A National Framework of Professional Standards for Change Leadership in Education [1]

By
Francis M. Duffy

In this article readers will find a set of professional standards for developing the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions of change leaders so they can facilitate the challenging and complex process of creating and sustaining systemic transformational change in their school districts. The standards were derived from research on effective change leadership and adjusted to apply to school systems.

The ten professional standards form what I call a *National Framework of Professional Standards for Change Leadership in Education*. Each standard has examples of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the research suggests are important for effective change leadership. It is my hope that this proposed national framework will result in 1) state departments of education creating a professional license for

[1] **A longer version of this article is being reviewed for publication by the NCPEA Yearbook and also by Connexions.**

change leadership in school districts and 2) schools of education in colleges and universities designing new graduate-level programs specializing in preparing educators to become change leaders.

The Need for Systemic Transformational Change in School Districts

Our Society Has Evolved, School Systems Have Not

Our society has undergone and is still undergoing a significant paradigm shift—one that is moving our institutions away from the requirements of the Industrial Age toward the requirements of the Information Age. This societal paradigm shift is large and pervasive, and it is affecting most of our society's organizations as they transform to create more customized, personalized approaches to organization design, serving customers, and providing services. However, the organizations in our society that are lagging significantly behind

society's transformation curve are school systems.

One of the hallmarks of the Information Age is a form of work called knowledge work, and it is the predominate form of work in our American Information Age society. Knowledge work, a term coined by Peter Drucker (1959), is a work process where a worker manipulates information or develops and uses knowledge in the workplace. Knowledge workers are now estimated to outnumber all other workers in North America by at least a four to one margin (Haag, Cummings, McCubbrey, Pinsonneault, & Donovan, 2006, p. 4).

Now that knowledge work predominates in our society, America needs a system of education that has as its purpose to ensure that every individual who enters public education leaves having mastered a variety of important knowledge and skills. To achieve this purpose some thought-leaders in education believe that we need to transform the current profes-

~ 2 ~

sion-wide paradigm for teaching and learning to a new paradigm that is more closely aligned with the requirements of the Information Age.

A paradigm of education that meets the requirements of the Information Age would not hold time constant, which forces achievement to vary; instead, it would hold achievement constant so that students can attain required learning standards. Within this new paradigm, each student would be given as much time as he or she needs to master mandated standards of learning. Further, to enrich their learning, students would benefit from having opportunities to select and study topics of their choosing or engage with others in community projects in which they would have opportunities to meet state mandated standards of learning. The current reforms that predominate in education, however, fail to do this. Instead, these reforms leave the old education paradigm intact and therefore these reforms cannot and will not meet the needs of our Information Age society. We must transform rather than reform our school systems.

I feel strongly that it is a moral imperative for federal and state education officials, school system leaders, school board members, and other key stakeholders for school systems to 1) understand that societal transformation is occurring; 2) recognize that the design and functioning of most current school systems are incompatible with our transforming society; and, 3) recognize the kinds

of key organization design features that would make school systems compatible with our changing society. I also think that each individual state education agency and local school system must decide on what their transformed school districts should be like in response to the requirements of the Information Age; that is, there is not a single one-size-fits-all ideal organization design for school systems to replicate.

Paradigm Change Requires Systemic Transformation

Much has been written about the need for paradigm change in education (e.g., see Ackoff, 2001; Banathy, 1992; Bar-Yam, 2003; Branson, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Duffy, 2003; Duffy, Rogerson & Blick, 2000; Egol, 2003; Elmore, 2004; Emery, 1977; Fullan, 2004; Kaufman, 2000; Pasmore, 1988; Reigeluth, 1994; Schlechty, 2003; Senge, 2000; Toffler, 1984; Tyack & Cuban, 1997). There is also a growing recognition that the Information Age, with its predominance of knowledge work replacing the Industrial Age's predominance of manual labor, requires a shift from a standardized, sorting-focused paradigm of education to a customized, learner-centered paradigm.

There is also substantial research supporting the efficacy of the customized, learner-centered paradigm of education. McCombs and Whisler (1997) summarize much of the research literature about learner-centered learning. Lambert and McCombs (1998) do an

even more thorough review of the extensive research supporting the efficacy of learner-centered education (Reigeluth, Watson, Lee Watson, Dutta, Zengguan, & Powell, 2008). Finally, Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (1999) also provide substantial research and theoretical support for learner-centered learning.

The Failure of Piecemeal Change to Transform Schooling

American school districts were designed to respond to the needs of the Industrial Age, but our society has evolved into the Information Age which has different requirements for education. This mismatch is what Banathy (1992) calls "co-evolutionary imbalance" and it places our country in peril because children are not being educated to succeed in our Information Age society. To correct this co-evolutionary imbalance whole school systems must be transformed to provide children with a customized, personalized education.

As children receive a personalized, learner-centered education fewer of them will be left behind. Actually, many of us who are advocates for learner-centered education believe that there will be a dramatic end to children being left behind in their pursuit of an education. Think about it. If children are receiving an education that is customized and personalized to meet their individual needs, interests, and abilities, and if they are given the time they need to master required knowledge and skills, how can they

~ 3 ~

possibly be left behind? By contrast, the current approach to teaching and learning–the dominant paradigm–is designed to leave children behind and will continue to do so if left in place.

School systems, however, are not making this required transformation journey. In fact, after many years of applying the traditional approach to improving education (one school, one program at a time), very little has changed in how America's children are educated in school systems. The old paradigm persists and is sustained by the one-school-at-a-time approach to improvement. This approach, although important and still needed as one element of a transformational change strategy, is inherently insufficient as a stand-alone change strategy because it disregards the nature of school districts as intact, organic systems governed by classic principles of system functioning. Further, the one-school-at-a-time approach often fails because changes to one part of a system makes that part incompatible with the rest of the system, which then works to change it back to its pre-change state. Therefore, the piecemeal approach to change is insufficient because it fails to transform an entire school district and it unintentionally maintains the system's status quo.

Given the insufficiency of the one-school-at-a-time approach to improvement, change efforts are now being scaled-up to the level of the whole district–but the whole-district improvement methodologies currently being used are not creating and sustaining the paradigm shift in teaching and learning that is required for the Information Age

because these approaches to whole-district change do not apply principles of systemic transformational change. Instead, all these approaches to change are doing is tweaking school systems in ways that maintain the status quo–the old paradigm.

One of the key reasons why current efforts to change whole-districts are failing to create transformational paradigm change is because there is definitional confusion about the meaning of "system" and "systemic change." Many approaches to change that are characterized as systemic are not; e.g., high school reform is not systemic change; developing a new curriculum is not systemic change; and introducing new instructional technology is not systemic change. However, some of these approaches can be used as elements of a whole-system change methodology.

Further, not all systemic change efforts aim to create transformational, paradigm-shifting change. For example, some systemic change efforts aim to make systemic (system-wide) improvements to a system's current operations (its controlling mental model). Making system-wide improvements to current operations is called continuous improvement and this does not create transformational change. Transformational change, on the other hand, seeks organizational reinvention rather than change by replicating best practices, discontinuity rather than incrementalism, and true innovation rather than periodic reordering of the system (Lazlo & Laugel, 2000, p. 184).

Transformational change also requires simultaneous improvements along three change paths: Path 1– transform the system's core and supporting work processes; Path 2– transform the system's internal social infrastructure; and, Path 3–transform the system's relationship with its external environment. Only one contemporary approach to transforming school systems (Duffy & Riegeluth, 2008) follows these three paths and failure to create change along these paths is one explanation of why so many contemporary change efforts failed or are failing to create systemic transformational change.

Despite the paucity of real-life examples of system-wide transformational change, there are many examples of school-wide transformational change that were very successful until the larger system that they were part of (i.e., the school system) changed them back to be compatible with the district's dominant, controlling Industrial Age mental model for teaching and learning. The power of the unchanged parts of a system to attack and destroy a changing part is not to be ignored or minimized. This phenomenon is real, it is common, and it is yet one more reason why whole districts need to be transformed, not pieces of them.

Change Leadership Competencies

This section summarizes selected research on key competencies for leading change in organizations. The section concludes with an analysis of the reported research that identifies patterns within the data.

~ 4 ~

Duffy and Reigeluth (2008) identified ten change leadership competencies for the *Future-Minds: Transforming American School Systems* initiative that they co-direct. They believe that leaders who want to facilitate systemic transformational change must:

1. Have strong interpersonal and group facilitation skills
2. Have a positive mindset about empowering and enabling others to participate effectively in a transformation journey
3. Have experience in preK-12 education
4. Have an understanding of the dynamics of complex systemic change and about how to create and sustain this kind of change
5. Have a personal presence and track record that commands respect
6. Have a likeable personality
7. Be organized
8. Be flexible and open-minded about how change occurs with ability to tolerate the messiness of the change process
9. Have a positive, can-do attitude
10. Be creative thinkers

Duffy and Reigeluth assume that very few current leaders in America's school systems have all the requisite technical knowledge and skills they need to guide a school district's transformation journey (characteristic #4, above). But they do believe that there are many current education leaders who have all of the other idiosyncratic characteristics and dispositions listed above. However,

while knowledge and skills can be taught, but the other dispositions probably cannot be taught because they are functions of a person's personality, personal style, and who they are as people. However, I believe that these non-trainable dispositions can be enhanced and refined through professional development opportunities.

Conner (1998) identified six distinct leadership styles related to change: Anti-Change, Rational, Panacea, Bolt-On, Integrated, and Continuous. Each leadership style represents a unique set of perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors regarding how organizational disruption should be addressed" (Conner, 1998, p. 148). Stopper (1999, pp. 1-6) characterizes each of Conner's leadership styles in this way:

The anti-change leader. A leader embracing this style seeks to avoid as much change as possible. "The Anti-Change leader operates from an underlying assumption that organizational life should be a mostly calm experience; therefore, significant modifications of any kind are undesirable. Their message is, '"Stay the course. Keep adjustments small. No need to change in any major way.'" (p. 3)

The rational leader. This leader focuses on how to constrain and control change with logic and linear, sequential, recipe-like execution. "Rational leaders tend to see life as a binary experience in which things are either good or bad, right or wrong, on track or off. They view organizational change as something to be implemented in as unemotional a fashion as

possible. Good planning and carefully worded announcements are the keys to the rational leader's change strategy." (p.3)

The panacea leader. The Panacea Leader believes that the way to respond to pressure for change is to communicate and motivate. "These senior officers have reconciled themselves to the fact that unforeseen, disconcerting transitions have become an inevitable part of their organization's life. It is their contention that negative emotions about change impede its progress and should, therefore, be either prevented or converted into positive feelings. These leaders place a high premium on a 'happy' workforce." One sign of this style is a high degree of emphasis on building enthusiasm for a change with little or no effort to address the deeper human issues." (p.4)

The bolt-on leader. This leader strives to regain control of a changing situation by attaching (bolting on) change management techniques to ad hoc projects that are created in response to pressure for change. "The Bolt-on leader's approach to change recognizes the importance of addressing the human dimension of change 'whenever we have the time and resources to do so.' While these leaders see change management as an important component of the change initiative, they maintain the belief that only a cursory review of people issues may be necessary." (p.4)

The integrated leader. The Integrated Leader searches for ways to use the structure and

discipline of what Harting and Rouse (2007) call "human due diligence" (the leadership practice of understanding the culture of an organization and the roles, capabilities, and attitudes of its people) as individual change projects are created and implemented. "The cornerstone of this style of change leadership is the respect and emphasis placed on the psycho-social-cultural issues associated with accomplishing important initiatives. These leaders move beyond operating as if the intellectual power of their ideas alone can compensate for the lack of careful diagnosis and skillful navigation. Instead, they blend a balanced concern for both the human and technical aspects of orchestrating change into their decision-making process as well as their execution tactics." (p.4)

The continuous leader. The Continuous Leader works to create an agile and quick-responding organization that can quickly anticipate threats and seize opportunities as change initiatives are designed and implemented. Continuous Leaders believe that to drive success during turbulent times they "…must deal with ongoing disruption… For Continuous Leaders, what is paramount is not whether their organization can execute any current, singular change efforts, but whether it can sustain an endless avalanche of dramatic, overlapping alterations in its key success factors." (p.5)

Conner also believes that the above leadership styles are related to two different types of organizational change: First-order change and second-order change. First-order change is

incremental, piecemeal change that is common in the field of education. According to Conner, second-order change (which is what transformational change is) is "…nonlinear in nature and reflects movement that is fundamentally different from anything seen before within the existing framework" (pp. 148-149).

Conner asserts that the first four leadership styles that he identified are appropriate for managing first-order change. However, he argues that the last two leadership styles are more appropriate for leading second-order change because that kind of change process "…requires shifting context; it represents a substantial variation in substance and form that discontinues whatever stability existed before." (p. 149) In other words, when an organization is engaging in discontinuous, transformational change the Integrated and Continuous leadership styles are more appropriate.

Stopper (1999) also identified what he believes are essential traits for change leaders. Those traits are:

Technical competence. Change leaders must have the technical knowledge and skills required to lead change.

Personal resilience. Stopper (1999, pp. 1-6) offers specific behavioral indicators for this characteristic:

- Positive - Resilient people effectively identify opportunities in turbulent environments and have the personal confidence

to believe they can succeed.

- Focused - Resilient people have a clear vision of what they want to achieve and use this as a lodestar to guide them when they become disoriented.

- Flexible - Resilient people draw effectively on a wide range of internal and external resources to develop creative, pliable strategies for responding to change.

- Organized - Resilient people use structured approaches to managing ambiguity; they plan and coordinate effectively in implementing their change strategies.

- Proactive - Resilient people act in the face of uncertainty, taking calibrated risks rather than seeking comfort.

Cultural alignment. Change leaders must "fit" the culture, mission and vision of their organizations.

Leadership approach to change. Change leaders use effective change leadership styles. Five leadership styles identified by Conner (1998) and characterized by Stopper (1999) were presented above. Both Conner and Stopper believe that only the last two styles (i.e., the Integrated Leader and the Continuous Leader) are suited to the challenges of discontinuous, second-order change; which is

~ 6 ~

what systemic transformational change in school districts is).

The National Training Center (2008) identified a set of essential change leadership competencies. In addition to defining each competency they also offered advice on how leaders can develop each one. The competencies they identified and examples of behavioral indicators for each one are presented below.

Vision
- Taking a long-term view and acting as a catalyst for organizational change.
- Collaborating with others to build a shared vision.
- Influencing others to translate vision into action.

External Awareness
- Identifying and keeping up-to-date on key policies and economic, political, and social trends that affect the organization.
- Determining how to best to position the organization to achieve a competitive advantage.
- Anticipating potential threats or opportunities.

Creativity and Innovation
- Developing new insights into situations
- Applying innovative solutions to make organizational improvements.
- Creating a work environment that encourages creative thinking and innovation.
- Designing and implementing cutting-edge

programs and processes.

Strategic Thinking
- Formulating effective strategies consistent with the organization's new mission, vision, and strategic direction.
- Examining policy issues that might constrain the strategic planning process.
- Determining short-term objectives and setting priorities.

Continual Learning
- Grasping the essence of new information.
- Mastering new knowledge and skills.
- Recognizing personal strengths and weaknesses.
- Pursuing self-development opportunities.
- Seeking feedback from others about their performance.

Resilience
- Dealing effectively with pressure.
- Maintaining focus and intensity.
- Remaining optimistic and persistent, even under adversity.
- Recovering quickly from setbacks.
- Balancing personal life and work.
-

Flexibility
- Remaining open to change and new information.
- Adapting behavior and work methods in response to new information, changing condi-

tions, or unexpected obstacles.
- Adjusting rapidly to new situations.

Service Motivation
- Creating and sustaining an organizational culture that encourages others to provide the quality of service essential to high performance.
- Enabling others to acquire the tools and support they need to perform well.
- Influencing others toward a spirit of service and meaningful contributions to mission accomplishment.

Higgs and Rowland (2000) identified a set of change leadership competencies that I think are probably the most comprehensive and clearly articulated change leadership competencies available. They identified these competencies by benchmarking them against "world class" best practices in the field of change management. The competencies are:

1. *Change Initiation*–ability to create the case for change and secure credible sponsorship.

2. *Change Impact*–ability to scope the breadth, depth, sustainability and returns of a change strategy.

3. *Change Facilitation*–ability to help others, through effective facilitation, to gain insight into the human dynamics of change and to develop the confidence to achieve the change goals.

~ 7 ~

4. *Change Leadership*–ability to influence and enthuse others, through personal advocacy, vision and drive, and to access resources to build a solid platform for change.

5. *Change Learning*–ability to scan, reflect and identify learning and ensure insights are used to develop individual, group and organizational capabilities.

6. *Change Execution*– ability to formulate and guide the implementation of a credible change plan with appropriate goals, resources, metrics and review mechanisms.

7. *Change Presence*– demonstrates high personal commitment to achievement of change goals through integrity and courage, while maintaining objectivity and individual resilience ('a non-anxious presence in a sea of anxiety').

8. *Change Technology*– knowledge, generation and skilful application of change theories, tools and processes.

Kotter (1995) identified eight causes of failed transformational change. The opposites of those eight causes (described below) represent change leadership competencies. The derived competencies and sample behavioral indicators of those competencies are presented below.

1. Change leaders *increase urgency* by

- Assessing threats, opportunities, and trends in the external environment.
- Collecting and interpreting data from outside the organization that change is necessary.

2. Change leaders *build a guiding team* by
- Assembling a group with enough power to lead the change effort
- Attracting key change leaders by showing enthusiasm and commitment
- Encouraging the group to work together as a team

3. Change leaders *get the vision right* by
- Creating a vision to help direct the change effort
- Developing strategies for achieving that vision

4. Change leaders *communicate for buy-in* by
- Using every means available to communicate the new vision and strategies
- Keeping communication simple and heartfelt
- Teaching new behaviors with the guiding coalition as role models
- Designing and executing a strategic communication plan.

5. Change leaders *empower for action* by
- Eliminating of obstacles to the change
- Revising or discarding managerial systems,

policies, procedures, or structures that seriously undermine the vision
- Encouraging and rewarding risk-taking and non-traditional ideas, activities, and actions

6. Change leaders *create short term wins* by
- Planning for visible performance improvements in the near-term
- Creating those improvements quickly
- Recognizing and rewarding people who help create successful short-term wins

7. Change leaders *do not let up* by
- Planning for visible successful change in all areas of the organization
- Implementing action plans
- Recognizing and rewarding people who contribute to the success of the implementation
- Evaluating the change process and outcomes periodically and making necessary course corrections.

8. Change leaders *make change stick* by
- Describing and reinforcing connections between the desirable changes that were made and the organization's on-going and future success.
- Creating and sustaining strategic alignment among all elements of the organization.

Emotional Intelligence and Change Leadership

Emotional Intelligence is a popular topic in the leadership literature. It is most often associated with Daniel Goleman (1995). However, there is a history of others who actually developed the concept before Goleman (please visit http://eqi.org/mayer.htm to see an annotated history of the concept).

Higgs (2002) commented on the fact that there is a lot of confusion, misunderstanding and differences of opinion about the concept of Emotional Intelligence. It seems that there is also not an agreed upon definition of the term. Dulewicz, Higgs and Slaski (2001), for example, categorized several definitions of the term by grouping them as follows: definitions based on an interpretation of Emotional Intelligence as an ability (Salovey & Mayer 1990); definitions that define Emotional Intelligence as a set of competencies (e.g. Goleman, 1996); and definitions that define Emotional Intelligence as a set of personal capabilities (e.g., Higgs & Dulewicz, 1999; Bar-On, 2000). According to Higgs, the personal capabilities approach is more easily operationalized while retaining psychometric rigor. Using the personal abilities characterization of Emotional Intelligence, Higgs and Dulewicz (1999, p. 20) offered the following definition:

Achieving one's goals through the ability to manage one's own feelings and emotions, to be sensitive to, and influence other key people, and to balance one's motives and drives with

conscientious and ethical behaviour.

In an extensive review of the literature on Emotional Intelligence, Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) identified the core elements of Emotional Intelligence that were subsequently validated in empirical studies. These elements are:

1. *Self-awareness*. The awareness of your own feelings and the ability to recognize and manage those feelings.
2. *Emotional resilience*. The ability to perform well and consistently in a range of situations and when under pressure.
3. *Motivation*. The drive and energy that you have to achieve results, balance short and long-term goals, and pursue your goals in the face of challenge and rejection.
4. *Interpersonal sensitivity*. The ability to be aware of the needs and feelings of others and to use this awareness effectively in interacting with them and arriving at decisions impacting on them.
5. *Influence*. The ability to persuade others to change their viewpoint on a problem, issue, or decision.
6. *Intuitiveness*. The ability to use insight and interaction to arrive at and implement decisions when faced with ambiguous or incomplete information.
7. *Conscientiousness and integrity*. The ability to display

commitment to a course of action in the face of challenge, to act consistently and in line with understood ethical requirements.

The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Change Leadership Competencies

There is a relationship between Emotional Intelligence and change leadership competencies. Higgs (2002) compared the characteristics of Emotional Intelligence identified by Higgs and Dulewicz (1999) to the Higgs and Rowland (2000) change leadership competencies (identified above). Based on his review, Higgs concluded that it is feasible to hypothesize a number of relationships between the change leadership competencies and the Emotional Intelligence traits. In reviewing the proposed relationships between Emotional Intelligence and change leadership competencies, Higgs asserts that there is an overarching hypothesis that there will be a clear and positive relationship between an individual's Emotional Intelligence and his or her overall change leadership competencies.

Identifying Patterns in the Research on Change Leadership Competencies

Below, I offer a comparative analysis of the various change leadership competencies and traits identified above, including Emotional Intelligence. To conduct the analysis, I used Higgs and Rowland's (2000) change competencies as a benchmark. I chose them as a benchmark because they have a substantial research base supporting

them and I think they are the most comprehensive change leadership competencies available.

Next, I created a matrix by listing all of Higgs and Rowland's change competencies in the left column of the matrix. Then, the authors of the five sets of change leadership traits and competencies described in this article were inserted across the top of the matrix (i.e., Duffy and Reigeluth; Conner; the National Training Center; Kotter; and, Higgs and Dulewicz). Then, I sorted all of the change leadership traits and competencies described above into the cells created by the intersection of Higgs and Rowland's change leadership competencies and the authors of change leadership traits and competencies. The results are displayed in Table 1 (shown in Appendix).

Duffy and Reigeluth's change leader traits were the only ones to align with all eight of Higgs and Rowland's change leadership competencies. All the traits and competencies identified by the remaining authors fit into the matrix, but not all of those competencies and traits aligned with all of Higgs and Rowland's competencies.

The Need for Effective Change Leadership Standards and Preparation Programs

It is clear that there is a stunning need for effective change leadership in America's school systems. If nothing else validates this need the failure of piecemeal school reform to transform teaching and learning, the cynical characterization of proposed changes as "flavors of the month," and the as-

tonishing inability to sustain change in school systems all stand as stark examples of why effective change leadership is needed. Yet, this need is not being effectively responded to by the field of education leadership.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) share a set of high-quality standards for preparing future education leaders at the district and building levels. Their standards have a sub-element that expects future education leaders to possess knowledge of change models and processes. These elements are appropriately embedded within broader standards for preparing school-based and district-level education leaders. However, as long as change leadership competencies are sub-elements of other professional standards for leaders, the field of education will not meet the need for effective change leadership in school systems.

Given the need for effective change leadership and given the significant lack of response to that need, I propose that state departments of education should adopt a set of research-based change leadership standards and then create a professional license (or certificate) for change leadership based on those standards. Then, universities and colleges with graduate-level education leadership programs should create new graduate-level programs tailored to satisfy the change leadership standards–programs that specialize in preparing change leaders about the how, what, and why of creating and

sustaining systemic transformational change in school districts (e.g., the Education Specialist Degree Program in Change Leadership in Education at Gallaudet University in Washington, D.C.).

Standards for Preparing Change Leaders in Education

The standards for preparing change leaders in education presented below are intended to define the practice of effective change leadership in school systems. The standards are derived from an analysis of the research and literature cited above, but adapted for the challenge of transforming school systems.

The formal development of change leaders' knowledge, dispositions, and skills, I believe, must occur within a rigorous team-based graduate-level preparation program that provides participants with learning experiences focusing on topics such as systems theory, systems thinking, systems dynamics, transformational change, change facilitation, interpersonal and group behavior in organizations, and organization theory and design, among others. Although completing a change leadership preparation program will help professionals master the art and science of systemic transformational change, effective change leadership requires a career-long devotion to learning about systemic transformational change. The standards presented below also can be used to guide change leaders' on-going professional development.

If teams of educators in change leadership preparation pro-

~ 10 ~

grams are to satisfy these standards it will be vitally important for these teams to become part of an organized nationwide "community of change leaders" that is endorsed and facilitated by state departments of education, local school systems, university faculty, and change partners from other sectors of American society. Being connected to an organized community of change leaders will also help each individual member of the change leadership teams to sustain his and her personal knowledge, skills, and dispositions for providing effective change leadership.

When implemented, the standards presented below and the related indicators should ensure high quality change leadership in education by:

- Providing a clear vision of high-quality change leadership;

- Providing a framework that focuses on the requirements of transforming school systems to align with the requirements of the Information Age and beyond; and,

- Allocating resources to support change leadership priorities at the federal, state, and local levels of education.

Ten Standards for Preparing Change Leaders in Education

Ten standards for preparing change leaders in education are displayed in Table 2 (shown in Appendix). Each standard has sample sub-elements identified as knowledge, dispositions, and skills (which will need

to be refined before adoption). The standards were developed by reviewing the research and literature on change competencies that was summarized above and then adjusted to fit school systems.

Validation of the Standards is Required

It is strongly recommended that the proposed standards and rubrics be validated. One validation design that could be used is a "competency study." The ultimate outcome of this kind of study is a validated model of change leadership competencies.

Competencies are clusters of knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for job success. Job competency models are used to guide the professional development of employees. A competency model, according to Workitect (2008), is "…a description of those competencies possessed by the top performers in a specific job or job family. In effect, a competency model is a 'blueprint for outstanding performance.' Models usually contain 8-16 competencies with definitions, often grouped into 'clusters' along with behavioral descriptors."

Boulter, Dalziel, and Hill (1998) described a six stage competency development model. The six stages are:

1. Performance criteria - Defining the criteria for superior performance in the targeted role.
2. Criterion sample - Choosing a sample of people performing the targeted role for data collection.

3. Data collection - Collecting sample data about behaviors that lead to success in the targeted role.
4. Data analysis - Developing hypotheses about the competencies of outstanding performers and how these competencies work together to produce desired results.
5. Validation - Validating the results of data collection and analysis.
6. Application - Applying the competency models in human resource activities.

Bernthal, Colteryahn, Davis, Naughton, Rothwell, and Wellins (2004, pp. 89-94) designed and conducted a competency study for the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). Their study is an example of how to design and implement a competency study that results in valid competencies for guiding professional behavior. Their competency development methodology has four phases and specific tasks within each phase. The four phases and specific tasks are:

Phase 1: Needs Assessment and Data Collection

- Conduct a review of the literature
- Interview experts possessing the competencies you wish to identify
- Summarize and report Phase 1 findings

Phase 2: Development of Competency Model

- Integrate the data collected from Phase 1
- Develop a first draft of a competency model

~ 11 ~

- Invite groups of experts to review and offer input to the first draft of the competency model
- Use input from the groups of experts to develop a second draft of a competency model
- Invite groups of experts to review and offer input to the second draft of the competency model
- Use input from the groups of experts to develop a third draft of a competency model

Phase 3: Validate the Competency Model

- Design a survey asking questions about the third draft of a competency model and distribute it to experts and practitioners asking them to validate the competencies identified in the survey.

Phase 4: Final Refinement of the Competency Model

- Review the results of the survey conducted in Phase 3 and uses the data to refine the competency model
- Disseminate final competency model to the field

The ten standards for change leadership presented in Table 2, I believe, satisfy the first stage of the Boulter, Dalziel, and Hill six stage competency development model and the first phase of the ASTD competency modeling process. The implication of this conclusion is that further research is needed to validate the ten standards of performance.

Conclusion

I believe there is a striking need for effective change leadership in America's school systems. This need is not being responded to by state departments of education or graduate-level education leadership programs. Further, I believe that an effective and proactive response to this need is for state departments of education to adopt research-based standards to develop a professional license for change leaders in education and for schools and colleges of education to design graduate-level programs specializing in preparing change leaders about the why, what, and how of creating and sustaining systemic transformational change in school districts.

If America's school systems are to be transformed to meet the demands of the Information Age, then they will need effective change leadership. Responding to this need will require courage, passion, and vision from state department of education leaders and university faculty if they are to do what's required to adopt a framework of standards for preparing change leaders.

Some readers of this article will say, "Impossible, can't be done!" However, I think that once the proposed standards are validated they can be applied to create a cadre of knowledgeable and highly skilled change leaders in education. I also believe that university faculty members who also have personal courage, passion, and vision can design and operate graduate-level programs of study with a focus on change

leadership by using the standards proposed in this article.

References

Ackoff, R. L. (2001). A brief guide to interactive planning and idealized design. Retrieved on March 19, 2006 at http://www.sociate.com/texts/ackoffGuidetoIdealizedRedesign.pdf.

Banathy, B. H. (1992). *A systems view of education: Concepts and principles for effective practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On & J. D.A. Parker (Eds.) (pp. 363-388). *Handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment and application at home, school and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-Yam, Y. (2003). *Dynamics of complex systems*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bernthal, P. R., Colteryahn, K., Davis, J., Naughton, Rothwell, W. J. & Wellins, R. (2004). *Mapping the future: New workplace learning and performance competencies*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Boulter, N., Dalziel, M., & Hill, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Achieving the perfect fit*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L. & Cocking, R. R. (1999) (Eds.). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

~ 12 ~

Branson, R. (1987). Why schools can't improve: The upper limit hypothesis. *Journal of Instructional Development, 10* (4), 15-26.

Conner, D. R. (1998). *Leading at the edge of chaos*. New York: John Wiley.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990, December). Achieving our goals: Superficial or structural reforms? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 286-295.

Drucker, P. F. (1959). *Landmarks of tomorrow: A report on the new "post-modern" world*. New York: Harper.

Duffy, F. M. (2003). *Courage, passion, and vision: A guide to leading systemic school improvement*. Lanham, Md.:Scarecrow Press.

Duffy, F.M. & Reigeluth, C.M. (2008 July-August). The school system transformation protocol. *Educational Technology Magazine: The Magazine for Managers of Change in Education, 41-49*.

Duffy, F. M., Rogerson, L. G., & Blick, C. (2000). *Redesigning America's schools: A systems approach*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Dulewicz, V., Higgs, M.J., & Slaski, M. (2001). Emotional intelligence: construct and concurrent validity. Henley Working Paper. Retrieved on June 11, 2008 at http://www.henleymc.ac.uk/elibrary/hwpr02.nsf/papers/D9A0AF5F912C8F9E00256B170066E384

Egol, M. (2003). *The education revolution: Spectacular learning at lower cost* (1st ed.). Tenafly, NJ: Wisdom Dynamics.

Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out:*

Policy, practice, and performance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Emery, F. E. (1977). *Two basic organization designs in futures we are in*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martius Nijhoff.

Fullan, M. (2004). *Leadership & sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence.* London: Bloomsbury.

Goleman, D. P. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ for character, health and life-long achievement*. New York: Bantam Books.

Haag, S., Cummings, M., McCubbrey, D., Pinsonneault, A., & Donovan, R. (2006). *Management information systems for the information age* (3rd Canadian Ed.). Canada: McGraw Hill Ryerson

Higgs, M. (2002, January-June). Do leaders need emotional intelligence?: A study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership of change. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 5*(6), 195-212

Higgs, M. J. & Dulewicz, S. V. D. (1999). *Making Sense of Emotional Intelligence*. Windsor, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)-Nelson.

Higgs, M.J. & Dulewicz, S.V.D. 1999, *Making Sense of Emotional Intelligence,* NFERNelson, Windsor.

Higgs, M. J. & Rowland, D. (2007). Leading Change: What are the critical leader behaviours? *Henley Work-*

ing Paper Series, HWP 0711.

Higgs, M. J. & Rowland, D. (2001). Developing Change Leaders: Assessing the impact of a development programme. *Change Management Journal, 2* (1), 47-66.

Higgs,M. J. & Rowland, D. (2000). Building change leadership capability: The quest for change competence, *Journal of Change* Management, 1(2), 116-131.

Kaufman, R. (2000). *Mega planning: Practical tools for organizational success*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publications.

Kotter, J. P. (1995, March-April). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 59-67.

Lazlo, C. & Laugel, J-F. (2000). *Large-scale organizational change: An executive's guide*. Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lambert, N. M., & McCombs, B. L. (Eds.) (1998). *How Students Learn: Reforming Schools through Learner-Centered Instruction*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

McCombs, B. L. & Whisler, J. S. (1997). Learner-centered classroom and schools: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 81*, 1-14.

National Training Center (2008). *Leadership competencies and developmental opportunities*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Retrieved on June 4, 2008 at http://www.ntc.blm.gov/lead

~ 13 ~

ership/
27_frame_define.html.
Pasmore, W. A. (1988). *Designing effective organizations: The socio-technical systems perspective*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
Reigeluth, C. (1994). *Introduction: The imperative for systemic change*. In C. Reigeluth & R. Garfinkle (Eds.) (pp. 3-11). *Systemic change in education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
Reigeluth, C. M., Watson, W. R., Lee Watson, S., Dutta, P., Zengguan, C., & Powell, N. D. P. (2008, October). Roles for technology in the Information Age paradigm of education: Learning management systems. *The F. M. Duffy Reports, 13* (4), 1-15.
Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*, 185-211.
Schlechty, P. (2003). *Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Senge, P., et al. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook*. New York: Doubleday.
Stopper, W. G. (1999, June 1). Hiring to build change capacity: the human resource role. *Human Resource Planning*, pp. 1-6. Retrieved on June 12, 2008, at http://www.allbusiness.com/human-resources/294952-1.html.
Toffler, A. (1984). *The third wave*. London: Bantam.
Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1997). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Workitect (2008). Competencies. Retrieved on June 20, 2008 at http://www.workitect.com/competency_systems.html.

Thank you for your interest in these Reports.

Francis M. Duffy

The F.M. **D**uffy
GROUP

In the past, these reports often contained articles written by readers. If you would like to write an article for these reports on a topic related to whole-system change in school districts, please send a copy of it to me as an E-mail attachment to duffy@thefmduffygroup.com.

The Rowman & Littlefield Education *Leading Systemic School Improvement Series* is a collection of books about "why" systemic change in school districts is needed, "what" some of the desirable outcomes of systemic change should be, and "how" to create and sustain systemic change. You can visit the website for the series by going to http://www.rowmaneducation.com/bookseries/LSI.

The *FutureMinds: Transforming American School Systems* initiative seeks to create a shift in the teaching-learning paradigm in school systems. You may visit the FutureMinds website by going to www.futureminds.us

~ 14 ~

Higgs & Rowland's (2000) Change Leadership Competencies	Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Change Leadership Competencies and Traits				
	Duffy & Reigeluth (2008)	Stopper (1999)	National Training Center (2008)	Kotter (1995)	Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) Emotional Intelligence
Change Initiation—ability to create the case for change and secure credible sponsorship.	Have an understanding of the dynamics of complex systemic change		External Awareness Service Motivation	Change leaders increase urgency Change leaders communicate for buy-in	Influence Conscientiousness and integrity
Change Impact—ability to scope the breadth, depth, sustainability and returns of a change strategy.	Have an understanding of the dynamics of complex systemic change				
Change Facilitation — ability to help others, through effective facilitation, to gain insight into the human dynamics of change and to develop the confidence to achieve the change goals.	Have strong interpersonal and group facilitation skills Have a positive mindset about empowering and enabling others to participate effectively in transformation	Leadership Approach to Change (integrated leader and continuous leader styles)		Change leaders build a guiding team	Interpersonal sensitivity

Higgs & Rowland's (2000) Change Leadership Competencies	Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Change Leadership Competencies and Traits				
	Duffy & Reigeluth (2008)	Stopper (1999)	National Training Center (2008)	Kotter (1995)	Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) Emotional Intelligence
Change Leadership — ability to influence and enthuse others, through personal advocacy, vision and drive, and to access resources to build a solid platform for change.	Have a personal presence and track record that commands respect Have a likeable personality Have experience in K-12 education	Cultural Alignment	Vision	Change leaders get the vision right Change leaders empower for action	
Change Learning—ability to scan, reflect and identify learning and ensure insights are used to develop individual, group and organizational capabilities.	Have an understanding of the dynamics of complex systemic change		Continual Learning Flexibility		Self-awareness Intuitiveness
Change Execution — ability to formulate and guide the implementation of a credible change plan with appropriate goals, resources, metrics and review mechanisms.	Are organized Have an understanding of the dynamics of complex systemic change	Technical Competence	Creativity and Innovation Strategic Thinking	Change leaders create short term wins Change leaders do not let up	

~ 16 ~

Higgs & Rowland's (2000) Change Leadership Competencies	Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Change Leadership Competencies and Traits				
	Duffy & Reigeluth (2008)	Stopper (1999)	National Training Center (2008)	Kotter (1995)	Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) Emotional Intelligence
Change Presence— demonstrates high personal commitment to achievement of change goals through integrity and courage, while maintaining objectivity and individual resilience ('a non-anxious presence in a sea of anxiety').	Have a positive, can-do attitude Have a personal presence and track record that commands respect Have a likeable personality	Personal Resilience	Resilience	Change leaders make change stick	Emotional resilience Motivation
Change Technology — knowledge, generation and skilful application of change theories, tools and processes.	Have an understanding of the dynamics of complex systemic change				

~ 17 ~

Table 2: A National Framework of Professional Standards for Change Leadership in Education
Performance Standards and Sample Rubrics for Change Leadership in Education

Standards of Performance	Sample Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions for Each Standard
Standard 1.0—Thinking Systemically: A change leader perceives school districts as intact, organic systems and explains how districts function as systems.	**Knowledge**…explains in detail the key features of school district as a system. **Skill**…analyzes in detail the functional properties of school districts as systems. **Disposition**…fully accepts that school districts intact, organic systems.
Standard 2.0—Focusing on Systemic Transformational Change: A change leader understands that transforming an entire school district requires improvements in student, faculty and staff, and whole-system learning.	**Knowledge**…describes the importance of whole-system improvement in rich detail. **Skill**… Collects and interprets data about the need for change. **Disposition**…accepts the importance of whole-district learning and can explain that importance in rich detail.
Standard 3.0—Initiating Change: A change leader creates the case for systemic transformation within school districts and in communities by providing data to support the both the <u>need</u> for change and the <u>opportunities</u> that can be seized by engaging in change.	**Knowledge**…explains in rich detail a strong rationale for creating and sustaining whole-district change. **Skill**…explains in rich detail tools and processes for gaining and sustaining internal and external political support for change. **Disposition**…enthusiastically endorses the concept of whole-system change.
Standard 4.0—Assessing the Impact of Change: A change leader assesses the breadth, depth, sustainability and anticipated positive outcomes of a systemic transformational change strategy.	**Knowledge**…can explain in rich detail the breadth, depth, sustainability and expected returns from engaging in whole-system change. **Skill**…able to conduct an in-depth analysis of the breadth, depth, sustainability and expected returns from engaging in whole-system change. **Disposition**…accepts the fact that whole-system change is complex and requires careful planning and acts on this acceptance.

~ 18 ~

Table 2: A National Framework of Professional Standards for Change Leadership in Education	
Performance Standards and Sample Rubrics for Change Leadership in Education	
Standards of Performance	**Sample Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions for Each Standard**
Standard 5.0—Facilitating Change: A change leader helps colleagues and community members gain insight into the human dynamics of system transformation and develops their confidence to achieve transformation goals.	**Knowledge**…possesses advanced level of knowledge of facilitation skills. **Skill**…possesses advance level of skill for facilitating interpersonal and group behavior. **Disposition**…is a strong advocate for helping people understand the nature of change prior to launching a change effort.
Standard 6.0: Developing Political Support for Change: A change leader develops political support for systemic transformational through effective change leadership.	**Knowledge**…explains in rich detail strategies and tactics for building political support. **Skill**…demonstrates sophisticated skills for developing political support. **Disposition**…is a staunch advocate for acting in a political way to gain political support for change.
Standard 7.0—Expanding Mindsets: A change leader engages in and shares with colleagues personal learning to deepen and broaden personal mindsets about why systemic transformation of school districts is necessary and about the best strategy for creating and sustaining transformational change.	**Knowledge**…provides a detailed and cogent rationale for engaging in personal learning. **Skill**…develops a detailed and feasible plan to engage in personal learning. **Disposition**…is a strong advocate for engaging in personal learning.
Standard 8.0—Planning Systemic Transformational Change: A change leader formulates and leads the implementation of a plan to create and sustain systemic transformation in school districts.	**Knowledge**…understands the complexity of planning for change and describes the key elements of change plans. **Skill**…possesses advanced skills for planning for system-wide change. **Disposition**…is a powerful advocate for engaging in good planning for change.

~ 19 ~

Table 2: A National Framework of Professional Standards for Change Leadership in Education	
Performance Standards and Sample Rubrics for Change Leadership in Education	
Standards of Performance	**Sample Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions for Each Standard**
Standard 9.0: Demonstrating Disposition for Change Leadership: A change leader demonstrates high personal emotional intelligence while leading transformational change.	**Knowledge**…provides a powerful rationale for leading with a high level of emotional intelligence. **Skill**…demonstrates advanced skills for emotional intelligence. **Disposition**…is a strong advocate for the importance of leading change with a high level of emotional intelligence and teaches others how to develop their emotional intelligence.
Standard 10.0—Mastering the art and science of systemic transformational change: A change leader is familiar with and skillful in using a variety of change theories, tools, and methodologies derived from interdisciplinary perspectives on change leadership and systemic transformation.	**Knowledge**…can explain in great detail at least one methodology for creating and sustaining whole-system change; including tools and processes that are part of that methodology. **Skill**…can apply at least one methodology for creating and sustaining whole-system change; including tools and processes that are part of that methodology. **Disposition**…is a vocal advocate for the importance of change leaders knowing, understanding, and applying change theories and tools.