

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

To Improve the Academy

Professional and Organizational Development
Network in Higher Education

1993

Faculty Developers as Change Facilitators: The Concerns-Based Adoption Model

Lynn Evans

Sheila Chauvin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Evans, Lynn and Chauvin, Sheila, "Faculty Developers as Change Facilitators: The Concerns-Based Adoption Model" (1993). *To Improve the Academy*. 278.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/278>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in To Improve the Academy by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Faculty Developers as Change Facilitators: The Concerns-Based Adoption Model

Lynn Evans

Louisiana State University

Sheila Chauvin

Southeastern Louisiana University

Faculty members involved in efforts to improve their teaching, as well as the faculty developers who work with them, progress through natural, predictable stages of concern which, if understood, can form the basis of appropriate interventions. In this article the authors examine a framework that faculty developers and leaders of change efforts can use in their roles as change facilitators. This framework for understanding and planning educational change is part of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) developed by Hall, Hord, and others at the University of Texas at Austin Research and Development Center.

The 1980s and early 1990s have been marked by frequent and recurring calls to reform key elements of postsecondary education. For example, Boyer (1990) and others (e.g., Massey & Wilger, 1992) illustrate the increasing public criticism of higher education. In particular, there has been a strong push from lawmakers, accreditation agencies, administrators, and faculty to place greater emphasis on the

teaching and learning functions that reflect the primary purpose of postsecondary institutions.

As faculty developers, an important aspect of our role is the facilitation of change, yet the process of effecting long-lasting change is difficult and not yet fully understood. What can we learn from the literature on planned change? What conceptual frameworks and models for facilitating change processes offer promise for faculty developers?

Planned Change: Understood or Not?

Past accounts have often characterized faculty as being inherently resistant to change and rigid in their conceptions of their organizational roles (Giacquinta, 1973; Hopkins, 1990; Massey and Wilger, 1992). Yet, organizational leaders and change facilitators (e.g., faculty developers and leaders of change efforts) have been described as having substantial influences on effecting positive change outcomes (Atkins & Svinicki, 1992; Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan & Lee, 1982; Hall & Hord, 1987; Weimer, 1992). Understanding the factors affecting planned change in academic communities might enhance success in achieving long-term results and incorporation of change efforts into everyday practice and organizational life, rather than simply resulting in short-lived, superficial attempts to change.

Recently, the literature on planned organizational change seems to be shifting its focus from the effects or outcomes of change to the *process* of change. (Chauvin, 1992; Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Hall & Hord, 1987; Joyce, 1990). These studies offer insights and conceptual frameworks (e.g., receptivity to change, change facilitator style, organizational culture and role orientations, and stages of concern) that appear useful for facilitating change processes and incorporating innovation into everyday professional practice. As individuals progress through various stages of planned change they alter their ways of *thinking and doing*. As Fullan (1985) points out, change at the individual level involves anxiety and uncertainty, developing new skills, practice, feedback and cognitive transformations with respect to “why this new way works better” (p. 396). At each stage of incorporating innovation into prac-

tice, perceptions, feelings, and concerns will similarly evolve and be resolved. Understanding individual perspectives or orientations toward organizational roles appears important for effecting long-lasting change in professional practice (e.g. teaching and learning) (Corbett, et al., 1987).

These findings are hardly surprising. While others often assume change to be an event, those of us who work with faculty to implement changes in organizations, in classrooms, and in individual faculty members' teaching know that change is a process. Indeed, in our roles as leaders in implementing change, we are change facilitators. The concept of change facilitation as one aspect of leadership style is emerging in the literature as an area of study in its own right, with a number of studies focusing on the role of school leaders as change facilitators (Evans & Teddlie, 1993; Chauvin, 1992; Hall & Hord, 1987).

The idea of change as a process implies that there are gradual steps in the change process, and that faculty members involved in efforts to improve their teaching, as well as the faculty developers who work with them, progress through natural, predictable stages of concern. This framework for understanding and planning educational change is part of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) developed by Hall and Hord at the University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (1987).

Origins of Concerns Theory

The concept of concerns theory emerged during the late 1960s in earlier work by Frances Fuller (1969). Fuller's work with student teachers revealed interesting patterns in beginning teachers' needs and interests. They were interested in and concerned about such things as class control, adequacy of their own content knowledge, and evaluations by their principals and their students. Experienced teachers, on the other hand, expressed concerns which were in striking contrast to their beginning colleagues. More frequently, their concerns centered on progress of students and student learning. Fuller and her colleagues concluded that there were clusters of concerns common to teachers at different stages of their careers, with beginning teachers operating at

a level of concern typified by self concerns, followed by concerns about management, or task concerns, and finally, concerns about outcomes such as student learning, at the impact level.

Concerns about Change

More recent research related to the change process has revealed that this phenomenon is not peculiar to beginning and more experienced teachers, but that it is a phenomenon common to all of us as we encounter change, new experiences, and new demands. Researchers working at the University of Texas at Austin Research and Development Center for Teacher Education have extended the pioneering work of Fuller in other educational settings and identified and defined seven developmental stages in relation to implementation of innovations (Hall, Wallace & Dossett, 1973; Hall, George & Rutherford, 1979; Hall & Hord, 1987). Based on their extensive field work, an expanded version of Fuller's original concerns model was developed, resulting in seven Stages of Concern, summarized in Figure 1. By stages of concern, Hall and his colleagues do not refer to a lock step, one-way progression, but rather to a developmental trend where the relative intensity of concerns is the key. Knowing the stage(s) of concern of an individual in relation to a particular innovation is important to facilitating that change.

At the beginning of a particular change process, an individual's concerns are likely to be related to self. For typical "nonusers," self concerns are relatively high in the earlier stages—Stage 0 Awareness, Stage 1 Informational, and Stage 2 Personal. That is, concerns are focused on gaining information about the innovation (Stage 1) and finding out how it will affect them personally (Stage 2). As they begin to actually use the innovation, task concerns about management and efficiency become foremost. Those in Stage 3 still have concerns in other areas, but learning how to manage the innovation and incorporate it into their routines in an efficient manner is primary. As they become skilled in managing the innovation, typically concerns in Stages 0, 1, 2, and 3 (self and task) decrease, and the potential exists for individuals' concerns to focus on the impact of the innovation in later stages—Stage 4 Consequence, Stage 5 Collaboration, and Stage

Figure 1

Stages of Concern: Typical Expressions of Concern About the Innovation

STAGES OF CONCERN	EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN
6 REFOCUSING	I have some ideas about something that would work even better.
5 COLLABORATION	I am concerned about relating what I am doing with what other instructors are doing.
4 CONSEQUENCE	How is my use affecting students?
3 MANAGEMENT	I seem to be spending all my time in getting material ready.
2 PERSONAL	How will using it affect me?
1 INFORMATIONAL	I would like to know more about it.
0 AWARENESS	I am not concerned about it (the innovation).

CBAM Project
Research and Development for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Used with permission.

6 Refocusing (Hall, George and Rutherford, 1979). Concerns about earlier stages do not disappear, but the relative intensity of these concerns is diminished. It is important to note that this is not an automatic progression but one that can be facilitated by addressing concerns at each stage as they arise.

Assessing Stages of Concern

The role of the change facilitator, then, is to become skilled at assessing concerns of faculty in relation to particular innovations, in order to be able to assist in appropriate ways. Hall and Hord (1987) discuss three methods developed to assess stages of concern about an innovation: (1) one-legged conferences, (2) open-ended statements, and (3) the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (Hall, George, and Rutherford, 1979).

One-legged conferences

Almost any interaction can provide an informal opportunity to gather information about a faculty member's stage of concern related to an innovation—over coffee, during breaks at a workshop, or walking down the hall, stepping with one leg at a time (hence the name, one-legged conferences!). To “get at” an individual's feelings, reactions, attitudes, or concerns, the change facilitator asks such questions as “What do you think of _____?” (substituting the name of the innovation), or “How does it affect you? How about others you teach with?” or “When you think about _____, what concerns do you have?” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 65).

Open-ended statements

Change facilitators can prepare open-ended statements to gauge the stage of concern of individuals related to the innovation. Using this technique, individuals complete in writing an open-ended statement such as “When you think about _____, what are you concerned about?” (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 66). Responses are then analyzed for content indicating stages of concern.

Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ)

This 35-item questionnaire (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1979) offers a more systematic approach to assessing stages of concern. Respondents need to substitute the name of the particular innovation in place of “the innovation” and indicate their choice on a seven-point Likert scale for each item. Example items from the SoCQ include the following: “I don’t even know what the innovation is” (Stage 0); “I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt this innovation” (Stage 1); “I am concerned about conflict between my interests and my responsibilities” (Stage 2); “I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day” (Stage 3); “I am concerned about how the innovation affects students” (Stage 4); “I would like to help other faculty in their use of the innovation” (Stage 5); and “I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance, or replace the innovation” (Stage 6).

Strong psychometric qualities of the SoCQ, including test-retest correlation results ranging from .65 to .86 and estimates of internal consistency (alpha coefficients) ranging from .64 to .83, allow the use of the instrument where systematic data collection over time is important. Use of the SoCQ results in a profile for each individual indicating the “peaks” and “valleys” of an individual’s concerns.

Interventions Targeting Stages of Concern

Once the relative intensity of an individual’s concerns has been assessed, how can this information be used? Interventions, or actions taken to facilitate the change process, need to be targeted to the concerns of the individual. If concerns are highest in Stage 1 Information, for example, the change facilitator needs to provide a variety of sources of information about the innovation—printed materials to read, an orientation session or workshop, a videotape, a colleague who uses “the innovation” successfully and is willing to share. If an individual’s concerns are at Stage 5 Collaboration, opportunities need to be provided to share with others—for example, in informal discussion groups, as seminar panelists or by presenting at conferences, or by mentoring another faculty member.

It makes little sense to spend time and energy concentrating on areas of low concern to the individual at a particular time. Also, concerns may “peak” at more than one stage. For example, an individual may be relatively high in both Stage 5 Collaboration and Stage 3 Management. An appropriate intervention in this case might be for the change facilitator to provide opportunities for faculty to collaborate in small groups about management aspects of the innovation. If the “innovation” in this case is a new problem-based learning curriculum, for example, an appropriate intervention might be a series of brown bag lunch discussions on managing materials related to case studies—developing, locating, organizing, and distributing case materials efficiently.

Interventions in Introducing Innovations

Those responsible for facilitating a change can anticipate that when an innovation is introduced, even if it is self-selected, Stage 1 Information and Stage 2 Personal concerns will be relatively high. Non-users, or those who are involved with a change but not yet actually using it, will be in Stage 0 Awareness, Stage 1 Information, or Stage 2 Personal. It would be important in this introductory phase to offer information and support, letting faculty know that it’s “okay” to have personal concerns—we all do. Examples of interventions appropriate in introducing innovations are listed in Figure 2, Stage 0 Awareness, Stage 1 Information and Stage 2 Personal.

While Stage 2 personal concerns are normal, change facilitators need to work to reduce these concerns and help faculty move on; otherwise, predictably, faculty with prolonged high personal concerns decide the innovation is too risky and “opt out.” If we were to examine more closely the fate of failed innovations, it is likely that not much attention was paid to facilitating the progression of individuals from personal or self concerns to task and then impact concerns.

Interventions in Implementing Innovations

Once a faculty member begins to use an innovation, task—Stage 3 Management—concerns may appear. Interventions at this stage help with organization and the efficient management of the task. Individu-

Figure 2

Interventions

STAGES OF CONCERN		EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN
I M P A C T	6 REFOCUSING	How can we make it better? What needs to be done now?
	5 COLLABORATION	Share ideas with others Have others come to visit Present new ideas, projects at a conference
	4 CONSEQUENCE	Share sessions--Show what works for you Survey teachers, students Pre and post data sharing Examining test scores Identify ways to measure impact (Is it working?) Let her/him share success stories with you
T A S K	3 MANAGEMENT	Help with planning Help develop timelines Help organize committees Show how you organize to accomplish the same task Share time management techniques
	2 PERSONAL	Build trust relationship Offer moral support, confidence-building Accept feelings and try to direct toward positive action Visit a site where innovation is being used to see it in action Clarify information (avoids fears about "grapevine" information)
S E L F	1 INFORMATIONAL	Provide printed materials to read Orientation session/workshop Videotape of program in action Pair "those who know" with "those who don't" Locate resources and provide number to contact
	0 AWARENESS	Offer new ideas

CBAM Project
 Research and Development for Teacher Education
 The University of Texas at Austin

Used with permission.

als may need help with planning, time management, organizing resources, etc., and interventions need to be targeted appropriately. Figure 2 lists examples of interventions at this stage.

Interventions in Arousing Impact Concerns

It would be nice if faculty, once on this continuum, automatically continued “up the stages,” progressing from personal and management concerns to concerns related to the impact of the innovation. Alas, such is not the case, according to Hall and Hord (1987). In arousing and maintaining concerns at the impact level—Stage 4 Consequence, Stage 5 Collaboration, Stage 6 Refocusing—the change facilitator still plays a key role. For example, the change facilitator might suggest a variety of ways to collect classroom data and analyze it to measure impact (Is it working?) and actively encourage collaboration and provide the opportunities for sharing. Other possible activities to support faculty in these stages are listed in Figure 2. Such analysis and collaboration are familiar to faculty in the research arena but are less likely to be established ways of operating in relation to their teaching roles. Again, the change facilitator is key in making this translation.

Applications

The CBAM model has been used in a number of settings; the three examples described here illustrate some of the model’s range of applications in college faculty development.

Small-Scale Application

In a session at the 1992 POD conference, participants identified an innovation which they as college faculty developers or faculty leaders were involved in implementing, to determine their own stage(s) of concern related to facilitating the innovation. Such an awareness of one’s own concerns about an innovation is a first step in using the model to work with others. In small groups, participants developed examples of typical faculty comments indicating various stages of concerns and brainstormed appropriate interventions.

Applications at Louisiana State University

At Louisiana State University, the CBAM model has been used in a variety of ways. Most obvious is the application of CBAM in individual consultations as faculty members select and experiment with innovative teaching strategies. The model has proven to be easy to use and beneficial in appropriately matching interventions with client needs.

CBAM also has been used at LSU in working with faculty groups. In the School of Veterinary Medicine, the curriculum development committee is developing a problem-based learning component of a new curriculum. A faculty developer trained in CBAM was invited to work as part of the committee and quickly realized that while much time and thought had been invested in the *development* of the curriculum revisions, little attention had been paid to planning the *implementation* of the problem-based curriculum—an innovation that required significant changes in the roles of faculty and students. As of now, the curriculum development committee has participated in an awareness-level workshop of CBAM. Plans are being made for an implementation phase which involves the training of curriculum development committee members as change facilitators and activities to prepare and support faculty in the process of implementation.

In the College of Agriculture, plans have been developed to train senior faculty as mentors to junior faculty using teaching portfolios. Part of the proposed training will be in developing a teaching portfolio; and since this is an innovation to most faculty, mentor training will also include training in the CBAM model.

Applications at Southeastern Louisiana University

At Southeastern Louisiana University, recent campus-wide efforts have been made to directly and purposefully link assessment, planning, and program development/enhancement activities within programs and departments and across campus. In this context, opportunities for professional reflection and collaboration among faculty have proliferated. One-legged conferences and open-ended statements have been used to assess concerns in consultations with individuals and faculty groups. In these instances, the CBAM model has provided

guidance in matching interventions to the needs of various clients (e.g., administrators, faculty, and students). In particular, the model has provided individuals with a useful conceptual framework for understanding their perceptions and feelings, as well as those of colleagues with whom they are working, and professional reflection and collaborative efforts have been enhanced.

Conclusion

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) (Hall & Hord, 1987) has provided faculty developers with a useful conceptualization for supporting and facilitating individuals and/or groups in implementing innovations within classrooms and universities. Within the larger perspective of planned change in educational organizations, CBAM's utility for effecting long lasting change seems well-supported by a number of studies (Corbett, et al., 1987; Elmore, 1987; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Kaslow & Giacquinta, 1974; Stern & Keislar, 1977). Corbett, et al. (1987) point out that teachers' responses to change efforts were influenced by their beliefs and perceptions and the informal norms pertaining to: (1) "the way we do things around here", and (2) "who we are around here" (p. 58). Any level of planned change has the potential of affecting deeply rooted norms embedded in a school/college/university organizational culture. Consistent with these findings, applications of the CBAM have been beneficial in understanding such contextual features and how they interact with specific innovations. Strategies matched to specific stages of concern have been successfully used to facilitate adoption, implementation, and incorporation of innovations.

These findings suggest substantial implications not only for faculty developers, but for administrators, faculty and students who are involved in innovation/planned change. Using a concerns-based approach facilitates the forward progress through stages of the process and enhances the likelihood of long-lasting, normative change.

References

- Atkins, S. S., & Svinicki, M. (1992). Faculty development in out-of-the-way places. *To Improve the Academy, 11*, 25-34..

- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 34-64.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the proessariate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Chauvin, S. W. (1992). *An exploration of principal change facilitator style, bureaucratic and professional orientations, and teacher receptivity to change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.
- Corbett, H. D., Firestone, W. A., & Rossman, G. B. (1987). Resistance to planned change and the sacred in school cultures. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 23(4), 36-59.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Instructional policy into practice: "The power of the bottom over the top." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3), 233-241.
- Elmore, R. F. (1987). Reform and the culture of authority in schools. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 23, 60-78.
- Evans, R. L. & Teddlie, C. (1993). *Facilitating change: Is there one best style?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA
- Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(3), 391-421.
- Fuller, F.F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226.
- Giacquinta, J. B. (1973). The process of organizational change in schools. *Review of Research in Education*, 1, 178-208.
- Hall, G. E., George, A., and Rutherford, W. L. (1979). *Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire*. (Report No. 3032). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 147 342)
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Hall, G. E., Wallace R. C., and Dossett, W. A. (1973). *A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions* (Report No. 3006). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 126)
- Hopkins, D. (1990). Integrating staff development and school improvement: A study of teacher personality and school climate. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 41-67). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). *Innovation up close: How school improvement works*. New York: Plenum.
- Joyce, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Changing school culture through staff development*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Kaslow, C., & Giacquinta, J. B. (1974, April). *Faculty receptivity to organizational change*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 090847).
- Massey, W. F., & Wilger, A. K. (1992). Productivity in postsecondary education: A new approach. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14*(4), 361-376.
- Stern, C., & Keislar, E. R. (1977). Teacher attitudes and attitude change: A research review. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 10*(2), 63-76.
- Weimer, M. (1992). Improving higher education: Issues and perspectives on teaching and learning. *To Improve the Academy, 11*. 13-24.