

**University of Alberta**

Bolman and Deal's Four Frames and the Quality Standards Academic Committee: An Analysis  
of Select Past and Future Leadership Decisions  
by

Athena Photinopoulos

A capping exercise submitted to the Department of Educational Policy Studies  
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education  
in  
Administration and Leadership

Educational Policy Studies

Edmonton, Alberta  
August 18, 2021

### **Abstract**

This paper considers Bolman and Deal's four frames, as developed in *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (2017), in the context of an academic advisory committee, the Quality Standards Assurance Committee (QSAC), at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. The background of the committee is discussed, as are the attributes and central premises of each frame. The frames are then applied to select aspects of the committee as a means of reflecting on decisions made to date and to inform improvements moving forward. Application of the Structural Frame affirms the authoritative style of the QSAC that is used by many academic advisory committees. Application of the Human Resources Frame reveals potential for optimizing member engagement and satisfaction. Application of the Political Frame prompts consideration of power relations and absence of overlooked members. The use of the Symbolic Frame invites thinking about alternate ways of leading and decision-making to more genuinely engage Indigenous cultures, as well as other cultures. Finally, criticism of the frame centred on 1) a need for greater evidence that the model impacts leadership, 2) whether the frames can be voluntarily learned chosen and learned; and 3) are representative of male-dominant leadership thinking discussed and largely dispelled.

**Table of Contents**

Introduction .....	4
The Four Frames .....	7
Structural Frame .....	8
Human Resources Frame .....	9
Political Frame .....	11
Symbolic Frame .....	12
Analysis .....	13
Structural Frame: Present State .....	14
Human Resources Frame: Thinking About Member Needs .....	14
Political Frame: Balancing Power .....	16
Symbolic Frame: Making Meaning .....	17
Limitations .....	18
Conclusion.....	19
References .....	21
Appendix .....	23
Terms of Reference .....	23
Quality Standards Advisory Committee .....	23

## **Introduction**

The Faculty of Education's (Faculty) Professional Learning Unit (PLU) at the University of Alberta developed graduate level courses EDU 520, EDU 521 and EDU 523 (the leadership courses) as a term of a 2018 grant agreement with the Ministry of Advanced Education, Government of Alberta (GOA). It developed these courses to meet the academic requirements for application to the GOA's Leadership Certification for Principals and Superintendents. EDU 520 focuses on foundational dimensions of school leadership, including fostering effective relationships, knowledge about Indigenous Peoples, and managing school operations and resources. EDU 521 is rooted in research and practice and focus on developing knowledge of select leadership competencies established by the GOA. EDU 523 is designed for aspiring superintendents and centers on professional practice leading large educational systems.

A term of the grant required the Faculty to create an academic advisory committee (AAC) to advise the PLU on the maintenance and future development of the leadership courses. I was engaged as a research assistant to make recommendations with respect to the optimal structure for the advisory committee, and to develop the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the same. I analyzed context, practical and stakeholders needs alongside relevant literature and business best practices to devise options for structure, and to develop the TOR for what is presently called the Quality Standards Advisory Committee (QSAC).

As I worked with academic leaders at the UofA to establish the purpose, structure, membership and management procedures (all captured in the TOR – see Appendix, attached), I began to recognize that my work was premised on certain assumptions, as derived from the QSAC's context and my own and institutional biases. For instance, it seemed essential to determine the 'authority' for the entity in question, and I learned that legally/policy-derived or

voluntary academic advisory committee (AAC) structures were possible and the norm. In addition, I sought out Terms of Reference templates from various 'reputable' organizations in Canada and the United States, including those related academic institutions, health professions and business organizations, since a good deal of my experience comes from the academic, governmental, legal and health sectors. With respect to determining membership, I relied heavily on counsel from academic leadership, who were dialed in to the most 'relevant' educational and professional organizations. Further, the literature I used to support and inform decisions related to the development of the QSAC drew mainly from Western contemporary business journal articles, which detailed 'best practices' based on observation and on some case study exploration.

Not surprisingly, upon finalizing the TOR, I realized that I had helped to create a very 'standard' type of AAC – probably indistinguishable from most other AAC created for a similar purpose over past several decades for the Canadian and American academies. I had captured a certain type of accepted structure for the QSAC, integrated a very top-down line of authority and included fairly structured (rather than, say, democratic) processes. Conversations with one stakeholder prompted questions about how the QSAC, as proposed, meets the needs of the 'here and now' – for instance, questions arose around whether the QSAC would effectively/appropriately engage with Indigenous communities, as well as how the courses and programs that the QSAC would advise on could bridge with other academic programs and communities. I began to wonder about how alternate structure, leadership and membership, could be implemented and what positive changes could result, and discovered that Bolman and Deal had impressively wrestled with similar questions in their text *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (2017).

Bolman and Deal (2017), considering the roles of management and leadership, synthesize major theoretical traditions from organization theory to propose four 'frames' through which one might better understand and respond to professional situations, conflicts and decisions. A frame, they explain, is "a coherent set of ideas or beliefs forming a prism or lens that enables you to see and understand more clearly what's going on in the world around you" (p. 74). They argue that to lead and/or manage (more) effectively, one does not need to simply align oneself with and implement one approach or frame. Instead, one should learn to embrace several ways of understanding (i.e. frames) and apply one or more – termed 'multi-frame thinking' (p. 49) – as appropriate, to best address a situation and move forward (p. 49).

Bolman and Deal (2017) offer the four following frames: 1) Structural Frame; 2) Human Resources Frame; 3) Political Frame; and 4) Symbolic Frame. The structural frame focuses on the design of working units, as well as on roles, goals and policies (p. 52). The human resources frame emphasizes the importance of understanding people and meeting their needs (p. 52). The political frame views organizations as inherently immersed in competition – for resources, interests, power and the related (p. 52). Finally, the symbolic frame attends to meaning, as derived from ritual, story, culture, faith and the related (p. 52).

This paper introduces Bolman and Deal's (2017) four frames and discusses how the present structure and composition of the QSAC is reflective of and may benefit moving forward from Bolman and Deal's (2017) frames. It draws from AAC best practices literature that shares tones of each of the frame to support the practical solutions derived from use of the frames. Finally, it considers limitations of Bolman and Deal's (2017) work. In doing so, it offers an

example of application of the four frames, as well as some future vision for the QSAC and/or for other advisory entities that stem from a similar context or have similar considerations and needs.

### **The Four Frames**

As organizations have become pervasive and dominant, they have also become harder to understand and manage. The result is that managers are often nearly as clueless as their subordinates...think they are. The consequences of myopic management and leadership show up every day, sometimes in small and subtle ways, sometimes in catastrophes. Our basic premise is that a primary cause of managerial failure is faulty thinking rooted in inadequate ideas. Managers and those who try to help them too often rely on narrow models that capture only part of organizational life. (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 49).

Bolman and Deal (2017) assert that learning multiple frames or perspectives can help leaders devise new understandings and questions, and develop new tools and approaches for effective problem-solving in the organizational context. While each frame offers its “own [valuable] image of reality” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 49), the authors tote the value of their combined use – multi-frame thinking – as a means deepening one’s appreciation and understanding of organizations. Bolman and Deal’s four frames are quite compelling and digestible. This section describes each frame in more detail, including relevant origins, metaphors and underlying assumptions. An understanding of the nature and workings of each frame will be valuable background for the analysis and application of the frames to the QSAC offered in the later sections of this paper.

### **Structural Frame**

Bolman and Deal (2017) describe the structural approach as being focused on choosing the 'right people' for the 'right roles' in order to "support and accommodate both collective [i.e. organizational] goals and individual differences" (p. 78). In essence, this frame places greatest value on the architecture of how a given company's people and resources are arranged, as well as inherent power structure and responsibilities. This frame seems to be reflective of most aspects of bureaucratic organizations, including governments, large corporations and academic institutions. Not surprisingly, the metaphor used by Bolman and Deal (2017) for the Structural Frame is Factories, with their emphasis on planning, structures, hierarchy, strategy, goals, structure, technology, specialized roles and metrics.

The Structural Frame stems from two sources: 1) Frederick W. Taylor's (1911) "scientific management approach" and 2) economist and sociologist Max Weber's (1947) "monocratic bureaucracy". The scientific management approach is characterized by its focus on 'time-and-motion studies', which involves the breaking down of tasks into timed events and hiring workers to work as efficiently as possible for "each motion and moment spent at work" (p.79). The monocratic bureaucracy similarly focused on a notion maximized efficiency, but also heavily embraced hierarchy, based on an idea patriarchal control: Bolman and Deal (2017) describe Weber's idea of the organization as involving "[a] father figure—who ruled with almost unlimited authority and power...He could reward, punish, promote, or fire on personal whim" (p. 79).

Bolman and Deal offer six assumptions central to the Structural Frame. These assumptions offer further insight into the nature of and intentions of said frame. They are:



1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives and devise strategies to reach those goals.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and appropriate division of labor.
3. Suitable forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh.
4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal agendas and extraneous pressures.
5. Effective structure fits an organization's current circumstances (including its strategy, technology, workforce, and environment).
6. When performance suffers from structural flaws, the remedy is problem solving and restructuring (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 78-79).

### **Human Resources Frame**

Amazon and Nucor represent different stances in a perennial debate about the relationship between people and organizations. One side sees individuals as objects or tools, important not so much in themselves as in what they can do for the organization. The opposing camp holds that the needs of individuals and organizations can be aligned, engaging people's talent and energy while profiting the enterprise. This debate has intensified with globalization and the growth in size and power of modern institutions. Can people find freedom and dignity in a world dominated by economic fluctuations and a push for cost reduction and short-term results? (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 148).

Through contrasting two companies, Amazon and Nucor, above, Bolman and Deal (2017) invite readers to consider if there is a place for a human-centered approach to leadership, management and work. Their proposed Human Resources Frame argues that there is room to create organizations that think about workplaces and workers as a symbiotic pairing. Under this frame, organizations ask, “How do we find and retain people with the skills and attitudes to do the work?” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 149), while workers wonder “How well will this place work for me?” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 149). The goal of this frame, then, is to craft organizations that meet their desired outcomes while, at the same time, making employees feel secure and good about themselves, and about their work. The authors use the metaphor of ‘family’ (2017, p. 475) is used to describe the Human Resources Frame: families can be very complex; however, they may benefit greatly from strong relationships and have the potential to achieve when harmonious.

The Human Resources Frame evolved from the work of, at least, Mary Parker Follett (1918) and Elton Mayo (1933, 1945), who “questioned a deeply held managerial assumption that employees had no right beyond a paycheck, and their duty was to work hard and follow orders” (p. 149). They criticized this view based on two grounds – it was unjust and was bad psychology – and instead asserted that workers’ skills, attitudes, energy, and commitment are “vital resources that can make or break an enterprise” (p. 149).

Bolman and Deal argue that the Human Resources Frame is premised on the following four core assumptions:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the converse.
2. People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities.

3. When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer. Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization—or both become victims.
4. A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed (cite).

### **Political Frame**

Whereas more traditional perspectives may view organizations as being created and controlled by some central source of 'legitimate' authority that establishes structures, goals and processes, the political frame offers a different view. The political frame characterizes organization of "coalitions" comprised of interdependent individuals and groups that possess "divergent interests, scarcity, and power relations inevitably spawn political activity." (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 219). Ultimately, the authors argue, the Political Frame asserts that the "ongoing process of bargaining and negotiation" among these interested parties establishes an organization's "goals, structure, and policies" (p. 238). The Political Frame, as applied to organizations, might be likened to arenas, contests, or, especially, jungles, all of which are "ripe with conflict, negotiation, compromise and competition over power and scarce resources (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 102)."

The following five assumptions, according to Bolman and Deal (2017), underlie this Political perspective and provide a good summary of its key characteristics:

- Organizations are coalitions of different individuals and interest groups.
- Coalition members have enduring differences in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
- Most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources—deciding who gets what.

- Scarce resources and enduring differences put conflict at the center of day-to-day dynamics and make power the most important asset.
- Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining and negotiation among competing stakeholders jockeying for their own interests (p. 301).

### **Symbolic Frame**

The Symbolic Frame focuses on the importance of culture, including the myths, beliefs, rituals, symbols and the related. It argues that these items help people make sense of their world, and work. With respect to organizations specifically, the Symbolic Frame proposes that culture, might be defined as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems...[and is] taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1992, p. 12). Leaders, then, who understand the significance of an organization’s distinctive culture – its beliefs, values, and customs, for instance - might better be able to “evoke spirit and soul...[and] shape more cohesive and effective organizations...” (Bolman and Deal, 2017, p. 301). The Symbolic Frame might liken organizations to temples, tribes, theaters, or carnivals (Bolman and Deal, 2017, p. 46). It, arguably, tempers the more ‘rational’ approaches expressed via other frames and instead, “depicts organizations as cultures, propelled by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, history, and myths rather than by rules, policies, and managerial authority” (Bolman and Deal, 2017, p. 46) and is derived from five assumptions:

- What is most important is not what happens but what it means.
- Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events and actions have multiple interpretations as people experience situations differently.

- In the face of uncertainty and ambiguity, symbols arise to help people resolve confusion, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.
- Events and processes are often more important for what they express or signal than for their intent or outcomes. Their emblematic form weaves a tapestry of secular myths, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories to help people find purpose and passion.
- Culture forms the superglue that bonds an organization, unites people, and helps an enterprise to accomplish desired ends (p. 282).

### **Analysis**

As noted above, the QSAC is an advisory body established to provide counsel in relation to the development of leadership courses that were designed to meet the academic requirements for Leadership Certification for Principals and Superintendents in Alberta. The creation of the QSAC thus involves a series of leadership decisions that might be reflected upon and possibly refined, with the benefit of Bolman and Deal's (2017) four frames and multi-frame thinking. Best practice literature related to AAC is useful to help work through and select potentially beneficial solutions when working through such analysis. The Structural Frame helps shed light on the current structure and workings of the QSAC. The Human Resources Frame is applied to foster positive outcomes to member engagement and retention. Finally, the while the Political Frame and Symbolic Frame are considered to foster appropriate power relations and to welcome other kinds of leadership and decision-making to support more balanced outcomes for stakeholders, respectively.

### **Structural Frame: Present State**

The current leadership structure of the QSAC seems very consistent with contemporary Western leadership structure that is arguably very representative of the Structural Frame presented by Bolman and Deal (2017). For instance, the Faculty determined the QSAC structure after careful consideration of legal and other (e.g. policy) authorities. Understanding authority is important since it establishes responsibilities and informs the weight of an AAC's work, being binding or simply recommendatory. The QSAC presently stands as a "voluntary" AAC, which might be defined as a group of volunteers that meets regularly on a long-term basis to provide advice and/or support to an institution or one of its subunits" (Biggerstaff 2016, p. 2) – rather than as one derived from some legislative authority, like a governing Act or regulation. Thinking more about the structural roots of the QSAC in its present state, one might also note that with respect to hierarchy and rules, the membership and processes housed within the QSAC TOR are reflective of Weber's (1947) contributions to structuralism. Tools like the well-established and often-used Robert's Rules (2020) that are doubtlessly Structural in nature were integrated into its creation. As an additional structural element, the TOR establishes authority for the Chair, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies to chair and appoint most of the QSAC members and provides that they also have the sole authority to create the agenda, set the meeting place and facilitate meetings. While the structuralist approach offers several benefits, like efficiently, division of labour, clear coordination and control, it has its short comings and may, as discussed further below, insufficiently address certain stakeholder and organizational needs and goals.

### **Human Resources Frame: Thinking About Member Needs**

The Human Resources Frame was, admittedly, not carefully considered when creating the present QSAC; however, it can offer significant benefits and ought to be considered moving

forward. The Human Resources Frame can potentially benefit the QSAC, at least, by offering ideas about and approaches to promote member engagement and retention. In turn, this can lead to improved outcomes for an organization as a whole. Literature related to AAC best practices that has tones of the human resources perspective and, considered alongside Bolman and Deal's work, supports this assertion. Where Bolman and Deal (2017) argue that "the organization benefits from a talented, motivated, loyal, and free-spirited workforce" (p. 170) and that, in turn, "[e]mployees in turn are more productive, innovative, and willing to go out of their way to get the job done" (p. 170), the literature picks up to offering practical approaches to engaging the Human Resources Frame. Meeder and Pawlowski (2012) articulate the importance of clear roles and sincere relationships within an ACC: "[t]o effectively manage your board, give it clear direction, substantive questions to attend to, and actively respond to each of their recommendations. Even if you don't want to, or can't, adopt their recommendations, engage in an honest dialogue about every serious recommendation" (p. 30). The importance of listening and taking AAC members 'seriously' is similarly forwarded by others, such as Biggerstaff (2016, p. 4), as a key to retaining members' interest and participation. Following the same trend, Felsen and Nastanski (2017, p. 665), as a result of their fairly recent study, assert that members will remain committed if they perceive that an AAC is carrying out meaningful activities – they found that AAC members seemed to enjoy engaging with AACs the most when their work enabled activities that directly impacted students, improved academic programs and involved collaboration with students and faculty. Thus, based on the Human Resources Frame and related AAC literature, the QSAC might benefit from meeting its membership's needs for clarity, 'real work', and results. Perhaps the Chair, taking up their leadership role, might aim to facilitate respectful and clear communication among members (in meetings and through other means of

communication), encourage the QSAC to include further clarity around any confusions processes in the TOR, when warranted. In addition, as positive results arise, the QSAC might find ways to share and celebrate these successes, whether formally or informally.

### **Political Frame: Balancing Power**

The Political Frame offers a way of thinking about organizations as 'arenas' in which different participants (or stakeholders) compete for power and resources in order to advocate for and forward their varying interests. The QSAC is inherently a political entity not only via its creation as part of a grant, especially because it engages members from several areas – the GOA, Faculty and K-12 education-related organizations – and mainly functions to advise on courses that are tied to governmental certification of K-12 principals and superintendents.

The Political Frame may be useful for informing changes to the QSAC's membership. The Political Frame tells us that power and resources move among involved parties; however, one must be *present* in order to have a share of said power and resources. Based on Bolman and Deal's (2017) assertions, then, the Faculty might stop to consider representation of certain 'missing', such as graduate students from the Faculty (who enroll in the courses and complete leadership certification) or underrepresented stakeholders, such as historically-marginalized groups. The inclusion of student members is already recommended in AAC best practice literature. For instance, Bringle and Hatcher (1996) encourage such inclusion in relation to development of post-secondary programs nearly 25 years ago, while Biggerstaff (2014, p. 3) and Schaeffer and Rouse (2014, p. 25) fairly recently reaffirmed this position. With respect to underrepresented stakeholders, some work has been done to introduce flexibility. A term in the TOR allows for the inclusion for unlimited experts, for instance. This could be used to invite a broader variety of Indigenous representative or representative from other cultures or interest areas. The



Faculty might even wish to be more deliberate in how it goes about determining and extending membership – by directly incorporating additional members moving forward – for the sake of sincerely developing courses and programs that are more truly reflective of our context and the broad variety of people impacted by the work of the AAC and the courses and programs it advises.

### **Symbolic Frame: Making Meaning**

Bolman and Deal's (2107) Symbolic Frame focuses on how symbols can help humans make meaning, "make sense of the chaotic, ambiguous world in which they live" (p. 283). Symbols include myths, vision, values, rituals and ceremonies (p.p. 283) and engage with the concept of leadership, according to Bolman and Deal (2017), because "[l]eaders are *bricoleurs*, people who survey and use the materials at hand to help construct meaning systems" (p. 277). For our purpose, this opens up questions about how the Symbolic Frame has been or can be used to facilitate or enhance QSAC function, to better align it with its goals and purposes.

The symbolic frame can offer rich analysis in relation to helping to foster an inclusive, committed and motivated membership, which has the potential to lead to a more productive and effective AAC. Thinking about the QSAC in its current form, there might be at least two specific areas that have or could benefit from application of the Symbolic Frame. They are: 1) welcoming and engagement of Indigenous Peoples and 2) adjusting QSAC leadership and meeting style to include Indigenous and additional groups. Approaches to welcoming and engaging Indigenous Peoples have been discussed, to some extent, as part of the Political Frame, but on a symbolic level, more can be done. As the Symbolic Frame highlights the importance of symbols, including ritual and ceremony, it would be valuable for the Faculty to, in consultation with Indigenous groups, adopt appropriate symbols, rituals and practices. A territorial acknowledgement that is

generally already practiced in relation to formal meetings at the UofA comes to mind, but is only a start. It will be up to leadership of the QSAC to learn and do more.

Adjusting leadership and meeting styles, is one other, more specific way that the QSAC might use the Symbolic Frame (and, perhaps, an adjusted Structural Frame) to sincerely engage Indigenous members while supporting its goals. AACs have historically embraced a 'top-down' authority structure inherent to Western practices. Hierarchy and authority characteristic of the Structural Frame is evident within and propagated via AAC best practice literature, which holds the assumption that said hierarchy will be used when putting together AACs. Along this line, Bolman and Deal (2017) succinctly note "[m]uch of the research on leadership in organizations has been conducted in a Western context" (p. 387) and argue that we "need to better understand what happens when citizens of one culture try to lead those of another" (p. 387). Interestingly, and in contrast to typical structural approaches, the literature generally indicates that leadership and decision-making in Indigenous cultures tends to be a community or collective endeavour (Faircloth, 2017, p. 408; Julien et al., 2010, p. 115-116). This is probably true for many other cultures, as well. With some work, there may be room to embrace more balance and change in leadership and decision-making. The QSAC TOR currently provides that Chair will, quite vaguely, "determine the meeting processes" (Faculty of Education, 2021). While the Chair maintains the so-called authority, the effect of this term opens up the possibility for them to invite guidance and leadership from Indigenous or other members to conduct meetings and/or make decisions in ways, spaces or with processes that are alternative to structured board-room discussions.

### **Limitations**

Upon review of the relevant literature, there does not appear to be a great deal of criticism of Bolman and Deal's work. This may be due to the fact that their work, as one author

puts it, doesn't present new theory, but instead "should be considered an incorporation of central schools of organisational thought" (Vuori, 2018, p. 170) – a way or model for thinking about how to apply theories. The small amount of criticism that has been presented focuses on three areas. First, Vuori (2018) argues that further research ought to be done in relation to the constructivist paradigm of leadership to determine if the model of thinking proposed by the four frames *actually* informs leaders' actions, or whether some other influence, like organisation-specific practices or procedures are more informative (Vuori, 2018, p. 174). While this criticism may be valid, it is somewhat vague, and its author does not propose specifics on how it might be addressed. A second point of criticism questions whether the frames can be voluntarily learned chosen and learned, and if so, whether multi-frame thinking might be too complex. A third concern is whether the Bolman and Deal's four frames are representative of male-dominant leadership thinking and do not represent the female voice in leadership (Vuori, 2018, p. 174). The last two points have, to some extent, already been contradicted in the research. Dunford & Palmer (1995) have demonstrated that even after two years, participants who were trained to use the four frames and multi-frame thinking felt that both of these benefited their leadership. In addition, research completed by both Bolman and Deal (1991) and Thompson (2000) has determined that there are no differences in the way that males and females use the frames.

### **Conclusion**

Bolman and Deal's *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (2017) offers four frames that they assert can help leaders approach problems in a manner that leads to creative and effective problem solving. Applied to the QSAC, as both a means of reflection and to refinement, they revealed some interesting ideas and approaches that might help the QSAC moving forward. Lessons learned have the potential to help others in similar contexts engage the

four-frame approach as well. Looking at the present form of the QSAC, the Structural Frame affirmed that the QSAC is presently rooted in a traditional, Western, authoritative style and structure of leadership that is used by many AACs and supported in best practice AAC literature. The Human Resources Frame may be useful in enhancing member engagement and satisfaction. Coupled with literature sharing similar tones, it seems to encourage clear communication among the membership, substantive work for the QSAC and acknowledgement of achievements, which in turn will reduce potential turnover. The Political Frame reminds us that the tension among stakeholders due to competing interest is a real concern in any organization, but that tension is far less concerning than the absence of overlooked parties, whose voices ought to be invited and considered. Finally, the Symbolic Frame might reveal a need to more sincerely engage with alternate ways of leading and decision-making to more genuinely engage Indigenous cultures, as well as other cultures that differ in approach to that of the pervasive Western paradigm engaged by AACs. While some criticism of Bolman and Deal's work exists, it is either not well-articulated or has largely been refuted by the literature. Generally, users of the four frames and multi-frame thinking, including this author, have embraced the tools it offers and feel more confident when working towards more creative problem-solving in organizational contexts.

### References

- Biggerstaff, P. A., (2016). Addressing the challenges of growing an effective advisory committee. *The CTE Journal*, 4(2), 2-6. Retrieved from <http://www.thectejournal.com/uploads/1/0/6/8/10686931/biggerstaff.pdf>
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 509-534. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930300406>
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations (6th edition)*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1996.11780257>
- Dunford, R. W., & Palmer, I. C. (1995). Claims about frames: Practitioners' assessment of the utility of reframing. *Journal of Management Education*, 19(1), 96-105.
- Faculty of Education. (2021). *Quality Standard Advisory Committee: Terms of Reference*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Roberts, H. M. (2020). *Robert's rules of order (7th ed.)*. Berkley Publishing.
- Faircloth, S. C. (2017). Reflections on the concept of authentic leadership: From an indigenous scholar/leader perspective. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 19(4), 407–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422317728935>
- Felsen, D., & Nastanski, M. (2016). The process of stakeholder engagement: The case of establishing advisory councils at a school of business. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 9(4), 655-667.

- Julien, M., Wright, B. & Zinni, D. M., (2010). Stories from the circle: Leadership lessons learned from aboriginal leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 114-126.  
<https://doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.009>
- Meeder, H., & Pawlowski, B. (2012). Advisory boards: Gateway to business engagement. *Techniques: Connecting Education and Careers*, 97(2), 28-31.
- Schaeffer, D. M., & Rouse, D. (2014). Effective academic advisory committee relationships. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research*, 7(1), 23–30. Retrieved from <https://clutejournals.com/index.php/CIER/article/view/8308>
- Schein, E. H. 1992. *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed). Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.
- Thompson, M. D. (2000). Gender, leadership orientation, and effectiveness: Testing the theoretical models of Bolman & Deal and Quinn. *Sex Roles*, 42(11/12), 969 - 992.
- Vuori, J. (2018). Understanding academic leadership using the four-frame model. In E. Pekkola, J. Kivistö, V. Kohtamäki, Y. Cai & A. Lyytinen (Eds.), *Theoretical and methodological perspectives on higher education management and transformation: An advanced reader for PhD students* (pp.167-178). Tampere University Press.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Free Press.

## Appendix

### Terms of Reference

#### Quality Standards Advisory Committee

##### *1. Purpose*

The purpose of the Quality Standards Advisory Committee (Committee) is to advise the Professional Learning Unit (PLU) in the Faculty of Education, University of Alberta on:

1. strategies to enable practicing and aspiring educational leaders to obtain specialized credentials from the Government of Alberta required to meet provincial standards for leadership practice.
2. the development and maintenance of graduate courses and program offerings in educational administration and leadership at the University of Alberta.

##### *3. Confidentiality*

Committee members shall respect and acknowledge that matters discussed at the Committee can be sensitive in nature and are to be kept confidential.

##### *4. Membership*

- (a) The Committee will be chaired by the Associate Dean, Graduate Studies (the "Chair").
  - (b) All other members are appointed by the Chair.
  - (c) The Committee must consist of the following members:
    - Chair
    - Director, PLU, Faculty of Education
    - 2 faculty members from Educational Administration and Leadership Specialization
    - 1 member to represent indigenous perspectives
    - 1 member from Alberta Education
    - 1 member from Alberta Teachers' Association
    - 1 member from College of Alberta School Superintendents
    - 1 member from Alberta School Board Association
    - 1 member from Alberta School Councils' Association
    - 1 member from Association of Independent Schools and Colleges in Alberta
- Associate Dean, Graduate Studies.

### 5. *Term*

- (a) The term of office for all members of the Committee appointed by Associate Dean, Graduate Studies shall not be more than 3 years.
- (b) All members of the Committee appointed by Associate Dean, Graduate Studies are eligible to be reappointed.

### 6. *Chair Duties (how is the chair elected?)*

The Chair has the following duties:

- Consult with the Director, PLU and the faculty members from Educational Leadership and Administration to create the agenda for each meeting
- Ensure meeting agenda is prepared and distributed in advance of the meeting
- Review previous meeting reports and material prior to the meetings
- Ensure that a meeting place is arranged
- Ensure members are notified of meeting dates, times and locations
- Facilitate the meetings
- Ensure any meeting minutes and/or reports are prepared and distributed
- Prepare all correspondence on behalf of the committee

### 7. *Meeting Procedures*

- The committee will meet at least once per year.
- The committee will normally meet in the month of May each year, at the discretion of the Chair.
- The Chair will determine the meeting processes.
- Meetings will be conducted by the Chair. In the Chair's absence, a meeting will be conducted by a member selected by the Chair.
- The Committee has the authority to engage experts and other resources it deems necessary to meet its purposes.
- The Committee will provide recommendations and advice to the Director, PLU, upon request.
- The Committee will oversee and advise on any continuous three-year strategy developed by the PLU, including relevant budgetary details.



8. *Records*

The committee must keep accurate records of all matters that come before it. The committee will maintain copies of its minutes for a period of at least 3 years from the date of the Committee meeting to which they relate.

9. *Reimbursement of Expenses and Compensation for Time*

No reimbursement of expenses or compensation for time is available to committee members.

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Chair  
*{Insert name of Chair}*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date