy, the Foundation works collaboratively with grantees to mobilize the intellectual and financial resources necessary to provide students with a challenging and transformative educational experience. We believe that the purposes of a liberal arts education are best achieved when colleges set clear goals for themselves and assess progress toward them in effective, well-designed ways. We bring this commitment to assessment to our own work as well, regularly evaluating the impact of our grantmaking. We disseminate our findings widely, as the knowledge generated by our grantees lies at the heart of our philanthropy.

The Teagle Foundation



570 Lexington Avenue, 38th Floor, New York, NY 10022

teaglefoundation.org