Organizational Change in a Malaysian Public University

Za'faran Hassan
Ahmad Suhaimi Ismail
Roziah Mohd. Janor
Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Malaysia

Email: keruing@tm.net.my
Email: asuhaimi071@salam.uitm.edu.my
Email: roziahmj@salam.uitm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Any organization that ignores the concept of change does so at its own peril. Modern organizations have to come to terms with a number of issues that will create a need for change. What is important, however, is the recognition that change occurs continuously, has numerous causes, and needs to be addressed all the time. Overall, planned change is not impossible, but it is often difficult. But what is it that makes an organization want to change? These may include factors related to the external environment, internal changes or perhaps where the organization itself tries to be ahead of change itself by being proactive. Many attempts have been made to characterize and classify organizational change approaches, and many dimensions for comparison have been suggested in relation to this. This paper describes the experience of planned organizational change in a local university, and its experiential support for a theoretical change model.

Introduction

Why is change management so important today and what is it that makes an organization wants to change? The answer cannot be easily explained. Any organization that ignores the concept of change does so at its own peril. One might suggest that the peril will come sooner rather than later. The issues that face modern organizations in terms of internal and external criteria are such that organizations have to deal with what Schwartz (1986) terms 'visible evolution'. If we take an external perspective for a moment, the average modern organizations has to come to terms with a number of issues which will create a need for internal change. There may be numerous issues that indicate the imperative for change in organizations, but what is important, however, is recognition that change occurs continuously, has numerous causes and needs to be addressed all the time. There are, for instance, a number of specific, even obvious, factors that will necessitate movement from the status quo. The obvious of these relate to changes in the external environment. Others may be precipitated by internal changes that can be regarded as internal triggers or where the organization itself tries to be ahead of change itself by being proactive.

Literature review

Many attempts have been made to characterize and classify organizational change approaches and many dimensions for comparison have been suggested in relation to this (Werr,1995). In the tradition of planned change, management is ascribed a central role; it is management that sets the goals of the change effort and who implements it. In the adaptation tradition, on the other hand, the environment is in focus as the initiator and the driving force of change. Different approaches to planned change are distinguished by what answers they provide to questions such as what is it one wants to change; how does one intends to change it? And what emphasis they give them. Some focus on what ought to be changed (diagnosis), while others look more at how changes should be implemented (how the change process should be run.

An important question in the literature concerns the degree to which organizations can adapt to changing circumstances. Are organizations *inert or adaptive*? Or does the answer to the question depend on the types of circumstance that initiate the change and the amount of change

that is required of the organizations? A related question focuses on the *role of management* in the change. Does management play a key role? Is change without guidance and involvement of management impossible? Or is the role of management considerably less important, for instance, because organizations cannot change substantially anyway and every effort of management is marginal in relation to the rigid features that characterize an organization?

In the prescriptive literature on strategy and organizational change, it is usually assumed that organizations are very adaptive and that management and leadership play a central role in this adaptive process (Hatten and Hatten, 1988). The opposite perspective can be found in the *population ecology model* that emphasizes the role of environments as executioners for the chances of survival of populations of organizations, and of the specific organizational forms within populations. Organizations are viewed as fairly inert, meaning that organizations respond relatively slowly to the occurrence of threats and opportunities in their environment (Hannan and Freeman, 1989). It is not stated that management does not matter. It is stated, however, that there are important constraints to the possibilities of managers to change organizations and that processes at the level of population of organizations are usually much more powerful.

According to the literature on the *strategic choice perspective*, emphasis is put on the ability of managers to perceive external developments and to initiate strategic change (Child, 1972; Schendal and Hofer, 1979). In the strategic choice literature, managers act as filters between organization and its environment. The external developments that the managers perceive, the alternative actions they come up with, and the choices they eventually make, determine, within the constraints posed by the environment, the direction of adaptation of the organization. This approach is contrary to the contingency perspective, in which adaptation of organization to external changes had a more or less mechanistic character (Miles and Snow, 1978).

It is interesting to note that radical adaptations are exceptional in literature that stresses the conservative, incremental character of strategic decision-making. One of the reasons for this is the existence of *'routines'* within the organizations (Nelson and Winter, 1982). Where routine have developed, they benefit the efficiency of the organization, but hinder adaptation. Another reason is the *rule of politics* within organizations. Radical adaptations disturb political balances within organization and therefore cause resistance. Furthermore, as a result of former strategy, usually large investments have been made that restrict the present

possibilities to change. 'Structure follows strategy', but existing structures define the range within which opportunities for change have to be found. Because of this and other reasons, decision-making within organizations often has an incremental character and adaptations take place, step by step as blockades can be lifted or circumvented. So strategic changes are often gradual in nature. Only if organizations do not succeed with gradual changes and end up in a crisis, they will undertake attempts to change radically (Miller, 1990). Such a change however, is very risky and carries a large possibility of failure.

Obviously, the literature clearly indicates that very different opinions are held about the feasibility of a strategic change of organizations. The role of management is similarly contested (D'Aveni, 1990). The complexity of change management involves the entire sphere of human frailties and potential. The ability of the individual to change also has a critical influence on the success of any change management process. The selection of these individuals who are to be the internal change consultants is critical; they must be role models for the behavior that is most desired for the organization. "The myths of Employee Satisfaction" (Atchison, 1999) explains one technique for the selection of the best members for the guiding coalition. A great number of change management efforts and strategies, involved different change intervention techniques. Peter Senge(1990)'s breakthrough work The Fifth Discipline (1990) supports the use of OD or 'Organizational Development' techniques in his powerful concepts about "Systematic Thinking" and the 'Learning Organization'. The practice of OD is more of a process than a step-by-step procedure. That is it is a consideration in general of how work is done, what the people who carry out the work believe and feel about their efficiency and effectiveness.

Problem Statement

Universiti Teknologi MARA began as a mere training center for RIDA (The Rural Industrial Development Board) in 1956. Since then, it has grown and developed into a reputable educational institute and in 1967 was renamed 'Maktab MARA', offering certificate courses and tertiary education at the diploma level for various field of studies. Once again in 1968, 'Maktab MARA' was renamed 'Institut Teknologi MARA' and in 1972, officially opened its main campus in Shah Alam. At the onset of the memorable day of the 26 August 1999, it was transformed into a

university and this transformation marks the beginning of a major shift in thinking and simultaneously poses a number of challenges to the organization and its members. With a new name, that is 'University Technology MARA (UiTM)' and followed by a new logo symbolizing new 'Corporate Colors', it was obvious that physical changes were definitely taking place. But does these physical changes reflect a change in embracing a culture of 'universitiness' too?

The Oretical Framework

This paper presents the 'Planned Organizational Change' strategy that UiTM's management embarked on, as an intentional attempt by the organization to influence the status quo of the organization. Because of the huge size and dispersed nature of the university, with branch campuses at almost each and every state in the country, the top management of UiTM decided to call in an external consultant to introduce internal organizational changes that allow it to cope more effectively with new challenges – both those presented by employees who now belong to a university and those from the outside in the form of increased competition amongst public universities and other private colleges, advances in technology, new government legislation and pressing social demands. This planned organizational change strategy of UiTM is purposefully aimed at changing mindsets of organizational members, employee acceptance of new technology, greater employee motivation, and more innovative employee behavior. The management of UiTM feels that it may not be able to change its adaptation strategy into a university, unless its members behave differently in their relationships with one another and to their jobs. The management of UiTM felt that internal capabilities and process improvements of the day-to-day running of a University had to be transformed to ensure efficiency, competitiveness and transparency in the system. The ultimate goal of change at UiTM then will intensify the intent and desire of both academicians and university administrations to create, harness and manage human and intellectual capital toward making the University into a viable Learning Organization. This study therefore attempts to:

1. examine the planned organizational change methodology employed by UiTM
2. analyze the models and processes of organizational change that was utilized

3. explore UiTM's deployment of different ways of overcoming resistance to change

Methodology

Planned Organizational Change Methodology

UiTM's management brought in an external consultant to provide the Transfer of Technology (TOT) process to Technology Recipients (TRs) identified by UiTM to further equipped the organization with the necessary skills to initiate, implement, and monitor change. This planned organizational change strategy was implemented in the form of a project kick-off on 6 June, 2000 known as Project 2000 (P2000). Thus this UiTM-Project 2000 is a *Change Management and Process Improvement Capability Development Program.* The objective of the project was to develop internal capabilities within UiTM in the areas of change management and process Improvements through a 'Learn by Doing' Program. It is based on the premise that Organizational Learning and Change is best affected by internal stakeholders after they acquire the skills and methodologies to map and manage the change. The duration of the project was for a period of one year from the kick-off date.

The transfer of technology was based on the *TOTeRM* (Transfer of Technology Reference Model) developed and used in mission critical projects like the KLIA project.

This transfer of technology took place via:

- lecturettes guided discussions, productive conversation, reading and reflecting
- participation in project activities, follow-up discussions, maintenance of learning logs and peer group presentations
- team presentations to target groups, guided discussions, participation in project activities
- leading ground level change projects from concept to completion with the aid of specific tools and techniques

The expected outcomes of this planned organizational strategy are: **(a)** measurable internal capability to map and manage change and process improvement initiatives using a toolkit of specific strategies, tactics, models, methods, templates and tools; as well as **(b)** the determination of 'Ground Level Change Agenda' within participating faculties or units.

UiTM will have developed the nucleus of a 'Learning, leadership and Change Management Center'. This center will act as a repository of institutional learning about governance, management, educational administration and change. It will be a pre-departure transition point for senior academics and administrators as well as an incubator for the development of academic managers and thought leaders. This center may also acts as a seedbed for knowledge management strategies and tactics, with a consulting focus and mandate.

Change Project Plan

The Project Plan comprised of ten workshops and eight roundtable discussions that were scheduled accordingly based on UiTM's academic calendar, taking into consideration the mid-term breaks, examination week, school holidays, semester breaks as well as public holidays. There were three level of participants, namely the Executive Project Sponsor who is the Datuk Vice Chancellor himself and the UiTM Executive Committee, monthly strategic level encounters, comprising of Deans, Provosts, and Heads of Departments, as well as weekly process level encounters with Faculty Technology Recipients (TRs). The focus areas for these participations were on Learning, Leadership and Change, through guided discussions, workshops, presentations and tryouts. In other words, the people involved in this project comprised of the Vice Chancellor, the Executive Committee and the Deans and Heads of Departments, who are the project owners. The drivers for this planned change project was the head of the 'Center for Total Quality Education' (CTQE), the Core Technology Recipients (CTRs) and the Faculty or Department Technology Recipients (TRs) who are the 'change enablers'. Road shows were also held and workshops were conducted for campus technology recipients at various branch campuses of UiTM. Sessions were also specially held at the main campus where UiTM branch campus's Provos and respective campus TRs attended.

Project Dependencies

The CTRs and the TRs were to be selected based on certain stated 'attitude' and 'skills' criteria. In terms of 'attitudes', they should be those who are willing to work without delegating, follow project timeliness and instructions, be punctual for project meetings, learn and be open to ideas, and read advanced material and research in English. From the perspective

of required 'skills', they should be those who have the ability to do structured stand-up presentations in English to the Executive Committee, to write clearly, correctly and concisely in English, and to structure and conduct interviews and converse with ease. Those with proven facilitation skills are most likely to succeed as TRs.

Apart from these criteria, an ideal technology recipient should have the ability to facilitate discussions and present ideas, is likely to stay in UiTM after the project is over, has capacity for more management responsibilities, has displayed leadership traits during critical times, is a risk taker, has an interest in process improvement initiatives and is comfortable in a team learning environment. He or she must be willing to move from 'know what' to 'know how', be willing to put back into the system what he or she takes from it and is likely to role model learned behavior. They should be prepared to assume the role of a visible Change Enabler, support each other as they start the change process, and keep communicating with each other keeping gains in mind.

CTRs should be available on a full time basis, whereas the TRs' with unit level change agendas, should be available one day per week. The Executive and Strategic Management Group should be present during monthly learning encounters and all participants must be willing and able to follow through 'on time'. There must also be visible support from Senior Management for all project activities, resources and channels for Change Communication and space and resources for a functional project office. In determining the UiTM's Change Agenda, the focus should be on real work goals and processes, on improving performance, involve people who have power to influence goals, and balance action with reflection. 'White Space' should also be created for thoughts and reflection, increase individual and collective capacity and a safe environment should be created for dialogue and learning.

Learn By Doing

The learn by doing began with each faculty, department and unit determining their own unit level change agenda, identify time frame, resource requirements and set up implementation schedule. The plans are then implemented and monitoring of implementation and recording of learning takes place. These learning are then shared with other teams and the plans are then refined and implemented. All these processes are assisted and monitored by the selected CTRs. The 'Learn By Doing' experience began with the CTQE-based CTRs who embarked upon the

setting up the project office. These CTRs were required to be at the project office for three days of the week to help develop, review and implement the Project Plan. They learn to develop Project documentation and learning logs, support rollout of process workshops and roundtables as well as design Readiness Assessment Instruments and interviews. Apart from these tasks, they also support alignment of Change Leadership Teams and Target units and support rollout of Change Communication Management Tasks. They prepared plans for technology diffusion and capability development and learn how to perform After-Action Reviews. On the part of the TRs, their learn by doing experience were through participation at strategic level monthly learning encounters, planning implementation and follow-up action based on learned principles and processes and experimenting with learned concepts within pilot groups. They executed operational level tasks based on guidance and coaching, apply learned processes and behaviors in routine activities, and set up the infrastructure to disseminate ideas. These TRs were also responsible for instituting and deploying mechanisms to reflect new practices and values, as well as retooling organizational and individual performance measures to induce new behaviors and practices. Financial implications and project progress reports were presented at each quarter to the management of UiTM.

Findings

A Systems Intervention Change Strategy Model
Harold Leavitt (1965) lists four interacting variables that could serve as the focus of planned change in an organization: *task, structure, people and technology variables*. The *task structure* refers to whether the job is simple or complex, novel or repetitive, or standardized or unique. A task's nature can also create independent, interdependent, or dependent relations among departments in an organization. The *structure variable* is the system of communication, authority, and responsibility in the organization. Each organization has its own structure, which specifies power relations among individuals in it. The *people variable* is individuals working within the organization, including their attitudes, personal styles, and motivations to work in the organization. The *technology variable* is the problem-solving methods and techniques in the organization, such as computers, information systems, and over-head projectors. These four variables are highly interdependent. A change in any one variable usually results in a change in one or more of the others. Thus Leavitt's model

provides a good framework for examining UiTM's planned change approach. As UiTM embarked on its restructuring endeavors (change in communication channels, number of hierarchical levels and locus of decision making), this will result in the assignment of different people to certain organizational tasks, and also changes in people in terms of their numbers, skills and motivations. However, a change in the structure of decision-making may also probably change the technology for performing the tasks. The methodology of planned organizational change utilized under UiTM Project 2000 appears to be a 'systems approach' to change but with specific emphasis on the people variable of organizational change

The whole exercise encompassed 24 workshop sessions and 14 roundtable encounters with 3 project review sessions. The transformation movement is nurtured by 12 core technology recipients (CTR) and supported by 62 technology recipients (TR) for the whole duration of the TOT. In the process, a total of 287 change initiatives were proposed. Of this total, 80 change agendas were related to people issues, 137change agendas concerned process related issues and 70 change items concerning issues relating to technology. These change initiatives were again supported by various workgroups, amounting to 828 persons that help generate further critical mass. It is envisaged that when the TOT extends to the branch campuses, then the critical mass would be further escalated.

Along the way, participants were asked as to whether they now know more about Change and Project Improvement than they did before participating in the project. Favorable responses were recorded amongst others it has changed their way of thinking, have acquired substantial new tools for improving processes as well as learned new ways of initiating change in a systematic manner.

Amongst the comments,

> *"Yes. The faculty has started writing minutes in the way carried out at Project 2000 workshop. Response from faculty members on the use of Technology Plan is encouraging." (Faridah Hashim).*

> *"Yes, things are carried out more efficiently than before at our Program. Times for meetings are much shorter than before." (Nazlinda Abdullah).*

> *"Yes, I do know more about Change and Project Improvement than I did before Project 2000. The tools were clearly explained*

and the exercises helped me to use the tools to improve the selected processes. The session on Matrices were also very helpful." (Bernadette Foo).

"I am convinced that processes can be improved under the right circumstances" (Uminajah Salleh)

"I am beginning to develop conscious oversight at my faculty" (Asmahan Razak)

"P2000 has provided a system for process improvement" (Sanip Wahid)

"I hope what I have learned in P2000 will be passed down as an accepted culture to everybody in UiTM" (Roziah Janor).

Organizational Change Techniques

The two change processes that were adopted for this Change Project are '*Action Research*' and '*Organization Development (OD)*'. *Action research* is a data based problem-solving process of organizational change that replicates the steps involved in the scientific method (French and Bell, 1994). It represents a powerful approach or model for organizational change and consists of three essential steps:

- Gathering information about problems, concerns and needed changes from the members in the various faculties, departments and units involved in the project
- Organizing this information in some meaningful way and sharing it with the TRs and members of the Executive and internal management team of UiTM involved in the change effort
- Planning and carrying out specific actions to correct identified problems.

The strength of the action research approach to change lies in (1) its involvement of members of UiTM in the change process, and (2) the fact that it bases change on a careful diagnosis of the current state of affairs in the organization. The Deans and Heads of departments or units can effectively change its organization or task group only if they understand the current situation, in terms of what the staff are not happy with, what things are done well and what needs improvement. In addition, staffs' involvement can present a powerful force for change because of the fact that they are more likely to implement and support a change that

they have help create. Furthermore, once the Deans and Heads of Departments or Units have identified the need for change and have widely shared this information, the need becomes difficult for UiTM's organizational members to ignore. The pressure for change thus comes from within UiTM rather than from outside. This internal pressure is a particularly powerful force for change.

Organization Development (OD), on the other hand, is a planned systematic process of organizational change based on behavioral science technology research and theory (Burke, 1982). OD is a field of behavioral science that focuses on the management of change in organizations and the management of change in organization. OD is not a single technique but a collection of techniques that have a certain philosophy and body of knowledge in common:

- OD seeks to create self-directed change to which people are committed. The problems and issues to be solved are those identified by the organizational members directly concerned.
- OD is a system-wide change effort. To make lasting changes that create a more effective organization requires an understanding of the entire organization. It is not possible to change part of the organization without changing the whole organization.
- OD typically places equal emphasis on solving immediate problems and the long-term development of an adaptive organization. The most effective change program is not one that solves present problems, but one that prepares organizational members to solve future problems.
- OD places more emphasis than do other approaches on a collaborative process of data collection, diagnosis and action for arriving at solutions to problems. Action research is the primary change process used in Project 2000 OD program
- OD often leads to new organizational arrangements and relationships that break with traditional bureaucratic patterns.

People-Focused Approach to Change

UiTM Change Project 2000 is basically a people focused approach to change, utilizing survey feedback, team building and process consultation.

Survey Feedback
Survey feedback is an organizational change process that consists of (1) collecting information by questionnaire and interviews from members of

UiTM or work groups within each Faculty, department or units, and then, (2) organizing the data into an understandable and useful form, and (3) feeding it back to the staff who generated the data. The members of the participating faculties, departments and units then use this information as a basis for planning actions to deal with specific issues and problems. Basically, the survey feedback follows the action research change model and the primary objective is to improve the relationships among the members of groups and between departments through the discussion of common problems. Group discussions and problem-solving meetings are held to discuss the data being fed back. Each group has sufficient discretion to consider and take actions based on its findings and analysis. The consolidated data from each group were reported to the top management of UiTM and they responded and became involved in recommendations requiring some action on their part. This commitment by all parties makes a difference in successful implementation of the change effort.

Team Building
Team building is an organizational change process by which members of each participating faculty, department or unit, together with their respective TRs and management team (Deans or Heads of Departments) diagnose how they work together and plan changes that will improve their effectiveness. These team building sessions focuses on:

- Setting goals or priorities for improvements that the faculty, departments or units would like change
- Analyzing or allocating the way the change improvements is to be perform
- Examining the way the group is working
- Examining relationships among the people doing the work

This collaborative behavior utilized in the UiTM process of organizational change allows for widespread participation of employees. This leads to increased involvement, which is a necessary prerequisite to effect and sustain meaningful change in UiTM.

Process Consultation
Process consultation is a set of activities on the part of the external consultant that help TRs and CTRs perceive, understand and act upon process events that occur in their various faculties, departments and units. Process events refer to the ways in which work gets done. Process events include the behavior of people at meetings; formal and informal

encounters at work and behavioral steps undertaken in performing a task. The external consultant acts as a facilitator who helps individuals and groups within UiTM examine the process by which they are working toward task accomplishment. These include the examining of the process of meetings, development of Team Operating Principles (TOPs) and agreeing on 'Ground Rules' and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)'. The process consultation techniques address such areas like:

- Communication
- Leadership styles
- Decision making and problem solving
- Group roles and norms
- Conflict resolution

The process consultation technique used in this planned change effort have resulted in the changing of attitudes, values, interpersonal skills, group norms and cohesiveness of TRs , CTRs and those who participated in the various activities conducted by the Project 2000 team.

Resistance to Change

Like many other change initiatives, problems were anticipated as members of UiTM went through the process of change. The mentioning of the word 'change' attracted different reactions from different levels of management and stakeholders of UiTM. Their reactions could be categorized into those who resisted change, those who did nothing and those who wanted change (Levene, 2000). The effects of resistance to change, were either overt or implicit and at times subtle and cumulative. There were some units and departments that refuse to participate at all on the Project 2000 and there were also one or two, whose TRs gradually dwindled in attendance and slowly disappeared from scheduled meetings and workshops held. Those who persevered through the Change Project TOT process, indicated their willingness to change by assuming the role of change leaders and initiated ground level changes in their respective faculties, departments and units. The learning that these change leaders undergone via the TOT process equipped them with the necessary tools to understand the resistance they face and taught them to be more 'reflective rather than reactive' when faced with difficult people and situations. Some of the different ways that resistance was portrayed was through overtly walking out of meetings, cynical remarks expressed, and disruptions at meetings

and encounters as well as indiscrete calls and comments regarding CTRs and TRs made to the external consultant. Some of the reason for resistance to change includes habitual ways of doing things that some refuse to unlearn. Others resist the change for fear that the TRs or CTRs may have access to information, expose their flaws and weaknesses and represents threats to their power and influence. Some were protective of their own self-interest because they have achieved status, privilege or self esteem through the past system and they see change as a threat. There were also those who fear the unknown in terms of uncertainty with regards to their abilities to learn new skills or to take new roles. Some had differing perceptions, lack trust and misunderstood the intentions of the proposed change affecting them. Change substitute ambiguity and uncertainty for the known. Change also threatens the 'investment' one has already made in the status quo. The more people have invested in the current system, the more resistant they tend to be toward change. This is because they fear the loss of monetary gains, authority, friendship, personal convenience, or other benefits they value. This explains why older members of UiTM resist change more then the younger ones. Perhaps, they have generally invested more into the current system, and have more to lose by adapting to a change.

Kurt Lewin (1951) idea on the 'force field analysis' was used as a positioning tool to look at what forces are at play and what are their likely magnitudes? Who is for the change and who is against the change? Can a proactive stance be adopted? To overcome resistance, there was a need to control their anxiety, by communicating empathy for their fears as well as encouraging their participation The idea was to go for early wins, and create a critical mass that can exert the pressure of support for change and overcome the resistance to change encountered, such that an equilibrium state is maintained within the UiTM systems during the duration of the Project. One of the key strategies utilized for handling resistance to change was to ensure that all communication and information on any change item or change agendas must be based on facts. Communication channels and strategies should be geared towards killing rumors. Furthermore, when questioned, the change enablers were advised to gather sufficient facts before attempting to answer.. One should also learn and know when to engage and disengage, kill rumors based on facts, as well as rectify misinformation. Constructive critical comments must be listened to and incorporated where warranted, and logically argued against when damaging or inapplicable. Peter Senge

(1990) proposed five disciplines to adhere to, for effective improvement of organizational practices that includes personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning and system thinking. All these were emphasized through the TOT in Project 2000.

Lessons learnt

The change management program has provided CTRs and TRs with such skills like the analytical skills, communication skills, delegation, diagnostic skills, diagramming skills, documentation skills, event management skills, information processing skills, organizing skills, presentation skills, negotiation skills, reasoning skills, time management skills, facilitation skills, reflective skills and of course, leadership skills. Apart from these skills acquired, concepts such as ladder of inference, left hand column, masked advocacy, mental models, tempered radicals, Russian doll syndrome and trend blindness were also learnt. Participants of the change project also acquired the skills for managing such processes like after action reviews (AAR), meeting management, planning the transformation focus, process mapping, systems mapping, project planning, and change mapping. Several documents were generated during the course of the projects, and they include work session template, change readiness assessment templates, project planning template, Use of technology plan template, IT mapping document, possible use of technology template, learning logs and change mapping matrices.

The Change Forum

The big 'Bang' at the end of the project 2000 was a 'Change Forum' held as a logical conclusion to Project 2000. This forum provided a reason for TRs to learn and jumpstart departmental efforts to chart growth.. The change forum was a showcase of departmental change agendas and transition plans. It provided a forum to discuss interrelationships and dependencies among departmental strategies and an opportunity to see the 'big picture'. It was also the platform to address internal and external stakeholders and a signal to skeptic that UiTM has plans to chart its own future. At the change forum, there were various displays of each faculties, departments and unit's historical context, successes and accomplishments to date, current state, desired future state and transition plans. What was emphasize by Peter Senge (2000) as the three main dimensions of change: *people, process, and technology* changes were also displayed.

This change forum held, created awareness of departmental transition plans, increased shared clarity on transition-related issues and saw the involvement of stakeholders.

Discussion

A review of UiTM's Project 2000 clearly indicated that UiTM had carefully selected a unique methodology for the stages of the change intervention strategy management as a means of handling the transition. Provision of adequate resources and support by UiTM's management was also crucial in ensuring the successful implementation of the Triple 'A' Model stages of change, namely: (a) **A**wareness, (b) **A**lignment and (c) **A**ction. The use of such a methodology ensures the development of a comprehensive systems definition that lay the foundation for an effective change management process and those affected by the change were involved and consulted as early as possible. Support from senior management of UiTM was vocal, visual and provide authority and leadership. The change agents were seen to have full support of their superiors, and thus have their formal and informal authority to act. The manner in which the planned change intervention strategy was implemented took the form of the *Total Project Management Model or TPMM* for short. This provided the project manager, who is the external consultant a package, which integrates the intervention strategies, associated with planning and managing change.

Conclusion

The UiTM experience proves that it is possible to introduce change even in a university as large as UiTM. This in a way dispels the perception that government agencies are not dynamic and full of bureaucracy. The project exposes new modes of thinking and analyzing processes. The various tools presented convinced the fact that processes within UiTM can be further systematically improved. This experience suggests that creating a sense of involvement with those likely to be affected by change encourages their commitment to change, and higher levels of performance results. This planned organizational change project has helped UiTM learn to cope with the problems that initiated the need for change. This analysis confirms the models and theoretical propositions on the

implications of change. Nonetheless to make these changes meaningful and real, they've got to be put into practice and this is the real challenge. The transfer of technology and learning by doing must be an accepted culture eventually to all of UiTM population. According to Schein (1984):
 As long as organizations are networks of people engaged in achieving some common goals, there will be various kinds of processes occurring between them. Therefore, the more we understand about how to diagnose and improve processes, the greater will be our chances of finding solutions to the more technical problems and of ensuring that such solutions will be accepted and used by members of the organization.

References

Atchison, A.T. (1999). Managing Change *Frontiers of health Services Management*, 16 (1): 3-29.

Burke, W.W. (1982*). Organizational Development: Principles and Practices* Boston: Little Brown.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational Structure, Environment and Performance: The Role of Strategic Choice. *Sociology*,6: 2-22.

D'Aveni, R. A. (1990). Top Managerial Prestige and Organizational Bankruptcy. *Organizational Science*, 1: 121-142.

French, W.L. and Bell, C.H. (1994). *Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvements*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Hannan, M.T. and Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hatten, K.J. and Hatten, M.L. (1988). *Effective Strategic Management*. Englewood Cliffs, N..J.: Prentice Hall.

Leavitt, H.H. (1965). Applied Organizational Change in Industry: Structural, Technological and Humanistic Approaches in *Handbook of Organizations*. Ed. J. March, Chicago: Rand McNally: 1144-1-1170.

Levine, A. (2000). The Future Colleges: Nine Inevitable Changes. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47: 9, 10-11.

Lewin, K. (1951*). Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper & Row.

Miles, R.E. and Snow, C.C. (1978). *Organizational Strategy, Structure and Process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, D. (1990). *The Icarus Paradox*. New York: Harper Business.

Nelson, R.R. and Winter, S.G. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Senge.P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. London: Random House.

Senge, P.M. (2000) *The Dance of Change*. London: Random House.

Schein, E.H. (1984). Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture. *Sloan Management Review*, Winter: 3-16.

Schendal, D. and Hofer, C.(1979). *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning*. Boston: Little Brown.

Schwartz, R. (1986). The Future; from the video series *The Business of Excellence.* Guild Sound and Vision Ltd., Peterborough.

Werr, A. (1995). Approach, Methods and Tools for Change – Literature Survey and Bibliography. *Economic and Industrial Democracy (EID)*, 16 (4): 607-651.