6/5/10 – Rachel Duchak has sent along this little video and article on why change is so hard. She asked me to share it with you.

Meeting 9: June 1, 2010

note: Linda was not here today and was missed. (Vicky reporting in).

Class for next week (June 8th) will be in the Honors Room.
Roger would like to hear from us and get some feedback with a few questions in mind: How did this class work? What could we do better in this class? (For yourself or Roger) How do we get better at learning?

Did any of you calculate your planetary consumption and carbon footprint? The reason why Roger asked about this: It’s a specific change process. You can look at your carbon footprint and consider what it means and begin to consider or ask…does it imply that any changes need to take place? (When thinking about sustainability and your own participation in life) It is also useful to look (as part of the change process), if you didn’t do it, at what the background conversations you have about that. What is the rationalization (on the surface and underneath your thinking) about not having done it? This is very tricky because it could be a blaming conversation…or the carbon footprint is wrong…or maybe I was just too busy.

Roger often gets people, early in the change process, to go into work everyday, at the same place, at the same time, sit for at least 5 minutes (10 if you are very ambitious) and do nothing in your regular work environment. Oh, by the way, don’t do this during your lunch hour. Do nothing and watch what happens in you and also in others around you. One of the things that happen is that people just don’t implement it. When asked why they often respond…it isn’t important. Then things about your systemic view of the world start to come up: Like I didn’t have enough time to do nothing. When you unfold it some people begin to see they are afraid to do nothing. What are your fears about what is going to happen if you go to work and do nothing for 5-10 minutes? People will see you as unproductive. Then you can begin to examine that…well what is that mental model? Does that mental model mean that I always have to be apparently doing something in order to prevent the negative condition of others people’s attributes about me as unproductive? This is not necessarily a productive thing to do. So then your attention is not on being productive it’s on always having to do things to appear productive in order to keep people from having a negative attribution about you.

The other thing that will happen, it looks like space and it gets filled in by others around you. They ask you things, people fill in your space…they may ask you if you are ok. You could try this exercise this week even in your personal setting. See what happens to you in your private setting to you if you decide to do nothing every day at roughly the same time. One of things you are doing is interrupting the flow of things by doing nothing and doing nothing is an interruption in our cultural context. Sometimes people have a problem with trying to optimize their time so when you are in a place where you have time it is sort of nice. It is great and enjoyable to do nothing. Roger likes to get on airplanes…you are circumstantially forced to do nothing and it’s enjoyable. No one knows where you are and they don’t know when to expect you.

This process of self observation is the same process around the carbon footprint. This process is not meant as a moral judgment but as an interpretive punctuation point to begin to surface the mental models. It is just as valuable it you didn’t do it from the point of view of learning if you are willing to look at why didn’t I do it? What is the structure of my thoughts and rationalization that had you not do it….was it too complicated….did you not have the time….not worth it….didn’t want to know the answer. The reason why it is important: So you can begin to consider the impact of your cooperation in a pre-built, pre-existing system, even if you are making the most benevolent alternative choices possible. Even in those choices, there is a built in infrastructure that has a carbon footprint that you are participating in. The level of deconstruction starts to be about how I work with that level of cooperation. There are lots of carbon footprints: our social fabric, economic fabric, built environment has a carbon footprint and I work with all of those…so how do I cooperate with all those and how do I work with it?

If you still haven’t done your carbon footprint Roger has asked you all to do one for sort of a base line and not for data. If you don’t do it…then why? What happened? Do watch what happens in the process. Because regardless you are looking at your mental models with your relationship to life change, carbon footprints, consumption. This is the bases for any change happening is your being able to place your attention on that. If you don’t do it…then why? What happened? Do watch what happens in the process. Because regardless you are looking at your mental models with your relationship to life change, carbon footprints, consumption. This is the bases for any change happening is your being able to place your attention on that.
you do the carbon footprint consider what does change look like? So this is your homework.

Check in happened:
I talked about being frustrated with my school group project. I had been working on a project for eight weeks and my group partners had not written the paper or contributed to the project. I was stressed, it was due the next day and I have a choice to make: submit the project without finishing, stay up all night and finish the project and take time away from my genetics exam studies, turn in the project with only my name.

There was lots of advice all around that I was happy to hear and be encouraged. Roger said: You can be loving and compassionate without doing, saying or acting in any way. Roger made the suggestion that a set of particular kinds of associative mechanisms were triggered amongst us when I spoke. Roger suggested that I could notice that I have a particular way of speaking that triggered this response in people and I could interact with this when triggered. Roger further stated: Probably the triggered responses don't do anything to circumstantially address something immediate about my apparent problem. The mental model that I have in my speaking is what people were responding to. Roger wanted us to notice that the space in the room became contracted when we were discussing this problem. Our physical, mental, emotional way of being changed and became contracted and he felt it was worth investigating the quality of solution you would come up with in a contracted space versus a more expanded space.

Sema is leaving to next week to live in Turkey on an Island with no cars. How exciting!! I am going to miss Sema. She will be gone for 15 months and have plenty of time to do nothing. She is very excited about the possibilities.

Roger: Did we feel the space in the room change? To some individuals the room may not feel so different but the feeling was different.

Roger talked about Systemic change and intervention. You do the work at the individual and collective level…then you consider systemic change. There are moments in time where immediate situational change and intervention is appropriate situation ally and the right thing. An example: When your daughter is pulling draino out from under the sink is not a time to be in a dialogue. With a highly multivariable complex, non-linear, interconnected human system the model of what you do about the draino it does something but the consequences….or it may not be necessarily the best model. Try to move back and forth between a real systemic frame and situational enacted life. How are you relating in the moment.

When Roger was giving advice to executives of big corporations: Sometimes people are unaware of how people are relating to one another or interacting with others. The quality of the way we relate one another directly affects the quality of the decisions you make and how that affects many systems on a global scale. It is difficult to connect those things on a moment to moment basis but it is unethical and irresponsible not to. We are all not heads of a multimillion dollar corporation but these concepts can still be used at a community level.

The subject was changed a bit here: Several of us framed different dilemmas here in class. Different people frame different dilemmas. What do they have in common and what is assumed? Each situation involved human interactions. Some frustrations could be that people expect too much from us. Each of these problems exists only in relationships. Some level of expectation is present in these problems.

What is the level of inquiry? What would this make possible? Why does it matter? The structure of necessity or need…the reason you do it is to examine the construction of necessity or its structure. Ask yourself what the structure of necessity is in a problem. (Linda here: you may recall that there is a section on necessity in the Bohm reading .  [Bohm6-29.pdf] )

Roger told a story about an angry person. This person was always angry and always the designated angry person in the meeting. Some people may have the assumption that if I don't get angry no one else will and who will correct this injustice. She came to Roger and said she didn't want to be an angry person. Roger worked with her so that she changed from being an angry person. What do you think happened around her? People got angry with her for selling out and not being angry any more. She had the role of holding all of that content which meant that they didn't have to be responsible for it. It also meant she had a particular role. So why did he tell that story? Maybe because people have roles and when they aren't fulfilling those roles people get upset. Because those roles aren't being fulfilled in the way they are use to. Sometimes a role occurs for a person as a sort of necessity.

We have all been in a position that we have felt like we are the only person doing the work or maybe that people think we aren't doing anything. The feeling of not being valued.

Roger was trying to point to several qualities. The chronic condition of responding to the necessity is often is fear based. The role lock that happens often goes unexamined and the collective nature of investing in those role locks in a particular ways. Role lock=you are locked into a role with another person like co-dependence which is a role lock. We get identified with those roles. Ego utility is another way to look at this. Ego utility is what we are known for and what you are counted on for with the people around you. What do the people around you say about you? Sema for instance has a nurturing quality about her.
Ego utility cases a shadow. If someone is count on and know for having justice, another person with thought, strategy, one that is caring, and another person with strength. What are the shadows? The person that is known for having justice has black and white thinking and could have no mercy. They could be judgmental. The one who is known for strategy is manipulative, untrustworthy, and crafty. The caring person is weak, emotional, illogical, nosy, trying to gain favor or not a contributor. A woman who is strong is sometimes known as a bitch but she could be a mover, a leader, one who can cut through barriers. On one of Roger’s teams they went around the table and described the strengths’ of each person and the shadows of the person too. So the context would be what is useful, the necessity and utility.

A reflective interlude by someone who was not there (Linda)
I’ve been thinking about the nature of my shadow for a long time (actually since 1995 when I read a book by Robert A. Johnson called “Owning your Own Shadow.” You can see that I’m slow to process some ideas. ). My recent consideration of my shadow has been along the lines of “What does my absence make possible?” I began wanting to know the answer to this question when I stepped down as department chair in 2006. I planned a distant sabbatical in part for the very purpose of enabling my colleagues to be free of me so that they could stretch in ways that aren’t possible when I am around.

I have two more data points...one is this meeting here. Another is our department senior banquet which I ACCIDENTALLY forgot to go to. I can often be counted on for being emotionally authentic. In both cases, in my absence, people expressed their emotions in ways that they haven’t in the past while I was present. This is painful to me because my background conversation about it is that there is something about my presence that oppresses others in a way that I don’t desire. I have a deep desire for people to be free of the oppression they feel, to be free to live the fullness of their lives with joy. Yet, somehow I manage to contribute to the exact opposite of all that. I’m trying to serve others’ freedom (and mine). But perhaps my very trying is undermining its possibility.

Don’t feel sorry for me, by the way, even though this little story is a little bit like a pity party. The thing to learn, in my view, is that it may be possible that actions drive a result. In unhealthy systems, the result can often be a “worsening” rather than the intended one. Is it wiser, then, to do nothing? Possibly. I’m experimenting with this today.

-LV

We often see ourselves in the role lock that we are in and when people violate our role lock we may feel threatened. When we break away from the role lock we are in to make a positive change in our lives it is sometimes difficult and painful. We need to notice patterns we can change in ourselves that would lead to positive changes in the way we live our lives. (this involves collective interactions with people, the structure of thought that lead to interactions with people which can create a positive change in our life and in the direction that we want to go.)

The End :o) (Vicky)

Meeting 8: May 25, 2010

note: Once again, it’s me, Linda. As luck would have it, Roger had a headache today. Of course, this must have been painful for him, but he served us well in spite of it. Today’s session occurred to me as very useful once again, forever raising our expectations for Roger when he is 100%.

Actually, I am being a little flippant here. I would like to say that I am profoundly grateful that Roger has chosen to entirely alter his life by moving to San Luis Obispo from Boston to help us with the learning initiative that we are launching next year (FrontPage). At the risk of embarrassing him, I will tell you that he is known internationally within the executive community of the largest corporations and organizations on the planet as the person to call if you are interested in systemic organizational change. He is normally paid six thousand dollars a day on the open market for his services. So, the way I figure it, he has donated well-over half a million dollars of his time to the initiative at Cal Poly since I met him in late 2008. He has not asked me ever to pay him nor pay for his trips to China where we’ve met a couple of times now. He is exploring new models for right-livelihood. This is remarkable to me, as he is attempting to live a life congruent with his convictions about what needs to take place on the planet. Sure, it’s easy for me to say that I’m trying to live more sustainably, to “teach sustainability to engineers”, as I fully participate in the existing unsustainable system with my stable job and it attendant benefits and my annual rate of consumption that equates to 2.5 earths if everyone on the planet were consuming like me. I admire Roger’s conviction to “walk the talk.”

I met Roger through Peter Senge (“The Fifth Discipline”), who is considered by Harvard Review as one of the 75 most influential people in the world of business (Peter is at MIT’s Sloan School of Business.) The only reason I know Peter is because I had the time and tuition to attend one of his “Foundations of Leadership” workshops--nothing special about me. It turned out that Peter had been actively engaging Chinese collaborators for the same reasons I had and he put me in touch with Roger. In addition to Roger’s many talents (opera singer, trumpet player, loyal friend, martial arts practitioner, hypnotist...), he is fluent in Mandarin, although his tones
Anyway, Roger has planned to be here for 5 years to help us get this initiative (SUSTAIN) off the ground. When I said, "It's amazing to me that you've moved here." He said, "Moving here was not the problem, it will be the staying here that's the problem." In fair exchange for Roger's help, the university made what seemed like promises of certain things "in kind," but so far, even a complementary bus pass has been impossible to materialize. But I have admit that I've stopped trying to manifest the other things. Roger is not at all bothered by this ("I have to be SOMEwhere."), as he thinks its a natural consequence of the system functioning perfectly.

I should tell you that Roger is not being paid by the university. By the way, he is being paid the lowest lecturer rate for 2 WTUs for the time he is with us in the workshop. I am grateful for Sema to finding funding to pay a subsistence wage to Roger for running this workshop. I would hate to see him existing on the snacks provided by the CTL. I suspect that he turns down opportunities for work so that he can be available to what is happening here.

I say this to be transparent, in the event that someone imagines that he is being paid an actual salary or that he has taken some special opportunity that would otherwise go to someone else, or some other version of the "background" conversation. You also might wonder how this workshop got created. I am happy to make this transparent to anyone who wants to know, but in a nutshell, the university has almost nothing to do with it. It came about because of people getting together and finding a way to make things happen.

I know this is a bit of a diversion, but I bring this up to reveal the magic among us... not just Roger, but you all who weekly come to this workshop.

What are you getting out of the workshop?
As you know, Liz collected responses and did a quick analysis of what people said in response to:
"In what ways are you benefitting from this workshop?" Please take a glance at this document. It has a table of the four areas of benefit that people cited: Greater facility with change models and personal change; personal and professional growth; enhanced relationships; intellectual engagement. workshop-benefits.pdf This particular document is part of a larger proposal, so please forgive the references to other things. I think you get the idea, though, of what you have reported getting out of the workshop.

Here is an wordle analysis of the 50 individual sentences provided by the 14 respondents.
"In what ways are you benefitting from this workshop?"

---

Clarifications about hitting range
Roger clarified a couple of things that were unclear from last week. One was what to do when you hit range: nothing. There is nothing to do with this but the be where you are.

Bringing the background conversations into the foreground, part 1: the individual conversation
As you may recall, last week Roger spoke of the fact that in any conversation, there is at least three different conversations taking place: the one in the room and the "background" conversations. These background conversation reside within individuals and in the collective. He asserted that in an emergent design process, what one is doing is making those background conversations explicit. Why do you do this? Because our actions are based on the background conversation, not the foreground one. Often, the background conversation is where our attention is. Roger then proceeded to describe a process by which the collective background conversation can be made explicit. I'm going to actually describe to you the process for making the individual background conversation transparent because my background conversation is that I think it is easier to relate to the individual one.

How does one bring the personal background conversation into the foreground? This, of course, requires one to know that they are having one. Roger said that when we recognize that we are having a background conversation, we have the choice to either engage it by saying aloud what you are thinking, or, you can choose...
The first thing that was brought up was, "What if it's unsafe to reveal the background conversation?" Roger's response: That's the first background conversation that you must reveal. "I notice that I'm having a conversation in my head about all this, but it feels intimidating here and I'm not sure if it's safe to say what I'm thinking because I don't know what the consequences will be."

Warning... anytime you make a choice to engage the background conversation, things will go crazy. It is the NOT engaging it that keeps things just as they are. So in a way, we participate in the existing system by not revealing the background conversation (I'm extrapolating here to my own conclusion). The Roger says that you must be clear about your own mandate if you are going to engage the background conversation. What he means by "mandate" is your personal conviction about what you are committed to---something larger than you that you're serving into existence or that is acting through you. If you're just engaging the background conversation for entertainment, DON'T DO IT!

It is also good to make your mandate clear when you speak. "I'd like you to hear what I am about to say as someone who is dedicated to the well-being of the students..." (for example) Why? Because if you don't articulate this (and even if you do), others will hear you in the habitual way that they hear you. And the result of that will be that whatever you say will simply add to the dossier that they are unconsciously keeping on you.

Another way of stating this is in reference to the ladder of inference.

```
I take Actions based on my Beliefs
I adopt Beliefs about the world
I draw Conclusions
I make Assumptions based on the meanings I added
I add Meanings (Cultural and personal)
I select "Data" from what I observe
observable observables (as a videotape recorder might capture it)

The reflexive loop (our beliefs affect what data we select next time)
```

Everyone has a belief system (top of the ladder) firmly in place. Anyone you encounter will have one about you (and vice versa); this is their dossier on you--who you are, what you think, your motives, etc. When you speak, they "select data" from the that event and use it to confirm their existing belief about you...adding to your existing dossier. The act of stating your mandate serves to interrupt that pattern and make possible a different outcome.

What if "they" still don't hear you? Contra-intuitively, the strategy for being heard is not to speak repeatedly or
What if “they” still don’t hear you? Contra-intuitively, the strategy for being heard is not to speak repeatedly or louder. It is to have your attention on people around you being heard, not yourself being heard. What does this look like? This means hearing them so deeply that you can recreate their narrative about their point of view. You can state to them how they see things differently, why it is that they see things differently and actually understand their position as a logical outcome of the situational factors. We must be patient enough to model people being heard. (Oh my gosh, are you really saying Roger, that to be understood, we have to understand others? This is so Steven Covey-ish and kind of a hassle. But alas, perhaps it’s worth an experiment or two.)

Roger also warned us of the consequences of strategically representing the other person’s viewpoint so that you can get to them understanding you. …it won’t work. You must hear it so clearly that you see their mandate and see why they made the choices that they made.

**How do you detect that you, yourself, are having a background conversation?** Roger asserted that often background conversations arise as complaints. He then identified three types of complaining: recreational complaining (yes, for fun), chronic complaining (yes, out of habit), and complaining because you are committed to something and the way that things are occurring violates what you care about. One of the ways that you can differentiate which type someone is enacting is that you can recreate the complaint for them...”This is what I heard you say, you are upset about hanna yada hana ya because yada hanna hanna,...is there something more? Do you want something to happen?” When we notice ourselves complaining about something, we can ask ourselves, “Why am I complaining about that, what are my expectations?”

Pete suggested a way to bring the background conversation into the foreground, using Non-violent Communication (Marshall Rosenberg). It was essentially something like, “When you said x, I felt y. In the future, I need you to Z.” Roger said that process occurred to him as violent. I didn’t catch why, but I suspect that it is because it combines two things. It combines a revelation of one’s background narrative and then imposes a solution without consideration of the other person. Roger depicted it like this, where the “X” on the left can be used as a simple way to reveal one’s own background conversation.

In describing this process, Roger referenced Ancona and Isaac’s 4-player model of healthy team balance (based on the work of Kantor and Lehr). This model looks like this.

---

In a healthy team, all functions are necessary. A healthy team would recognize when, for example, the team is...
getting stuck between MOVE and OPPOSE and will BYSTAND or FOLLOW. There are healthy and unhealthy versions of each of the players. For example, a healthy version of the OPPOSE is someone speaking for the purpose of ensuring the group decisions align with their larger goals. An unhealthy OPPOSE is an opposing action that is habitual, for the sake of opposing, rather than to serve a larger intent. Most teams, Roger asserted, do get stuck between MOVE and OPPOSE and do not advance in their work.

If you are interested in reading about this, you can download this file. I found it quite interesting and immediately recognized the dysfunctional versions of the four players in my daily life. This model has helped me to have some clarity and different choices about my own group interactions.

Making your mandate explicit
As mentioned above, making your mandate explicit interrupts the habitual way that others might hear you. But there is also a way in which advocating for something can be heard by others as "You're wrong, your view, your actions are wrong." The way in which one frames their mandate could have a shaming quality. This is presumably an undesirable result. This conversation came about in the course of Dianne bravely recounting an experience in which she felt she made her mandate clear but the outcome was not beneficial. Roger asked her to recreate for us how she made her mandate clear. What proceeded was all SUPER helpful to see unpacked, but I won't recreate it here because I have a background conversation that says I should ask permission before posting it. Anyway, there was an equally brave moment when Eric revealed he was the "perpetrator" in the story. None of this is real, I might add. But it was all a way in which Dianne and Eric served the larger group by recounting and reflecting on what had happened. Thank you.

Bringing the background conversations into the foreground, part II: the collective conversation
What we know about the collective background conversation is that it occurs as a shared view, expressed during coffee breaks or other supposedly safe havens within the organization. Roger talked about a structured process for making the shared conversation explicit. This consisted of a process called OPEN SPACE.

Homework: look up OPEN SPACE, what are the rules? Also look up I.C.A. townhall methodology

This process is based on the assumption that the solution resides in the collective mind. But how do we access the collective mind when it is hidden in the individual minds?

Then Roger proceeded to tells us the rules and describe the process. This involved a sticky wall, many 6 x 8 cards, one thought per card, block lettering, simplest form possible of the idea. The intent of the process is to make explicit the collective mind by making explicit each distinct thought (on the cards). People meet in groups of to generate the ideas on the card. The cards are then placed on the sticky wall by a method that involves asking "Is this idea alike or different from this one?" You generate a large array of groupings of like ideas. This process makes the background conversation explicit in an anonymous way. Then, there is a debriefing on the collective mind that everyone can see. People go off and think/talk about it. Then they are asked to vote with their feet. Go to the idea that they have energy for. There is more (see below)

This process allows the following:
1. Seeing of the collective mind
2. Talking through the meaning of the collective mind groupings of ideas?
3. Look at whole thing and determine where most leveraged point is in the system (in terms of Meadow's systems thinking interventions)
4. Seeing where peoples' attention is (when they vote with their feet)
5. Learning about where people are NOT invested (ask why. Sometimes people will see something is very high leverage but have no energy or interest to deal with it or believe that it can never change).
6. Give a second chance to readjust.
7. Resource check-do you have resources to address questions where you have energy? Give them hours to work on this, make requests of the group.

Roger often constrains the task a little to help people focus.

Roger asserts that this can be useful for pre-interview work.

Meeting 7: May 18, 2010
note: Linda here. The Roger is with us today after having returned from China on Sunday. He asserted that he was "a mess" by which we believed he was referring to his jet-lagged condition. However, as the meeting unfolded, one seriously wondered "If this is a mess, Roger must be awesome when fully functional."

I found this meeting to be very rich with practical information. I’ve tried to capture it in this entry, but as always, I invite others to provide their perspective. Oftentimes, my experience of Roger is that he describes reality in a way that I’ve always experienced, but never quite understood. It’s like he is able to expose the underbelly of organizational human experiences. For me, seeing this underbelly enables a whole new set of
responses that I didn't have access to. This I find liberating. (Plus, I'm a scorpio, so I am somehow strangely
drawn to the underbelly of things).

**The Creative Process in Change**

After we checked in, Roger began talking about the creative process. He used this graphic to indicate the
process that we have been in together:

![Creative Process Graphic](http://sustainslo.pbworks.com/w/page/24998799/Change%20Management%20and%20Action%20Research%20Workshop)

The process begins in a "contracted" space where our attention is focused on the condition of fragmentation. We
didn't exactly explore the meaning of the term "fragmentation," but I will supply a dictionary version:

**fragmentation |ˌfragməˈtān|**
**noun**
the process or state of breaking or being broken into small or separate parts : the fragmentation of society into a
collection of interest groups.

For our individual "problems," we focused through analyzing our problem using Kantor's meta-model (What is our
theory of the "thing"? What is our theory of change? What is our theory of process? Who are we in that process?) We
also had the chance to explore our problem further by asking these questions about change (thank you Luanne for
providing this synopsis):

- What do you want to conserve?
- What do you want to dissolve (=a non-violent going out of existence, or release)?
- What do you want to nurture (amplify, support)?
- If the change happened, what would it make possible? (ask this question recursively until you arrive at
  something that has intrinsic value for you)
- Why do you care about the change?
  Express it as a value, a possibility.
- Then, consider what your life would be like if you had this thing. If someone was following you around with a
  camera, what would they see?

Our next move was to imagine our lives in this state, 5 years from now, 1 year from now, 8 weeks from now (this was
week 2 when we did this). Anyway, if you happened to do this particular homework, I have to say it was a lot of
navel-gazing all at once (useful though, not like my regular navel-gazing).

In the creative process, this initial focus is followed by a period of widening attention. In this phase, you look at
the problem very broadly. This is a divergent period accompanied by a feeling of ambiguity and not-knowing.
This phase of the change can have a great deal of creative tension (indicated by the red arrow in the above
graphic, of course). In a group process, one knows that it is time to move the next phase of contracting on to a
solution when people start to call for it. That is, you know it is time to focus when people complain about how
unfocused it is.

Roger asserted that oftentimes, if a group is going through this process, it can collapse at the point of creative
tension by the actions of someone in a hierarchical structure. That person often has a prefigured idea of what
"should" be done. They enter into the change process with the idea that they are going to engage people in an
open process of change. However, they often have a bias about what should be done but do not reveal this bias.
They then attempt to manipulate the process to enroll people in their own solution. When they see that things
are not going the way they think it should go, they use their position of power to clamp down and direct the
group to their preconceived solution.

**An aside: Confessions of a recovering department chair (not to be confused with "Recovering a chair
in the confessions department").**

Alas, it pains me to admit it, but I've done this in the past, particularly when I had an imagined position of
responsibility. Strangely, I had no idea that I was doing this. I thought I was genuinely open to different
solutions because I was not aware of my own attachment and identification with what I felt needed to happen.
And on another note, I feel that Roger’s description of the collapsing design process by a hierarchical leader is nearly my entire experience of any change process in my 19 years at Cal Poly. We are so culturally steeped in hierarchy even though we profess to embrace “shared governance.” And when I say this, I am not blaming this dynamic on our leaders, necessarily. I am saying that I have participated at all levels in this dynamic but have never had the skills to see what was happening or to even be responsible for my action in the dynamic. So how I have participated as “being lead” this way is in not having the awareness or vocabulary to state what I saw happening. I would go sideways or abort the creative process because I didn’t know what to do.

Back to the workshop...

**Hitting range in the creative process**

Roger described how the creative process can be contracted during the creative tension by a person in a hierarchical position of power. He also talked about individuals or groups aborting the process. He called this “hitting range.” The idea of “range” comes from the work of Jeff Conklin, the author of Dialogue Mapping: Building Shared Understanding of Wicked Problems.

From Wikipedia: "Wicked problem" is a phrase used in social planning to describe a problem that is difficult or impossible to solve because of incomplete, contradictory, and changing requirements that are often difficult to recognize. Moreover, because of complex interdependencies, the effort to solve one aspect of a wicked problem may reveal or create other problems.

1. The problem isn’t understood until a solution is developed.
2. There are several people with something at stake in how the problem is resolved.
3. The constraints change over time.
4. The problem-solving process ends when the resources run out.

In my view, curricular change at universities is the epitome of a wicked problem. (This paper has a nice introduction to fragmentation and wicked problems. [wickedproblems.pdf](http://sustainslo.pbworks.com/w/page/24998799/Change%20Management%20and%20Action%20Research%20Workshop)).

The moment the individual or group hits range, they remove themselves from the creative process. One of the symptoms of this is that they will tell a joke in the face of a real question within the creative process. Trevor, at this point, foolishly volunteered to demonstrate with the Roger, some of these points. Roger began by asking Trevor this question: "Why are you here?" The conversation went a little like this (with most of the content removed):

R: Why are you here?
T: Yada, yada, yada
R: If you had that, what would it make possible?
T: (I'm re-presenting this without the exact content) I have a conflict between something internal and something external

At this point, Roger asked us all what we made of the answer. We noticed that Trevor did not answer the question. Roger said he heard Trevor basically describe the process of "being stuck." Trevor in fact demonstrated "being stuck" by kind of getting stuck in answering the question. I believe we were at Trevor's range (for creativity) in this moment. The problem is that the unsticking is the creative process. In other words, when people hit (creative) range in the creative process, they often exit the process. They disengage when the engagement is the very thing required to move beyond their stuck point.

What was there to do in the moment? We could keep asking him "If you had that, what would it make possible?" and continue to frustrate Trevor. We could also think in our minds "Gee, my range is 'bigger' than Trevor's range, he needs to keep going in order to grow." I suppose this is a version of forcing someone past their current "comfort zone," if you will. Another option is to recognize what was happening ("being stuck") and relate to it compassionately. I’m not sure what this means, but it may mean making it transparent enough so that the person has choices. This obviously requires one to serve another in this way...listening to their response, noticing when they have "hit range", and compassionately making that transparent to them so they can make responsible choices.

It occurs to me that this process requires a lot from the listener. This may be what Torbert means when he said, "valid social knowledge depends first and foremost on the development among persons a new politics based on a shared wish to research their everyday lives together...secondarily on the development among persons of a new ethics based on the commitment to confront apparent incongruities in their common life." (p. 151, Torbert paper from two weeks ago). Actually, this sounds a lot like loving someone. Hmm... it's a lot. (I'm pretty sure we're not in a cult here, but just in case, do not drink any kool-aid offered at any of the sessions.)

**Background conversations**

The process of communication involves both speaking and listening. "Which is more important, the speaking or the listening?" Roger asked. Like a real seasoned professor, he then waited less than 1.3 seconds for us to respond before he answered his own question, "I assert that the listening is more important because it provides..."
the context for meaning.” This statement reminded me of the ladder of inference (C. Argyris).

The process starts with observable data. In a conversation, I suppose that would be the words that are actually being said. The person actively selects “data” from the whole, adds meaning to that data (a cultural and personal interpretation), makes assumptions based on the personal meaning that they have added, draws conclusions based on the assumptions and then adopts beliefs based on these self-generated conclusions. This is followed by some action based on the beliefs. Notice that this process all occurs inside of one’s head without any testing outside of the head. That is, this process of inference occurs without checking the validity of one’s internally-created meaning, one’s assumptions, one’s conclusions or one’s beliefs. So the act of “listening” encompasses all the steps of the ladder of inference, from “selecting data” to “adopting beliefs.” I’m guessing that this is why Roger asserted that listening is more important than what is actually said. The listening establishes our reality out of which we take action, not the speaking part.

Another aside: How the background conversation creates the reality

This process is a little bit of what was happening when I had conflict with “Roger the jerk,” as you recall. The actions that I took came out of my deeply-seated belief that “Roger” was a jerk (after all, I had a lot of evidence that I selected). My actions then served to “produce” the result of additional jerky behavior by “Roger.” This is what I meant about my question on the role of our assumptions in creating the “realities” that we experience.

When one asserts a reality, “My boss is a jerk,” it’s not so useful, it seems, to discern whether or not that person can objectively be considered a jerk. The more useful question to me is “How does the belief that the person is a jerk serve to produce the expected, jerky behavior in a dynamic human system?” If one were to relate to that person in a way that was different, perhaps the “jerk” would also relate differently. (This is the same reasoning I was trying to ask about those who designed the gas chambers for the Nazis. If they questioned their beliefs that were compelling them to design the chambers, would the outcome have been the same? How were their mental models of reality creating the action of the system?). It is very informative to actually check the validity of one’s internally constructed story with the other person. However, if you are going to do this, I recommend you check at the level of “This is what I heard you say. Is that right?” (the bottom of the ladder), rather than “You are a bona fide jerk. Is that correct?” (the top of the ladder).

back to the workshop...

So this conversation in our head is the personal, associative narrative that is considered one of the “background conversations.” There is also a group shared narrative that is the background conversation. In organizations, it takes the form of rumor, innuendo and complaint. How does this happen? Well, it happens when the leader gets
Roger offered an alternative model of change to the “motivate people to change” model. One way looks like this: father had an intent to act lovingly. I will assert that this is a very hard pill to swallow for anyone who has been conditioned to pattern “love” from his father, who was also abusive. So in the moments of abuse, Roger’s father learned to enact a behavior that he believed to be a loving way. If taken literally, this is quite an offensive idea, especially when we consider atrocious acts of violence. Roger said his father was abusive. They are now reconciled. But that does not mean that all is well. The question of why people don’t do this or that, Roger takes a radical position that people are all enacting in their own way according to their paradigms. In trying to change something in an organization, we are likely to encounter resistance in others. In assessing the status quo, people decide which paradigm to hold and which to discard...based on their value system, completely outside of their paradigms and evaluate the alignment of the expected consequences with their value system. That is when the tipping point of paradigm shift occurs. Roger said that in order to change paradigms, you must first recognize that you have one. Then, you must consider the consequences of your paradigm against the consequences of another. Then, all parties must exit their paradigms and evaluate the alignment of the expected consequences with their value system. That is when they decide which paradigm to hold and which to discard...based on their value system, completely outside of both paradigms.

Roger asserted that people are already doing things that make sense to them. No amount of behavioral manipulation through motivational persuasion ("selling") or even the presentation of "objective" evidence will change peoples’ minds. This is largely because those who want minds changed (the changers) are holding a different mental model or paradigm than those whose minds they want to change (the changees). Data is presented by the changers within their own system of belief. This data cannot change the changees minds because they have a different system...the data does not mean the same thing to them. The only way to change paradigms is to follow the path described by Thomas Kuhn (The Structure of Scientific Revolutions). Essentially, he says that in order to change paradigms, you must first recognize that you have one. Then, you must consider the consequences of your paradigm against the consequences of another. Then, all parties must exit their paradigms and evaluate the alignment of the expected consequences with their value system. That is when they decide which paradigm to hold and which to discard...based on their value system, completely outside of both paradigms.

Grid-based navigation versus situational navigation: metaphors for two ways of navigating change

Roger told a story of how the Polynesians navigated across enormous gaps in the ocean through Micronesia just by observing their environment (e.g., pollen flows on the surface of the water, animal migrations). In other words, that look at the clues within their lived environment (the situational evidence). Grid-based navigation is when one superimposes an abstracted x-y coordinate system onto the real space. In grid based navigation, a point on the coordinate system is chosen and one navigates to the new point by knowing their current location on the grid. I believe Roger meant for these ways of navigation to illustrate ways that one can enact a change process. They can imagine the existence of a point on this x-y coordinate system (the abstracted frame of reference, superimposed on reality), or they could put their attention on reality (situational evidence). It seems to me that the situational navigation is analogous to action-research, where you create a change by attention to the nuances of the situation (the lived practice) and adjust your trajectory accordingly. The grid-based seems to represent a mechanistic world view where one can navigate based only on an abstracted idea of reality (theory). Maybe I’m misrepresenting this idea.

The role of motivation in change and an alternate model: telos

Roger stated his view that motivation is not a helpful way to create change in an organization. Pete observed that it seems that the purpose of motivation is to drown out the background conversations with emotion. Why isn’t motivation a helpful way to create change? I am not sure if we even talked about this. But as I look at it, the motivation idea is kind of inside a mental model of getting over a barrier. This is a mechanistic world view that uses force and energy to accomplish something. What happens when the force is removed? Does the system revert back or does it stay put in a new location? Regardless, this model of motivation for change requires a constant input of motivation. Hmm...this doesn’t sustain change in organizations, it precedes burnout.

Roger asserted that people are already doing things that make sense to them. No amount of behavioral manipulation through motivational persuasion ("selling") or even the presentation of "objective" evidence will change peoples’ minds. This is largely because those who want minds changed (the changers) are holding a different mental model or paradigm than those whose minds they want to change (the changees). Data is presented by the changers within their own system of belief. This data cannot change the changees minds because they have a different system...the data does not mean the same thing to them. The only way to change paradigms is to follow the path described by Thomas Kuhn (The Structure of Scientific Revolutions). Essentially, he says that in order to change paradigms, you must first recognize that you have one. Then, you must consider the consequences of your paradigm against the consequences of another. Then, all parties must exit their paradigms and evaluate the alignment of the expected consequences with their value system. That is when they decide which paradigm to hold and which to discard...based on their value system, completely outside of both paradigms.

In trying to change something in an organization, we are likely to encounter resistance in others. In assessing the question of why people don’t do this or that, Roger takes a radical position that people are all enacting in their own way according to their paradigms. In trying to change something in an organization, we are likely to encounter resistance in others. In assessing the status quo, people decide which paradigm to hold and which to discard...based on their value system, completely outside of their paradigms and evaluate the alignment of the expected consequences with their value system. That is when the tipping point of paradigm shift occurs. Roger said that in order to change paradigms, you must first recognize that you have one. Then, you must consider the consequences of your paradigm against the consequences of another. Then, all parties must exit their paradigms and evaluate the alignment of the expected consequences with their value system. That is when they decide which paradigm to hold and which to discard...based on their value system, completely outside of both paradigms.

In many organizations, change means developing a kind of vision in isolation of a genuinely open conversation. This occurs in organizational processes that “look like” emergent processes but are intended to manipulate people into thinking they are emergent. Or, they are intended to make people “feel” heard. Notice the the difference between people “feeling” heard and actually “being” heard. Another manipulation. (Personally, I think this process of manipulation can occur even one has a positive intent. As I said, I’ve regrettably done this in the past.)

In a change process, if you deal with the status quo, the first thing that happens is that people state all the impossibilities of why things cannot be changed. Lots of change processes suppress that and use unilateral control to say “This is how we will solve it.” However, another approach is to treat the impossibilities as design boundaries to work with.
Roger offered an alternative model of change to the "motivate people to change" model. One way looks like this:

In this model, whoever is wanting to serve into existence a solution to a perceived problem could assume that they have some knowledge about the problem and how to solve it. There would then be a set of transactions around power, money, and solutions to the problem.

Another way in which change can take place is through a focus on the intent that they are trying to serve into existence. This would be different than focusing on solving a problem.

In this model, the attention is on the shared intent. Transactions still exist, but they are a by-product of the focus on the shared intent rather than the focal point. This particular model of change is teleologic, for its focus on telos (aim, purpose). It is the focus on FINAL cause in Aristotle’s model.

**Homework**

Oh my, homework after all this?

There will be a reading posted about holism. In the mean time, Roger asked everyone to figure out their ecological footprint. He wanted to know how many earths would be required if everyone on the planet lived like you do. Here is one calculator. There are 26 questions. I think it takes about 10 minutes to complete.


**Meeting 6: May 11, 2010**

**note:** It’s me again, Linda. I’m afraid, as you will see in this blog, that I have failed you this week in my role as scribe. As you all know, Roger is in China. So, I was serving as the alleged facilitator. I had forgotten the kinds of emotional demands it takes to effectively "hold a space" for others. Pete Schwartz has been serving the [SUSTAIN](http://www.sustainslo.pbworks.com/w/page/24998799/Change%20Management%20and%20Action%20Research%20Workshop) group in this way (thank you, Pete) for the last several months so I am out of practice.

Incidentally, Roger is in China as one of the key people on an international initiative on Low Carbon Cities. Adrienne Greve is also working in this very important design space. She is slated to be in China and Korea this summer to present the work that she has been doing to aid the transition to Low Carbon Cities through policy. Low Carbon Cities is one of the three current initiatives of the SUSTAIN group.

One of the reasons that it was difficult for me in this week’s meeting is that I am actually experiencing my change. The thing that I wanted to change was that I wanted to be “whole.” Actually, my theory of change is that we are born whole, and to “get there,” it’s really a matter of removing the things in my attentional space that are preventing me from experiencing wholeness. Oddly enough, I am experiencing this greater wholeness, and I did not anticipate the consequences, not exactly ever having experiencing this before. I’m experiencing
beauty more fully in all those around me and it has a sensory component to it (imagine that!). I'm hoping this will pass or transform into something else, because frankly, it is quite distracting. It's a little like something Roger described to me in a different context: Let's say you get your teeth cleaned and suddenly you have this new, slippery sensation on your teeth. You know how you keep running your tongue over your teeth because of the new sensation of smoothness? It's like that.

This week was supposed to be our self-induced midterm exams. We broke up into small groups and reviewed with one another the status of our change processes. I have no idea what was happening in other conversations, so I will skip to the summary of the larger group conversation.

**Change begins with "I"**
Pete kicked us off by revealing that his group discussed his efforts to change a very important 3-some dynamic in his life. What he discovered in the conversation was that all the interventions they discussed were about him as part of this threesome. He found that very interesting. I didn't have the presence of mind in the moment to explore further what he meant by "interesting." I was distracted by this beautiful thing about Pete: he directly reveals his own personal struggles and often the way in which he is participating in their existence. He does this without blame or shame, but with a kind of freedom in the truth of it. Very practical, Pete is. (Speaking like Yoda, I am.)

### What is a "change model" exactly?

Then I believe Tonia pointed out her confusion around what a "change model" is, exactly. I was no help in this regard. I blame the Roger for this. I can't recall what came of this conversation because I was again distracted by her "self." I don't know Tonia well, but my experience of her over the years is that she has this wonderfully open disposition and a genuine inquiry around things. When she speaks, you can almost sense her humble interest in learning new things. What a beautiful human quality.

But back to the moment...I believe that what we are attempting to do together is verify theories of change in our own lives through practicing change and examining the results. This is also called "participatory action research." This will demand of us a certain kind of rigor. If we are to have intellectual integrity, it will demand that we look closely at our theories of what it is that we are attempting to change, our theory of how change occurs, our theory of the process of change, our actions as part of that system, the evidence of change, and the congruence between all of these. Of course, we will also need to have an awareness of things we did not account for. And that awareness (according to Torbert) comes when we encounter the unexpected in the course of our change process. These places of "conflict" or interruption become the entry point for further exploration and greater understanding. It's funny. Oftentimes in engineering research, we call these places of interruption "outliers" and delete them from the data set. In this way, we continue to perpetuate our belief in what we believe we know...we only accept the data that conforms to our expected behavior. The evidence of an healthy organization, according to Torbert, is the extent to which it welcomes interruption in the plans, as these are the opportunities to deconstruct our existing mental models and learn something new.

As I think about this, it occurs to me that we are becoming more alert to living. All of life is change and action,...more change, more action. We are exploring ways in which we can consciously choose to participate in all of life (i.e., change). So I think that a "change model" is simply a belief about how things happen. But Roger, please correct me if I'm wrong. All of us are living these beliefs out, but we are often not conscious of doing that. By surfacing our models of change (and this definitely takes some exploration into our own mental models), we can create new options of interacting with the world around us.

I recall Roger saying once that a change model is evidenced by the expression of "need". For example, I often tell myself I need to fulfill this or that promise that I made. On closer examination, I have a belief that honoring my commitments somehow honors other people, creates a stronger continuity in my relationships with others. This somehow strengthens the social fabric in the world and achieves for me a kind of community and personal peace about the world that I participate in.

### Who are we in the system? What is the system?

Somehow we got onto the topic of who we are in larger systemic change and whether change in a larger human system began with ourselves or whether it began outside of ourselves. Trevor stated how he was seeing that by changing ourselves, we are forever changing the system. He said a lot more than this, but I was distracted in the moment by his wonderful passion to serve the greater good. That is a consistent and endearing quality of his. I cannot reconstruct what he said, my apologies. It was something about noticing all the ways in which academics construct monuments to their own egos and his desire for a different kind of impact.

Then a funny thing happened. Several of us sunk into a powerful hypnotic state induced by a conversation about RPT, policy, rules and whether or not we should play the game and change the system from the inside or if "resistance is futile" (no, really, I'm not a Trekkie). Of course this is a completely mesmerizing conversation for all (i.e., if you are a faculty member in the process of tenure). Adrienne pointed out that there are policy rules in the system, made and implemented by beings unknown to her, that govern one's future employment status at Cal Poly. Eric pointed out, having recently been through the process, that this story, he discovered, was a powerful mythology. Someone else pointed out that it's essentially easy to see it as mythology if you have tenure. Sema, with beautiful self-revealing honesty and grace, brought up an example of an oppressive
experience that was caused by an individual exercising unilateral control. These are all real encounters of what I will call oppression that we are either experiencing, enacting or perpetuating. Are these things "real" or "created?" What power do we have to change them? What to do? (Where is the Roger when you need him?)

Eric said something that I think was very wise…but alas, I was so taken by his earnest and humble desire to create change in all of Cal Poly…I truly did not hear a thing he said. (You can see the kind of problem this new state of "wholeness" is causing.) [Eric, feel free to add here where you said: ]

This powerful state of hypnosis was broken quite simply by Sean intervening with this opening statement, "I don't even know what RPT is..." Once again, I feel terrible about this, but I cannot recall what Sean actually said. I have known Sean since he was a freshman. I've read his change model and I felt I was witnessing a transformed person before my eyes. Sean was speaking with confidence about his views, things that are very meaningful to him and have kept him returning to our group. This moment for me was like that FarSide cartoon.

Interventions in systems...what are the options for shifting a paradigm?

At the apparent closing, a few offered comments about the Meadows reading. Eli found it inspiring in some way. I think that she was referring to there being different options for creating a paradigm change. But again, I'm inferring. My attention was on the fact that she probably deals with peoples' internal world all day, yet brings her full person and attention to the our conversation, where we are trying to unlock our internal worlds together…fascinating, and humbling.

Nina, ever sensitive to the subtleties of communication, pointed out how our choice of words can have a large impact, even though they hold similar meanings. I find I fall prey to victimization of my own inattention to this subtle dimension of communication. I'm probably doing it right now. I hope I'm not offending anyone in this hole-ly recollection.

Sema provided an example of shifting paradigms from Turkey….she spoke of a Turkish leader, Atatürk, who, in his brilliance, introduced a new Turkish alphabet. The act of doing that somehow created a great deal more equality for women. (As an aside, this reminded me of an idea promoted by Buckminster Fuller…if you want to change someone's mind, don't try to change it directly. Give them a tool through the use of which their minds will be changed). She said that he was viewed as a great hero for a long time, but now there is a shift in paradigm to view him as a dictator. (Sema is so alive and always thinking about how she can improve the lives of others; I am so grateful to her.) Pete asked if Atatürk was a dictator and Sema said, "It was certainly difficult to control the PTA..."
Now, for me, the funny thing in this moment was this question, "Can someone be a great hero and a dictator at the same time?" Is someone's status as a "hero" an objective status or a story that we tell about them? Is someone's status as a "dictator" the same? A paradigm is a mental model that is widely shared. So, what is our role in giving life or form, through the mental models that we hold, to any paradigm? Can people be dictators without us thinking they are so? [From my life, can "Roger" be an jerk without me thinking he is one?] How do our mental models create the power dynamic? This is a question I suspect was often asked about Nazi Germany. For those who participated in Nazi Germany's atrocities, to what extent did their mental models enter into their behavior? All those engineers who designed and built the gas chambers, were they enacting a reality that they themselves had created?

How is this relevant for us? I am often wondering about the ways in which I am creating not just my own, but the suffering around me, or the suffering in the larger world system. We all want change in our immediate worlds, if only this is the world of our departments or the world of Cal Poly. But what are the ways that our actions are serving to make the system function as it is? I don't know the answer to this. I am just wondering.

**Meeting 5: May 4, 2010**

*note:* Your faithful servant, Linda here. I am happy to report that I quickly overcame the emotional trauma of the check-in. See? Not to worry.

Roger will be in China next week, so our homework is for us to meet in pairs or groups and review our personal change experiments next week. He also said that we can avoid this task, but pay attention to our tendency to avoid it. That is, notice that you are doing that.

We began our time together with a check-in. I kicked it off by revealing that I attempted the homework without sufficient consideration of what my actions might have. I had done this by choosing an alternative to unilateral control. What I had done was to choose instead a mode of transparency with a "stuck" professional collaboration. I chose to confess that upon consideration, there was a way in which I had been disingenuous over the past two years of the attempted collaboration of co-writing a manuscript by hiding my frustration with the slowness of the process. There was more. I did all this without the other person requesting any of it, with a naive notion that being more transparent would serve a different kind of relationship. Anyway, what I didn't account for was that the other person was very much inside a system of relating to me with unilateral control about it. Her reaction to my confession was to respond, amusingly to me, with severing the 2-year project relationship in a 500-word nasty-gram which began with this line: "CONFIDENTIAL: The following message may not be forwarded, quoted or paraphrased." (I'm quoting it here to demonstrate the illusion and ineffectiveness of unilateral control.) The important lesson for me, which I don't seem to be learning, is that when one is inside of a particular paradigm, any action that I take to in an effort to dissolve that paradigm only serves to confirm their chosen reality and amplify their experience of whatever they believe it happening.

Roger then said (approximately a week too late, in my view) that we haven't sufficiently talked about ecology in a change process. We haven't had a deep consideration of successfully creating the change we want to create. What are the risks in success? What investment do I have in the current system? What are you trying to conserve?

### Unilateral control and problems

One of the things we need to consider in a situation where we are exerting unilateral control is, What am I getting out of it? If I release it, what are the risks? Can you unilaterally release unilateral control?

Roger asserts that we are often defined by our problems, but are we aware of it? Is the necessity of having the problem examined or unexamined? He illustrated this through a story about a gentleman he was working with who was deathly allergic to cats. He found that his allergy enabled him to create a private space in his home where only he was allowed to enter. I think the moral of this story was that there was a way in which the man's allergy was serving a purpose in his life that he was unconscious of. When we become conscious of the ways in which our problems are serving some other need in our life, we suddenly have a new set of options around meeting that need. Otherwise, we can be unconsciously invested in keeping that problem alive. Or, we can successfully create a change and lose something we valued in the process.

### The map is not the territory

Somehow we got onto the conversation about the re-presentational nature of our experience of reality. Roger repeated Chomsky's assertion that we do not directly experience reality, but symbolically re-present it to ourselves and to others. That is, in an encounter with reality, we sample it, create a model of it in our minds, perhaps add meaning to that model, create a kind of theory and/or belief system about that model. This new re-presentation of "reality" becomes our model of reality and we become unconscious that we have substituted our model for reality (or the map for the actual territory). In this process, we necessarily do three things:

- delete [parts of reality]
- distort [parts of reality]
- generalize [isolated data to larger systems or experiences]
I am doing this right now. For those of you who were there, notice how I’ve deleted all reference to orgasms. (There are some things that are simply outside of the engineer’s lexicon.)

Faculty are quite expert at this re-presentational activity regarding “students” and it goes a little like this: A student comes to me for help on a homework problem and has not fully read the assigned chapter. I begin to say to myself and colleagues “Students are lazy.” In this act, I’ve deleted the fact that this young person has worked hard to get to college, have possibly distorted the event of him not reading the whole chapter into the attribution of "laziness" and generalized this one encounter to all students. (By the way, I NEVER do this...just giving an example of how prevalent and unconscious our behavior can be, in case you happen to notice others doing this.)

Roger asserted that these three processes (deletion, distortion and generalization) can be used in skilled inquiry. One can listen for ways that the speaker is engaged in one of them (e.g., distortion) and use it as a way to inquire. If you can inquire into the distinctions inside of the, for example, distortion, does it bring more clarity? I'm not exactly sure what this process would look like, but I am interested in seeing it in action. It may go something like this: I assert that students are lazy (I NEVER do this.) One might say, “How do you know that they are lazy? What is the evidence? ” If one is honest, an inquiry like this would not get very far without seeing a clear misalignment between the assertions and the evidence. It’s funny. In our “scientific” roles, we often insist on a kind of evidence-based rigor, but we don’t often require that in other areas of our lives, for example, when we are dealing with people. We somehow give ourselves the freedom to delete, distort and generalize at will. And, in my opinion, much of traditional science also suffers from an unexamined deletion, distortion and generalization (I’m generalizing here).

**Aristotle’s Model of Causality**

Roger then began to introduce Aristotle’s model of causality, which involves four “causes.”: material, efficient, formal and final. Roger arranged these in a 2 x 2 matrix as shown below.

These are Aristotle’s four types of causality. In this picture, Roger sees the bottom half representing as representing a focus on the material world. The top half represents attention on the relational. It occurs to me that the bottom half is focused more on “external” while the top is “internal”.

The Roger uses a sculpture to illustrate these. So, if you were making a sculpture, if it were made of clay, wood or ice or stone, that would certainly influence the final outcome. The process that you chose would also influence the outcome. So, if your sculpture was ice and you chose to use heat to melt in the shape rather than chisel or cast it, that would also influence the final outcome. The design or form of that you had envisioned also influences it; a statue of mickey mouse would of course be different than one of a horse. The intent would also influence the outcome. The statue that was created as a tribute will be different than one that is intended for commercial success.

I’ve selected images to represent the kind of relationships that each area represents. The “material” represents a kind of object to object relationship. The “efficient” is a subject (the person) who manipulates objects. In the formal domain, people begin to relate to one another as subjects (i.e., those with interests, feelings, values) like...
themselves. This subject-subject relationship is also known as "intersubjectivity." The final cause is a domain where the relationship is transpersonal, where people begin to consider something bigger than themselves.

In terms of organizations, the "material" represents assets, inventory, content, stocks. The "efficient" represents action, process, information flows, and governance. The "formal" represents ideation, emergence, vision and thought. The "final" represents service, values, transcendence.

For the last 200-300 years, western civilization has been focusing their efforts on the bottom half of these set of causes as the place where they take action. It is the realm of focus on external things, of materials things. In particular, for the modern, these body of distinctions around cause have been collapsed down to the "efficient" domain, where modern "science" resides. It is this domain which focuses on manipulating objects (usually for useful and oftentimes benevolent ends, but not always). The Roger compared this to the way in which "love" in our modern times has collapsed from the distinctions of:

- eros: the celebration of all life
- philos: love of companionship
- agape: service-based, transcendental love

onto the sub-section of eros which represents the sexual. This is particularly true in our (US) culture. In the same way, much of what we consider when we consider intervening to change a system, is collapsed from all the options to the realms of "material" and "efficient".

In terms of the personal change work that we have been doing, one could see that visioning what our lives would look like in 5-years, 1-year, 8-weeks is an action of thought or ideation that falls within the "Formal" domain. The formal domain is the realm of deriving meaning. Time and space fall within this domain as well, whereas "Final" (or telos) is prior to time and space. Organizational visions reside in "formal" domain of action, but are not often viewed as "causal" to achieving the outcome. (There is a question here: Is it possible that placing one's attention on "visions" can causally move one toward that vision? What about placing one's attention on "intent"?) The interventions organizations choose to accomplish the vision are often in the "efficient" and "material." At Cal Poly, you can see this happening before your very eyes: In the face of budget crisis, "fixing" the problem consists of getting more money somehow (student fees, reducing costs by laying off lecturers--the "material") to increasing class size (process--"efficient"). In terms of systems interventions, interventions in the bottom half are considered low-impact interventions.

Shirley mentioned Einstein's urging that we can't solve problems at the same level of thinking that we used when we created them. I believe that he would encourage us to evolve to the top half of this diagram, which Roger refers to as the relational domain. Unlike the bottom domain, the medium of work for the relational domain is "internal."

Now, what types of interventions might proceed from each of these domains?
around systems interventions (Donella Meadows, "Thinking in Systems: A Primer"). The size of the circles represent the leverage within that particular type of intervention. So, working in the realm of "intent" is the realm of paradigms and mental models. By changing those could drive different decisions about all the other things. For example, getting an college degree has often been seen as a pathway to employment. What if it was about educating a kind of citizen who could create a more just and equitable future for all of society? This would be a very different intent with probably very different decisions around form, process and material (I'm digressing here).

Roger also drew a picture of the kind of change associated with interventions in "efficient" "formal" and "final." In efficient (or action), the operative mode of working is unilateral control, the application of force. Change in this domain typically is large, immediate and transient. It doesn't last because this type of change requires the continual application of force. It is exhausting! I will add here that a change in the material that requires a continual application of money cannot be sustained either. This would be the "charity" model of change, which requires a continually successful fundraising activity.

In the realm of formal (or thought), there is incremental change, but that change doesn't last either. In both cases, the change inventions have not dealt with the assumptions that produced the "problem." That is, they have not dealt with the mental models that are collectively held by those in the system that are actually creating the outcome in the form of policies, procedures, and actions. Roger then challenged us to an experiment to determine if we actually have control over our thoughts. He said to test this, one would simply need to sit for 5 minutes to see if you can not think. He predicts the outcome of that experiment is that you will see that you actually don't have control of your thoughts.

Where do we have control? He asserts it is in the realm of "final" or intent. The primary medium of action for this domain is attention. He asserts that we do have control over our attention or can develop it. I am guessing that this falls within Roger's theory that free attention is what is required for change because it enables us to better see the congruency (or incongruency) of our intent, our thoughts, our actions. This would be supported by Torbert's suggestion that we develop "interpenetrating attention." Free attention also makes be more creative about the choices we are making ("formal") and our actions "efficient".

![Diagram of change types](image.png)

**Homework**

Answer the question, "what is a system?" Do the research on what others say (Laszlo, Bertalanffy, Bateson, Capra, Checkland, Meadows, Senge, Forrester), and come up with your own definition. How do you recognize a system? Do systems have a purpose or not? What is the difference between human and non-human systems?

Read the following documents on causality (by Roger) [Burton-Causality.doc](http://sustainslo.pbworks.com/w/page/24998799/Change%20Management%20and%20Action%20Research%20Workshop) and systems interventions (by Donella Meadows) [Meadows-system-interventions.doc](http://sustainslo.pbworks.com/w/page/24998799/Change%20Management%20and%20Action%20Research%20Workshop).

**Meeting 4: April 27, 2010**

*note:* Linda here. Once again, I offer my perspective with all the distortions caused by filtering the events through my mind. Please feel free to offer your perspectives.

**A review of our journey to date**

Today's session began with a review of what we have learned so far, this time, by Roger. At one of the meetings, Roger said that he is most interested in verifying our theories through experiments situated in our own lives. That is, this workshop is all about managing change ("Change Management") through the practice of change in our own lives ("Action Research"). The things that we are doing are in service to creating, managing and assessing those changes.

**Kantor's change model**, which requires one to make explicit four implicit theories of their own thinking/behavior:

1. theory of the "thing" [that one wants to change]
2. theory of change [related to the thing]
3. theory of process [of change]
4. theory of who I am [in relation to all of the above]

**practice:** We were to apply this change model to something we wanted to change in our lives.
Critical inquiry into contextual value sets.

This was a homework assignment in which we were to examine the thing that we desired changed and ask ourselves the question, “If I had that, what would it bring me?” We were to recursively ask ourselves this question until we arrived at something that we found intrinsically valuable. This exercise was meant to uncover our values (or “ends” that we are seeking) through a kind of critical inquiry.

For example, I may want more free time. I would ask myself, if I had free time, what would it bring me? I may say, it would give me a chance to do x. What would x bring me…eventually, I would arrive at something like “peace.” I think that the value in doing this exercise is that it frees our attention to be more creative about achieving the means. My experience is that the means often get confused with the ends and that having a fuller understanding of what we are really seeking (the “ends”) liberates us. That is, it would be easy to get fixated on the “means,” when a free attention may enable one to see that if they implemented changes in another arena, they would more directly achieve their “ends.”

Oh, an example for the world of education is our collective obsession with grades. Somewhere we have forgotten that grading (“means”) is supposedly a proxy measure of learning (“ends”). And in this process, the focus on the grades can often actually diminish our achievement of learning!

As an aside, it occurs to me that this exact practice (critical inquiry into value sets) is at the heart of practices of “design innovation,” as practiced by IDEO. It enables the designer to see other options for meeting the clients needs (“values”).

Strategic Formalization of value indicators.

This was another homework assignment in which we were to take our intrinsically valued qualities that we uncovered in the Critical Inquiry and imagine what our lives would look like if we possessed the ends we were seeking. We were to do this at the 5-yr, 1-yr and 8-wk mark at a level of detail that one would observe if they were videotaping ourselves at those points.

strategic

adjective. relating to the identification of long-term or overall aims and interests and the means of achieving them

In other words, we were to use our values to strategically imagine the form that our lives would take if we were living these values. In my mind, this activity answers the question, “If your life was consistent with your values, what would it look like?”

practice: We were to apply this strategic formalization to the something we wanted to change in our lives.

Self-Observation

I'm not remembering what this was about. But it had something to do with reflecting on the three things above.

A reflective interlude by Roger: What does it all mean?

In the course of review, Roger said, “By the way, I don't believe any of these are real,” by which we can only guess what he meant. He proceeded to say that the models are a way for us talk about change, but he is not attached to any of them as a “reality.”

For me, this is one of the beautiful qualities of the Roger: He does not insist that anyone adopt his point of view. One could not notice that he is NOT insisting for you to change your thinking if one has known nothing but a world of right and wrong. That is, it would be easy to hear what the Roger is saying and imagine that he is saying “this is the right way to understand it,” especially if you’ve never encountered anything but that dynamic.

I had trouble when I first met the Roger because my engineering worldview mostly consisted of “right” and “wrong.” So, amusingly, as if there was a slide projector in my mind, I kept seeing on the screen of the Roger, someone who was insisting on his view being “right.” For a long time, I said to myself, “Something's not right here.” Luckily, I did not spend much energy on trying to fix the what I saw on the screen, as I normally do in other areas of my life. Of course, trying to fix what is on the screen is quite futile when the image originates in the projector. It took me a while to see that I was actually seeing MY insistence on having the “right” view simply projected onto the Roger.

I forget who said this, but it's in one of Senge's book, "Insisting that someone adopts your point of view is a demand for obedience." Once I saw this, I suddenly felt like I was being violent to another human when I attempted for them to see things my way. This institutionalized practice of telling others they are "wrong" is one of the things I was thinking about when I said that I feel as if we live in a system of institutionalized violence. back to the class...

Roger then reminded us of the homework activities that we were doing "in the background." These were an activity on defining for ourselves, "What is a problem?" and "What is the source of our action?" He then asserted his belief that we would not really talk about these. We then proceeded to talk about them.

In the course of the dialogue about our background activities that we were not going to have, people revealed several insights, which I will have trouble recreating, so I invite all to add to my recollection.

"Problems" were viewed in many ways. Some saw "problems" as states that people desired to change, some without a negative association with the word "problem." Pete said that he often experiences "negative emotions" with "problems," and his new strategy is to actually notice and experience these emotions, rather than to put his efforts into changing whatever he perceives to be causing these emotions. Roger asserted his suspicion the "problems" exist only in the face of another, "idealized" state. This brought up the issue of pain and pleasure, reward and punishment--our relationship to these.

Somehow we got on the topic of death and dying and whether or not that is a problem. I’ll bypass this part of the conversation.

Some viewed "problems" as containing "opportunities." Liz pointed out that the way we talk about problems (or anything, really) is laden with value judgments. It seems impossible to get away from that in our language.
The word "problem" has a negative connotation, perhaps a negativity that limits the set of solutions that we see." Liz pointed out that the ability to see a range of options to "solve" a problem is rooted in the ability to be present in the moment, which she finds quite challenging.

It was pointed out that a lot of our feeling of necessity about problems or solving problems is rooted in our identity (either with having the problem or solving the problem). There was this question, "If we are identified with a problem, what does that then imply about our investment in them?" I didn't say this, but this reminds me of one of the star trek films where the galaxy had somehow obtained a state of galactic peace. In the face of this peace, the "good guys" and the "bad guys" were both seeking to create a kind of new war so they they had something to do. (No, I'm not a trekkie, I swear it!)

The conversation on the Torbert paper

We transitioned to a conversation on Torbert and the ideas that he presented in his paper "Why is educational research so uneducational?" A central thesis of this paper was that the way in which we were doing research creates the phenomenon that the research results do not inform the practice in useful ways. His characterization of current social science research is as a scientist standing outside of a social system and examining it as an "object" of study, separated from ourselves. He further asserts that researchers have a mental model of unilateral control. This consists of "controlled" experiments to produce generalized theories that can predict behaviors of human systems.

His premise was that we, as researchers, are filtering all of our observations and subsequent interpretations through our human selves, so we necessarily influence the measurements. We therefore both influence/distort what we are trying to observe, making our empirical data not "objectively measured" by our methods as we assume, but "produced" by our methods with all their inherent biases.

What to do? He suggests that we need a new research model which he calls collaborative inquiry. This new model requires the cultivation of a kind of "interpenetrating attention" that enables the researcher to see the interconnections between their theories, the empirical data AND the information that comes through intuition and sensual experience. In traditional scientific research, we place a high priority and value on theory and empirical data and delete the influence of the researcher, the researcher's mental model and the researcher's methods.

Torbert's call for a collaborative inquiry is premised on the fact that we cannot adequately "see" ourselves (like the eye cannot see itself) without the assistance of others. If this is true, if we need others, Torbert suggests that it is necessary to develop a new politic of inquiry based on:

- A shared wish to research everyday lives together
- People of a new ethics based on the commitment to confront apparent incongruities in their common life;
- Development of skills in discriminating the degree of trustworthiness of experiential-empirical data.

Then a funny thing happened. Roger referred to Torbert, in his paper, as very articulate. He then asked what Torbert meant by "six dimensions of human activity" (spatial: gravity, levity, extension | temporal: duration, eternity and intention.) Of course, this all made me wonder how Roger was using the word "articulate."

Homework:

Our assignment is for each of us to find someplace where we are participating in unilateral control. Observe ourselves. Begin to consider what alternatives are. If brave enough, try them out.

OR, do the revers--consider chaos. Test unilateral control. Before implementing, consider the full implications.

Meeting 3: April 20, 2010

note: This record of our time together is being entered by Linda Vanasupa. Again, I will make no pretenses about the non-biased nature of my entries. I'm presenting snippets, in a non-chronological order. In fact I am a little punchy right now, so some of this may be a tad mischievous. I encourage others to make entries. We are in the process of moving this blog to a location where inserting your entries in context will be easier.

A dialogue, accidentally practiced without a directive to do so.

Today's session began with a review of what we have learned so far. Several people spoke. I will not recreate it here, but do invite others to offer up what they contributed. Some of the things that were mentioned were: Suspension, an awareness of choices that we have in a conversation (polite, difference, inquiry, generative), the awareness of habitual models of change (or "default" models that we enact without consciously choosing them). Many of these are well-articulated in the Bohm reading, which is now available in an easier format. Here is the preface by Senge:


I must confess that my current fatigue is preventing me from recalling much of what we spoke about. I'm also
distracted by the fact that we actually were practicing (without knowing this), a kind of dialogue together. We were speaking about change models. What happened during this dialogue, as I saw it, was that we seemed to genuinely enter a state of inquiry several times. People were asking questions that were real for them and inquiring to others statements (to a lesser degree) for clarification. Others posed possible answers but also posed further questions. There were times in the conversation when someone asserted a difference. There were also times where the conversation jumped from one point to a somewhat distant other. What I noticed is that this occurred mostly because people were genuinely listening to and reflecting on what someone else had said, but a little behind since the conversation had moved. There were several times when people came back to an issue that was raised in the conversation earlier. I will say that I noticed that some people did not speak at all and I plan to be more mindful of my choices next time so that those who are less inclined to speak will have the "room" to do so.

One of the central questions was: Is change possible without manipulation? This conversation spawned another question: What is meant by manipulation? Luanne, armed with a iPad, offered up two definitions, one dripping with value judgments and the other descriptive of a process:

MANIPULATE
1 handle or control (a tool, mechanism, etc.), typically in a skillful manner : he manipulated the dials of the set.
2 control or influence (a person or situation) cleverly, unfairly, or unscrupulously : the masses were deceived and manipulated by a tiny group.

Another question was: Is there a difference between personal change models (for something in one's own life) and a model of change for a larger system like an institution? Do these model scale up (from individual to system)? Roger, curiously (to me) stated that he was not at all interested in that question. (I was not interested in Roger's lack of interest in the question, but graciously did not say that out loud :) ) This lead to the a conversation about "scale" ...what does it mean to scale something up (presumably from person to system of people)? Does this presume something about time? Space? Reality? (yes, yes, yes, but what?) These question eventually uncovered the Roger's association of "scaling up" something (in an Adam Smith kind of "economy of scale" way) with the a mental model of deficiency (i.e., something exists here and it doesn't exist there, how can we scale it up to reproduce it over there). This association may explain the Roger's lack of interest in this industrial era question "Does it scale?" As you can see, it really was curious to me when Roger said he wasn't interested and I was being facetious when I said I wasn't interested in his lack of interest.

But others questioned the meaning of scale in human systems. Ruth used the analogy of fractals (an infinite, self-propagating pattern that shows interest at every level of resolution), and viruses. She stated that the mechanism of propagation for these phenomenon did not occur to her as the same process that occurs in the kind of replication and centralized distribution present in economy of scale. This was a very interesting (to me) differentiation. Viral propagation occurs to me as a kind of change model. If we believe in the wisdom of biological systems, this may hold a number of lessons in change for us.

Observing others' change models
Roger asked about our progress and we collectively had little to report. We were asked to listen for when someone is asserting a change model. Personally, I don't exactly know the difference between when someone is asserting a change model and when they are asserting a mental model. A clue which Roger offered is that "change models" are present when someone asserts a "necessity" about doing something. Behind that belief that "something must be done" is another belief about how "that which must be done" will cause a change of state to a presumably better state (see homework below). There are also assumptions about where the power lies in the process of change and who that person is in the process.

Robert Fritz's model of structural dynamic tension
Roger introduced another change model which is around a concept proposed by Robert Fritz. Fritz's theory is that there is a creative tension created in a system by the difference between the current state and the aspirational state. The theory is that creative tension seeks a resolution toward a more stable point, that dynamic systems migrate toward points of stability. The theory of change is that you can move toward the aspirational state as the point of stability by placing your attention on the VALUES you hold in the aspirational state.
To illustrate this, Roger asked us to consider something in our lives which we wanted to change. (For me, I'd like to get more exercise. Most of my exercise comes in the form of typing...this is not a load-bearing activity, regrettably). We were then asked to imagine the current state...in doing this, we were asked to notice everything about how that current state feels...physically, emotionally. Then we were asked to imagine the aspirational state and notice everything about how the aspirational state felt. We were then asked to attempt to feel both. Observe. Bring your attention to the values around the aspirational state.

Roger reports that others can experience a kind of oscillation between current and aspirational. (If this account is not confusing enough, see homework below).

Homework for next week:
1. From last week: Listen for others’ change models & review the Torbert paper from last week (2010Torbert.pdf) to have a detailed dialogue about it next week.
2. Continue to work with the thing we want to change.
3. Answer this question: What is the “problem?” or What is a “problem?” Answer this question in a way that enables someone to recreate the problem in their lives:
   - What would it take for someone else to have that problem? What would they have to know? What would they have to feel?
   - What must be assumed for this problem to exist for you?
   - What is the structure that must exist for it to be a problem? (You might consider a specific “problem” in order to answer this question).
   - Who are you in the absence of that problem?
   - To what extent is your identity invested in the problem that you have? An indicator of this may be the degree to which that problem plays a central role in your conversations (the ones in your head or the ones outside of your head).
   - Are we really free in our free time?
   - Does Roger really want us to answer all these questions and will we get credit for it?
4. Reflect on the meaning of MANIPULATION. What do we mean by manipulation? To get at this, ask yourself, “What is the source of my action?” A way in which you may answer that question is to set aside some time each day to do nothing. Then watch the impulse arise to do something and follow the source of it.
5. In reference to Fritz’s structural change model, practice holding both states in relation to one another; observe what happens—bring focus to the VALUES of the aspirational state. Observe yourself in this.

Meeting 2: April 13, 2010

note: This record of our time together is being entered by Linda Vanasupa. It is my intent to provide this summary as a service to those who were not there and might be interested in what took place. I originally thought I would describe things objectively, but I want you all to know that I’ve quite abandoned that goal, knowing now that it is impossible. I invite others to provide feedback in the comments section to enrich the perspectives on what took place.

Check-in: Sitting in the round, we began with what Roger called a “check in.” This intent of this ritual is to build a kind of social “container” or “field” (Roger, please tell us what you mean with this word, “field”) to hold the work that we are about to do together in that moment. People are invited to say anything they want or need in order to be more present. It is possible that what happens is that someone says something and another has an association with that and responds. It is also possible that individuals come to the meeting with something that is holding their attention. The most important part of this is not what is said, but the quality of listening taking place.

I’m not quite recalling, but I believe Roger asked us to both listen and notice in ourselves when we feel the need to “fix something” about what someone else says during the check in. The check-in was a practice in awareness and listening that served the purpose of defining our social “container.”

We spent probably 15 minutes doing this. During that time, a range of things were said. One of the things that we were testing together were the questions, “Is it safe enough here to say ____?”

Building the Capacity for Change

Roger stated his theory that a core capacity for change is free attention, free energy. (I believe this literally means “attention” or “energy” that is not tied up in something else.) If free attention is required for change, a process that we may follow to be more capable of change is to find places where our attention has become fixed and habituated. Once we discover that, we could then begin to make conscious choices.

The reason, in Roger’s mind, that we would be interested in discovering our own habituation and then make choices about it is because habituation has consequences about the meaning then ascribed to external events. In my mind, this means that if I have habits of mind, they will create a kind of “reality filter” that will delete portions of reality. This can be useful, but it can have consequences that I would not choose were I aware of it.
For example, in observing myself last quarter, I found that I was constantly (and actively) thinking about all the things that I had to do, telling myself I didn't have enough time to complete them. Strangely, this habit of keeping this conversation alive in my mind was actually preventing me from accomplishing the things that needed to get done because it was tying up my attention. Once I realized I was engaged in this on-going, exhausting conversation with myself, I decided I no longer wanted to participate in it. I was then free to obsess about something else, which I promptly chose to do.

Exercise: Listening
We then did an exercise in which we paired up with another individual, preferably someone we didn't know well. In this pair of person A and person B, one was to speak first, say person A. Person B was then to re-create or re-present what person A said. We were to serve person A in this act of re-presenting what they said as evidence that they were listened to. In essence, this was an exercise in being present.

We did this for each of person A and B and then reported back about the experience. In reporting back, the issue of suspension arose. The act of suspension (from Bohm) involves mentally "shelving" one's thoughts. It is not an idealized state of mind, but an awareness of what is occurring for you while listening to others and being responsible about what is occurring for you.

For example, while listening to my partner, I found myself being distracted by my own thoughts, some of which were related to what he was saying. When I noticed this, I chose to bring my attention back to what my partner was saying rather than follow my own thoughts, remembering that I was in a role of listening rather than interpreting or adding my own experience to what he was saying. I "think" this may be a kind of suspension, but perhaps Roger can correct me if I'm wrong.

Another example of suspension (from Peter Senge) is to literally hang something up for all to examine. For example, one could say in a group, "I am noticing that this dialogue is surfacing my anxiety about X."

**Homework for next week:**

1. Read the document by William Torbert. 2010Torbert.pdf, we will have a dialogue on it next week.
2. With regard to what each of us wants to change (homework from last week), we are to ask ourselves the following questions:

   1. What do you want to conserve? or What do you want to dissolve? What do you want to nurture, have more of, etc? What is the context?
   2. If the "change" happened, what would that make possible? [continue to ask yourself that question about each of the answers until you have exhausted the question]
      - Express as a "value", not as a specific form of something; This is essentially the answer to the question, "Why do you care about this?"
      - With respect to the "value," choose measurable indicators that you would see if the "change" happened: a 5-year indicator, a 1-year indicator and an 8-week indicator. That is, if someone followed you around with a video camera at that time, how would they know/see that the change had taken place.

3. Over the course of the week, listen for one person's change model. It is better to choose someone who is not in the class. Listen in a conversation for a change model that they are expressing (or assuming).

**Meeting 1: April 6, 2010**

**setting:** Cal Poly's Kennedy Library, room 510B, Tuesdays 12:10–2:00 PM starting April 6, 2010 and running through May.

**attending:** 3 community member (Ruth Rominger); 21 Cal Poly members (4 students, 2 staff, remaining faculty representing all colleges except business)

**why people came to participate** (summary of comments): recognize a current state of change and desire to be effective in the change, to learn, to grow.

Roger introduced the first of many models of change. These are essentially beliefs around reality and how that reality can be changed. The reality is anything from a personal state of being to an organizational system. This particular model can serve as a framework for inquiry when one is interested in changing something. It requires awareness of four dimensions.

**David Kantor's model of change** (brief: David Kantor whose bio can be found [here](#); His most recent work is around emergent models of leadership and change.)

- The theory of the "thing" (What is it? What are assumptions you must make to define it?)
- The theory of change (What is the nature of reality around this "thing" and how is changed caused?)
- The theory of process (If the above is true, what would be the steps of creating change? How would you know that you've achieved the state that you are seeking?)
- The theory of self (Who am I in the process of change?)
Homework for next week on working with an issue that "should" change
Choose something that, in your mind, needs to be changed. (I have chosen two items: I want to personally be whole and I want to change the way we educate people at the university.) Then use Kantor's model of change to on this particular "thing" that you want changed.

Example – these are just ways in which I (LV) experienced it...I invite you to add your experiences through the comment tool below.

Theory of the thing
Using the example of personal wholeness, I would need to state that I have a belief that there is such a thing as personal wholeness and that the human condition can be "unwhole." I would have to state that I believe that it is possible move from a state "A" (unwhole) to a state "B" (whole).

Theory of change
I would have to describe how one moves from state A to state B. I may say something like "Change requires filling in the parts of the self that I find insufficient or incomplete."

Theory of process
The first steps I would then take in this process is to implement a self-awareness where I vigilantly observed ways in which I was imperfect and sought to rectify those imperfections through a kind of personal growth. How would I know I had achieved this final "whole" state? It is clear as I write this that my assumption of the thing implies a state of perfection that can be described and achieved. But as I type, I can see that this is not possible.

Theory of self
In my model of change, I am the agent of change. I am both responsible for enacting the change and for achieving the outcome.

Bohm's Model of Dialogue
Roger also introduced this particular model of collective dialogue. "Dialogue" (in the use by David Bohm) is meant here as kind of generative way of collectively creating something that is radically different from a discussion. Bohm’s model describes four types of dialogue: polite, difference (conflicting), inquiry (inquirying) and generative. They are represented in this image. The bottom half of the figure refers to a focus on the material, whereas the top half refers to a focus on relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>generative</th>
<th>inquiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>create new from the whole</td>
<td>attempt to see other’s viewpoint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| polite | conflicting |
| unexpressed differences | attempt to impose viewpoint |

He discussed the consequences of each of these types of dialogue and how each is experienced. An example of a primary contrasting experience was in the "conflicting" mode, when one experiences someone else in the group saying something that they were about to say, the feeling and reaction is a competition with that other person for the ownership of the idea. This same phenomenon can happen in the "generative" domain of dialogue, but the feeling and reaction is one of interconnectedness with the "other."

Homework around dialogue: Pay attention to how you interact with others and notice the strategy that you normally enact when you enter a conference that involves difference or conflict.

Reading assignment for next week: (Note, go to Meeting 3 to get a better PDF version of Bohm’s On Dialogue reading). An introduction to David Bohm’s ideas about dialogue (click link). You can also order the book from amazon.
I am so energized after these class meetings. It give me such hope that there are many others in the world who are desiring to be more authentic, more aware, more kind, and more loving. Thanks Linda for a very good summary.

lfose@calpoly.edu said at 5:42 pm on Apr 21, 2010

Thanks so much for doing this, Linda. I try to take accurate notes when Roger is talking but sometimes it is tough for me to concentrate on what he is saying and then get that down in my notes. Frankly, sometimes I just get lost! In my opinion, you have captured yesterday's workshop session quite well here and even more with your little comments about what you're thinking too. (I love your little side comments; it keeps it more entertaining to read when you open up that window to your thoughts and let us see what you're thinking. :-) )

~ Luanne

Liz Schlemer said at 11:36 am on May 12, 2010

Thank you Linda for your excellent summary, funny antidotes, and humble representation of what we are trying to do. We do miss Roger, but you did a great job of filling it. And no matter how much you are distracted, you are an amazing scribe.

lfose@calpoly.edu said at 2:20 pm on May 13, 2010

I concur with Liz. Great summary, Linda. Reading it was almost like being there... but I did miss hearing it all firsthand this week. BTW: Loved the "clean teeth" analogy.

Linda Vanasupa said at 10:49 pm on May 15, 2010

thank you liz and luanne for bringing me a smile with your commments.

Add a comment