The University of Hong Kong
Faculty of Education

MEDD 6343: Managing Organizational Change in Higher Education
M.Ed. specialist strand in the specialism of Higher Education (Spring Semester 2011)
Dr. Anatoly OLEKSIYENKO, Assistant Professor

Title: Facilitating and Managing Institutional Change in Higher Education: The Organizational Structure at UC Berkeley and Harvard University

Name: CHAN, Roy Yew Hung
University Number: 2009938028
Date: May 12, 2011
E-mail(s): rychan@hku.hk / rychan@sjtu.edu.cn
Homepage: http://www.rychan.com

How can the University of California at Berkeley and Harvard University adapt to the changing competitive world of the 21st century? Is institutional change necessary at all universities? In this new century, facilitating and leading organizational change is seen as one of the most talked about issues facing academic leaders today, whether they are presidents, provosts, deans, students, or faculty members. Changes are often difficult to execute and enforce because stakeholders are constantly growing and changing. Nowadays, institutional change in higher education is considered as a natural part of human or organizational development. Institutional change is designed to improve university performance, enrich administrative staff, and re-orientate university missions and values. The process of institutional change is growing not only in the United States, but also abroad. Community colleges and universities both domestically and internationally are feeling the pressure to change daily as a result to globalization. Hence, many leaders, change agents, and others view universities as a large, complex changing industry facing many profound challenges. Although initiating "real" change is both desirable and elusive, many higher education stakeholders are afraid of changes because any changes done to universities may result in the erosion of academic freedom. Others stakeholders fear that institutional change may weaken the interdependencies between governance, finance, human resources, epistemic norms and organizational culture. As a result, implementing and initiating long-term "real" change is seen as a complex yet slow process as a result of the high bureaucratic nature of universities both from the central administrators to the top senior management teams. Thus, institutions like UC Berkeley and Harvard University must pay heavy attention to the systemic and balanced aspects of implementing "real" change that encourage stakeholders to fully embrace a shared vision of allomorphic organizational change in order to revise its hierarchal structure

from an authoritarian figure to an entrepreneurialism that includes both convergence and divergence as well as autonomy and collegiality for universities that allows them to create an organizational saga at their institutions.

But how can UC Berkeley and Harvard University move to implement "real" change when such complexities reality exists? In order to fully understand and analyze the complexities of change, the conceptualization framework and theories surrounding institutional change must be examined in it's entirely. Universities, like all organizations, are faced with a number of changes which are deeply rooted in their organizational structure and mission (Rebora & Turri, 2010: 2). Many elite universities like UC Berkeley and Harvard University are pressured to change as a result of fierce competition among other elite institutions, trends in student financial aid, problems arising from shared governance, and diminishing state budgets all of which forces many campuses to change dramatically (Barnett, 2011: 132). Consequently, promoting "real" systematic changes to higher education can be seen as a complex yet odious task for many faculty members and senior management teams because these institutions are constantly facing unprecedented changes in university leadership across research, teaching, and service that particularly encompass college life.

Gumport's most recent article in *Governmental policies and organizational change in higher education* suggests that organizational structure like UC Berkeley and Harvard University are facing a variety of problems within their academic structure facing issues of poor or non-existent planning, bureaucratic structures, and weak leadership among senior staff. The author outlines that universities must do better in understanding how post-secondary education relates to other social actors in order for administrators and senior management teams to implement "real" change

overtime. Nowadays, implementing "real" change in universities are initiated and enacted in different settings (Scheytt, 2005). Generally, institutional or organizational change is defined as 'the observation of difference over time in one or more dimensions of an entity' (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). In addition, organizational change can be seen as top-down (driven by management), bottom-up (reflecting emergent or participatory-driven change), or combinations of the two (Marshall, 2010). Thus, leaders and team members who desire to activate change must be prepared to relate to internal and external events in order to enact "real" changes (Rebora & Turri, 2010: 291). Any types of change require leaders to fully understand how organizations act to control and avoid dependencies as well as how internal power distributions are affected by external dependencies (Gumport, 1999: 8).

Frequently, some common factors that have made "real" change difficult for universities are the continued rise of stakeholders, a lack of synergy among similar efforts, an inability to prioritize, and institutional isomorphism (Kezar, 2009). Other factors are caused by a lack of vision, poor implementation strategies, lack of long-term planning, and ineffective communication that impede "real" changes (Kezar, 2009). Though some changes have slightly improved these universities overtime, many higher education institutions still fail to understand how these constant changes affect their organizational structure as a result of the small interaction between higher education institution and the government (Gornitzka, 1999). Thus, many scholars define the relationship between state government and public institutions as an 'intricate and clumsy dance with both partners often trying to play the role of lead dancer' (Lane, 2007: 615). Hence, this makes initiating "real" change to be very slow yet quite complex as a result of the high bureaucratic nature of universities, both from the central administrators to the top senior management teams.

So question arises: is university a factory? If so, what must be done to ensure universities like UC Berkeley and Harvard University are well positioned to meet the challenges of the 21st century? That was the central key question addressed by Professor Burton R. Clark in his book "***Creating Entrepreneurial Universities***." In this new century, many universities like UC Berkeley and Harvard University are facing an overload of demands as a result of fierce competition and market demands (Clark, 1998: 129). In order to control demand and to enhance capability, higher education institutions must seek better strategies to achieve real transformation or what Clark proposes as the 'entrepreneurial response'. He believes that institutions like UC Berkeley and Harvard University should endeavor to become a "focused universities" that is achieved via an entrepreneurial response. In general, an 'entrepreneurial response' is a self-protection concept developed to provide universities better control over their future destinies in order to satisfy all stakeholders (Clark, 1998: 148). Entrepreneurial response can be defined as a 'simple formula for organizations to increase financial resources, reduce governmental dependency, and develop new units outside traditional departments' (Clark, 1998: 146). In other words, an entrepreneurial response can help yield higher education institutions to have a better focus and identity that allows them to solve problems of severe imbalance (p. 147).

In this day in age, UC Berkeley and Harvard University are considered to be two of the most prestigious universities with different organizational structure and formation. Though the two institutions share similar goals and mission, both universities deal with similar conflicts and pressures i as a result of the changing knowledge in academic management, academic consumerism, and academic stratification from other higher education institutions (Gumport, 2000: 67). It is

known today that both UC Berkeley and Harvard University are facing an endowment loss from both fundraising and scholarship as a result of America's worst economic crisis (Fair, 2009). Moreover, the increasing number of has created some tension and worry about universities ability to fulfill its overall mission (Kerr, 1991). Hence, Clark advocates not only the importance of entrepreneurship in university education, but also 'centralized decentralization' of university. UC Berkeley and Harvard University are increasingly changing from once a social institution to an industry of organization. Thus, the two institutions must pay more particular attention to the systemic and balanced aspects of implementing organizational change that allows faculty members and staff to fully embrace a shared vision of institutional change.

By comparing the academic and organizational chart between UC Berkeley and Harvard University, one can clearly identify multiple levels of change agents from the top senior management teams to the bottom end. These agents have created large complexities by stakeholders when promoting "real" change as a result of its bureaucratic nature within the institutional level. In order to overcome its bureaucratic nature, UC Berkeley and Harvard University must promote better strategies that allow change agents to simultaneously and synergistically perform at multiple levels where faculty members and staff can fully embrace a shared vision of "real" change (Moore 2006; Russell 2009; Southwell et al. 2005). Universities must invest more time to recruit more dedicated senior management team that fully embrace and support the university mission and vision (Clark, 2001). Additionally, they must recruit leaders who are both visionaries and implementers (Kezar, 2001). These change agents and leaders must take more obligations to better the multitude of initiatives already happening on their campuses. Although promoting these systems of change is very challenging, all universities must continue to reinvent themselves to change university

leadership from a dictator or authoritarian figure to an entrepreneurial archetype (Clark, 2001).

UC Berkeley and Harvard University as well as other higher education institutions must continue revising their academic structure in order to meet the challenges of globalization and internationalization in higher education. Universities must provide better yet new foundations for rebuilding both internal collegiality and external autonomy (Clark, 2001:23). Weick (1969) once identified universities as loosely coupled systems that are continuously recreated through interaction (p. 3). Because universities often deal with issues of lack of coordination and absence of regulations in their organizational structure, recruiting more change agents and leaders who have strong leadership of the dynamics and culture of a university is needed when implementing long-term "real" changes for universities (Marshall, 2010). Many higher education institutions seek to change overtime in order to control the demand and enhance capability. Change should often be infrequent, predictable, discussed openly, participatory, gradual, and based on consensus (Allen, 2004). Though change is neither always a good thing nor is certainly not a panacea for all the issues facing higher education, understanding how academic leadership and governance works can allow more senior management teams to achieve long-term proactive change at their universities (Kezar, 2001: 9).

A perspective that best exemplifies change is called 'organizational allomophism'. Clark (2001) research on entrepreneurial universities clearly outlines that these institutions are either isomorphism or polymorphism (p. 10). Although isomorphism can lead to identity challenges of universities, many institutions like UC Berkeley and Harvard University are typically promoting allomorphic organizational change within their university structure as a result to the rose of globalization and the

increasing pressure for institutions to compete with other universities. In general, an 'allomophism' addresses how universities in various countries are developing similar patterns of university organization and practice (Yoder, 2006). These institutions like UC Berkeley and Harvard University are required to adapt certain organizational structure or practices in response to new institutional pressures. Because organizations are required to follow institutionalized archetypes, many universities give rise to a national allomorphic institutional structure (Vaira, 2004). Though UC Berkeley and Harvard University may have different academic and organizational structure, the two institutions must continue to promote proactive change by recruiting faculty members and staff that embraces a shared vision of allomorphic organizational change that includes both convergence and divergence at their institutions.

By implementing allomorphic organizational change into university education, stakeholders can play a large role to the systemic and balanced aspects that lead to "real" change within higher education institutions. Stakeholders at UC Berkeley and Harvard University must maintain a positive, transparent and supportive communication with other stakeholders that allows universities to achieve beneficial organizational change. Tolerance between stakeholders is crucial in the management of universities. In general, stakeholder groups includes governing boards, administrators, academic and other staff, students, parents, alumni, community members, and employers (Barnett, 2011: 132). They can be seen as 'any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the firm's objectives' (Freeman, 1984). Because stakeholder consists of many individuals in the higher education sector, stakeholders must be identified and ranked accordingly in order to build effective work relationships that are most important to the institution. The identification off stakeholder has important implications for the very survival of the

university (Jongbloed & Enders, 2008: 308). Thus, in order to initiate allomorphic organizational change and to improve the academic structure at UC Berkeley and Harvard University, these two institutions must identify who are the stakeholders and what are their roles within the university. University should know who exactly are the stakeholder groups and what criteria are they using to judge the institution performance. By identifying how stakeholders should relate to other higher education institutions, collaboration and cooperation can easily be promoted that will giveaway to the importance of Organized Research Units(ORU) at various universities.

Organized Research Units(ORU) are increasingly important to contemporary higher education because these units can further enhance global agendas and increase international collaborations in American universities (Oleskieyenko & Sa, 2010:1). Moreover, organized research units can help set up research agendas as well as support faculty work on campuses like UC Berkeley and Harvard University to better forge international partnerships, conduct research overseas, and incorporate global issues into their projects (Oleksiyenko & Sa, 2010 :4). From these units, universities like UC Berkeley and Harvard University would have the capacity to strengthen collaboration between other institutions as well as foster interactions between different stakeholders such as scientists, international partners and sponsors. Simply by fostering what kind of management structure is best for stakeholders, universities like UC Berkeley and Harvard University can easily embrace a shared vision of allomorphic organizational change needed to revise its hierarchal structure from an authoritarian figure to an entrepreneurialism that includes both convergence and divergence as well as collegiality and autonomy for universities to create an organizational saga at their institutions.

In closing, both UC Berkeley and Harvard University must continue to find niches that encourage more stakeholders to fully embrace the university mission for management change and purposive transformation. Despite the fact how the two institutions are completely different in organizational structure from public to private, UC Berkeley and Harvard University must to re-examine the tensions between centralized and decentralized approaches as well as the role of planning and management in order to improve funding, change governance, and embrace the culture at their universities. There must be similar and dissimilar patterns of organization and practice that allows the two institutions to actively participate to globalization. Moreover, the role of university leadership and the internal power distribution between stakeholders must be emphasized to achieve organizational change. Hence, higher education change agents are seen as important as the stakeholders because the two play an important role in the interdependencies between governance, finance, infrastructures, epistemic norms and organizational culture. Though implementing long-term "real" change is a slow yet quite complex process as a result of the high bureaucratic nature of universities, both from the central administrators to the top senior management teams, institutions like UC Berkeley and Harvard University must pay heavy attention to the systemic and balanced aspects of initiating "real" change that encourage stakeholders to fully embrace a shared vision of allomorphic organizational change in order to revise its hierarchal structure from an authoritarian figure to an entrepreneurialism that includes both convergence and divergence as well as autonomy and collegiality for universities to create an organizational saga at their institutions.

References

Allen, D K. (2003). Organizational climate and strategic change in higher education: Organizational insecurity. *Higher Education*, 46, 61-92.

Altbach, Philip (2007). Empires of Knowledge and Development. *World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Barnett, Kathy (2011). System members at odds: managing divergent perspectives in the higher education change process. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* Vol. 33, No. 2, April 2011, 131–140.

Clark, Burton (2001). The Entrepreneurial University: New Foundations for Collegiality, Autonomy, and Achievement."*Higher Education Management*, 13 (2), 9-24.

Clark, Burton (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation.* Pergamon, pp. 11-38.

Fair, Vanity (2009). "Rich Harvard, Poor Harvard." Found in *VF Magazine*, June 30, 2009.

Freeman, Edward (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach.* Pitman Publishing: New York, NY.

Gornitzka, Ase (1999). Governmental policies and organizational change in higher education. *Higher Education*, 38, 5-31.

Gumport, Patricia (2000). "Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives." *Higher Education*, 39:67-91.

Jongbloed, Ben, Enders, Jurgen, & Salerno, Carlo. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education*, 56, 303-324.

Kerr, Clark (1991). *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980.* State University of New York Press: New York, NY.

Kerr, Clark (1963). *The Use of the Universities*. 5th edition, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Kezar, Adrianna (2009). "Change in Higher Education: Not Enough, or Too Much?." Taken from *Change – The Magazine of Higher Learning*. December 2009.

Kezar, Adrianna (2001). "Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations." ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28(4), 1-147.

Kotter, John (1995). Leading change. Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review, 73*(2), 59–67.

Lane, Jason (2007). The Spider Web of Oversight: An Analysis of External Oversight of Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education,* Volume 78, Number 6, November/December 2007, 615-644.

Marginson, Simon (2007). The public/private divide in higher education: A global revision. *Higher Education*, 53, 307-333.

Marshall, Stephen (2010). Change, technology and higher education: are universities capable of organizational change? *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology,* Vol. 18, No. 3, November 2010, 179–192.

Oleksiyenko, Anatoly (2011). Week 1-10 lectures. The University of Hong Kong Pokfulam, Hong Kong.

Oleksiyenko, Anatoly & Sa, Creso (2010). "Beyond the Local and the Global: Organized Research Units and International Collaborations in the Health Sciences." *Higher Education*, Springer.

Piderit, Sandy (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 783–794.

Reboraa, Gianfranco & Turri, Matteo (2010). Change Management in Universities: More a question of balance than a pathway. *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 16, No. 4, December 2010, pp. 285–302.

Schroeder, Connie (2010). *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Changes*. Stylus Publishing: New York, NY.

Salerno, Carlo (2004). Public money and private providers: Funding channels and national patterns in four countries. *Higher Education*, 48, 101-130.

Scheytt, Tobias & Meister-Scheytt, Claudia (2005). The complexity of change in universities. *Higher Education Quarterly, 59*(1), 76–99.

Tierney, William. (2004). *Competing conceptions of academic governance: negotiating the perfect storm.* The Johns Hopkins University Press: New York, NY.

Vaira, Massimiliano (2004). Globalization and Higher Education Organizational Change: A Framework for Analysis. *Higher Education*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Dec., 2004.

Van de Ven, Andrew & Poole, Marshall (1995). Explaining Development and Change in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 3, Jul., 1995

Weick, Karl. (2001). *Making Sense of the Organization*. Blackwell Business. pp. 32-57.

Weick, Karl. (1969). *The social psychology of organizing.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weisbrod, Burton, Ballou, Jeffrey, & Asch, Evelyn (2008). *Mission and money: Understanding the university*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yoder, Brian (2006). "Globalization of Higher Education in Eight Chinese Universities: Incorporation of and Strategic Responses to World Culture." University of Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh, PA.

Yokoyama, Keiko (2009). "The Patters of Higher Education Change: The cases of the challenging quality assurance mechanisms in England, Japan, and New York State." Taken from the *European Higher Education Society*. Vilniaus University: Vilniaus, Lithuania.