THE CULTURAL CONDITIONS THAT SHAPE CHANGE AT TRI-C

What institutional feedback suggests about execution, momentum, and the distance between insight and action

By: Gregory Stoup, VP Institutional Progress and Effectiveness
Cuyahoga Community College

At Cuyahoga Community College (Tri-C), the challenge of institutional change does not begin with a lack of ideas. The College has spent years examining student outcomes, studying its own operations, and engaging faculty, staff, and managers in thoughtful conversations about what needs to improve. It has developed a clearer understanding of where student momentum weakens, where institutional processes create friction, and where stronger alignment is needed. In that sense, Tri-C is not an institution struggling to recognize its challenges. It is an institution that has become increasingly capable of naming them.

What the recent cultural assessment makes visible is a different difficulty. The central issue is not whether the College can identify what needs to change. It is whether the conditions of daily institutional life are strong enough to carry change forward once it has been named. Strategy can set direction, and analysis can clarify priorities, but culture shapes what happens after that. It influences whether people move from agreement to ownership, whether evidence becomes adjustment, and whether work gains momentum or gradually loses force as it moves across units, meetings, and responsibilities.

Data sources

What follows draws on feedback from faculty, staff, and managers gathered across multiple collegewide surveys, including the Great Colleges survey and Vision 2030 listening sessions, offering a composite view of how the institution experiences its culture, performance, and day-to-day practices.

Knowing what to change is not the same as being able to change

This is why institutional culture matters so much in a period of transformation. Culture is not a secondary matter that sits beside strategy. It shapes how strategy is interpreted, how new expectations are received, how much candor people can tolerate, and whether planning remains connected to execution. It influences whether people experience change as shared institutional work or as another initiative passing through. When those conditions are strong, change is more likely to accumulate into real progress. When they are weaker, even sound strategies can remain suspended at the level of aspiration.

The cultural assessment suggests that Tri-C's situation is best understood in exactly those terms. The College appears to know a great deal about what should change, yet has not fully built the conditions of a more performance-oriented culture. That distinction is important because it separates diagnostic capacity from institutional readiness. A college can understand its challenges and still struggle to act on them with consistency. It can generate

thoughtful plans, name the right priorities, and still find that follow-through varies widely across teams. It can also possess strong commitment, substantial talent, and genuine care for students while lacking the shared habits, expectations, and coordination needed to translate those strengths into sustained institutional movement. The issue, then, is not whether Tri-C has enough insight. It is whether the conditions of everyday organizational life are strong enough to convert insight into aligned and durable action.

Skepticism as institutional memory

One of the clearest patterns in the assessment is the role of skepticism. At Tri-C, skepticism appears to function as a baseline posture in the face of change. This does not read as simple cynicism. It reads more as learned caution. In colleges where people have seen initiatives begin with energy and then fade, skepticism can become a rational habit. It protects people from over-committing to efforts that may not last and allows them to reserve judgment until visible follow-through appears. In that sense, skepticism serves as a kind of institutional memory, carrying forward past experience into present decision-making.

It also shapes how new efforts are interpreted at the outset. Early signals are read carefully. Language is tested against prior experience. Commitments from leadership are weighed against whether they translate into sustained action. People look for evidence that this effort will be resourced, supported, and carried through beyond its initial phase. Until that evidence accumulates, engagement may remain measured rather than immediate.

At the same time, skepticism has consequences. It can slow the formation of early commitment, especially during the period when implementation needs visible movement. People may express support while withholding deeper engagement until they are convinced the effort is real and durable. Participation can take the form of observation rather than ownership, with individuals waiting for clearer proof before investing fully in the work.

This kind of stance does not look like resistance, but it can still weaken momentum at precisely the point where momentum must begin. Early stages of implementation depend on distributed action, not just agreement in principle. When engagement is delayed across many individuals at once, the institution can struggle to generate the initial traction that would, in turn, reduce skepticism. The result is a reinforcing cycle in which caution limits early movement, and limited early movement reinforces the caution that produced it.

When feedback affirms more easily than it evaluates

A second pattern concerns the role of feedback. Candid conversation is more easily welcomed when it affirms existing work than when it introduces evaluation tied to expectations for change. In a mission-driven institution, this is understandable. People want their efforts recognized and their work respected, especially when that work is carried out under real constraints and with genuine care for students. Affirmation signals that effort has been seen and valued.

The difficulty arises when affirmation becomes easier to receive than evaluation. When that happens, the practical use of feedback begins to narrow. Evidence can be introduced, discussed, and even agreed upon in general terms, yet the connection between that evidence and specific changes in practice may remain indirect. Conversations acknowledge complexity, recognize effort, and surface challenges, but stop short of defining what would need to be done differently.

Over time, this shifts the tone of institutional dialogue. Conversations remain thoughtful and engaged, though less likely to produce the kinds of adjustments that improvement requires. Feedback becomes more descriptive than directive, more interpretive than operational. It clarifies what is happening, but does not consistently translate into decisions about what will change, who will act, or how progress will be judged.

The result is not a lack of discussion, but a softer form of it, one in which important issues are examined without always being converted into action. Institutions in this position often have a strong capacity for understanding their challenges, while making slower progress in addressing them. The gap is not in awareness, but in the conditions that allow feedback to move from acknowledgment into sustained, practice-level change.

Professional identity and the interpretation of change

The assessment also points to the role of professional identity in shaping how change is received. Tri-C has a strong sense of mission and a deeply grounded understanding of its work. Faculty and staff operate with a clear view of the students they serve, the constraints they navigate, and the practical demands of day-to-day operations. That orientation supports commitment and care for students, and it gives the institution much of its strength. At the same time, it influences how proposed changes are interpreted and evaluated.

When new ideas are introduced, they are often filtered through the question of whether they reflect a full and accurate understanding of how the work actually unfolds. Proposals that appear aligned with lived experience are more likely to be taken up. Those that seem abstract, simplified, or removed from operational reality may be set aside before being fully tested. This response is not dismissive in intent. It reflects a reliance on professional knowledge and accumulated experience as the basis for judgment, particularly in an environment where conditions are complex and often shifting.

At the same time, this pattern can shape the range of change that feels plausible. When the standard for engagement is immediate alignment with current realities, there is less room for exploration of approaches that require adaptation, iteration, or temporary discomfort. New ideas may be evaluated primarily against existing practice rather than as opportunities to rework that practice over time. In that setting, institutions can become more practiced at explaining why current arrangements exist than at testing whether those arrangements continue to produce the outcomes they are intended to achieve.

The effect is not resistance to improvement, but a narrowing of the space in which experimentation can occur. Change is more likely to proceed incrementally and within familiar boundaries, while efforts that call for more visible shifts in practice may struggle to gain early traction.

Conversation without ownership

Another important theme is the gap between commentary and commitment. Tri-C appears to be an institution rich in discussion. People think carefully, ask meaningful questions, and engage seriously with institutional challenges. There is intellectual energy in the organization and a genuine willingness to examine problems from multiple angles. Ideas are surfaced, refined, and debated with care. In that sense, the College has many of the ingredients associated with thoughtful institutional work.

The difficulty arises in what happens next. That energy does not always convert into clear ownership and sustained follow-through. Meetings generate alignment at the level of understanding, while responsibility for action can remain diffuse. Participants leave with a shared sense of the issue, though with less clarity about who will take the next step, what that step will be, and how progress will be tracked. Engagement is visible in the quality of the conversation, yet less visible in the structure of execution that follows it.

This pattern can be subtle because participation itself is often interpreted as progress. Attendance, contribution, and thoughtful dialogue signal that the institution is engaged with the issue. What is less certain is how that engagement is translated into operational movement. Without clear ownership, defined actions, and agreed points of follow-up, work can lose coherence as it moves beyond the meeting. Different units may proceed in parallel, or wait for further direction, or assume that responsibility sits elsewhere.

Over time, this creates a familiar institutional dynamic. Important issues are widely understood and regularly discussed, yet progress against them moves unevenly. Effort is present across the organization, but it does not always accumulate. The gap is not in awareness or intent. It sits in the transition from shared understanding to assigned responsibility, from conversation to coordinated action, and from initial engagement to sustained execution.

Insight that does not always convert to action

This dynamic extends into how the institution handles insight more broadly. Tri-C can be understood as intellectually mature but behaviorally cautious. People across the College are capable of diagnosing problems with nuance, drawing on data, experience, and professional judgment to arrive at well-informed conclusions. Ideas are not superficial. They are often well-considered and grounded in a genuine understanding of the work. At the same time, the transition from insight to action is less consistent.

In practice, this appears as a tendency to wait for broad alignment before moving forward. Ideas circulate, are refined, and gain support over time, though they do not always move into implementation with the same clarity or pace. The institution demonstrates a strong preference for shared understanding, which reflects a commitment to inclusivity and respect for different perspectives. That orientation has clear value, particularly in complex environments where decisions affect multiple parts of the organization.

At the same time, it can slow execution. When action depends on widespread comfort, the threshold for movement becomes high. Even well-supported ideas may remain in discussion longer than is necessary, as the institution seeks additional clarity, reassurance, or consensus. In that interval, the energy that accompanied the original insight can dissipate, and the work can lose some of its initial direction.

This dynamic also shapes how uncertainty is handled. In environments where movement is closely tied to agreement, uncertainty can delay action rather than accompany it. Yet most meaningful institutional change unfolds under conditions where not everything can be known in advance. It requires steps that are informed, though not fully resolved, and that are adjusted as learning occurs.

Without that kind of forward movement, ideas remain in circulation longer than they remain in practice. The institution continues to build understanding, though with less consistent translation into operational change. The result is not a lack of insight, but a pattern in which insight advances more quickly than the actions it is meant to inform.

Planning and execution as separate experiences

A related issue sits in the connection between planning and execution. Strategic planning processes at Tri-C can produce clarity, direction, and a shared understanding of priorities. Goals are articulated, language is aligned, and the institution develops a coherent sense of what it is trying to accomplish. As work moves into implementation, however, that clarity can soften as it passes across units, roles, and layers of responsibility.

This pattern is not unusual in complex institutions. Plans are developed in integrated ways, often through collaborative processes that bring multiple perspectives into alignment. Execution, by contrast, unfolds through a series of transitions. Work moves from strategy to division, from division to department, and from department into day-to-day practice. At each point, interpretation is required. Priorities are translated into local context, responsibilities are distributed, and decisions are made about how the work will be carried forward alongside other demands.

Without strong alignment across those transitions, planning and execution can begin to feel like separate experiences. The coherence present at the point of planning is not always sustained through implementation. Instead of a continuous line from strategy to action, there

can be a series of partial connections, each shaped by local interpretation. Momentum has to be recreated at each stage rather than carried forward as part of a shared institutional effort.

As that happens, institutional priorities can fragment into a set of local efforts that are directionally related but not tightly coordinated. Work is occurring across the College, but not always in ways that reinforce one another. The effect is not inactivity, but diffusion. Progress depends on the strength of individual areas rather than on the alignment of the institution as a whole. Over time, this makes it more difficult for strategy to translate into sustained, cumulative impact.

Strong analysis, uneven coordination

The assessment also highlights a pattern of strong analysis paired with uneven coordination across teams. Different areas of the College are thinking deeply about similar challenges, often at the same time and with comparable levels of sophistication. Faculty, staff, and managers are not approaching these issues superficially. They are drawing on data, experience, and professional judgment to understand what is happening and why.

The difficulty is less about the quality of thinking and more about how that thinking is organized across the institution. Work tends to develop within units, shaped by local context and immediate responsibilities, rather than through shared frameworks that connect efforts across areas. As a result, similar problems are often approached in parallel, with limited visibility into how others are interpreting or addressing them.

This leads to parallel effort rather than cumulative progress. Good ideas emerge, though they often remain local rather than becoming institutional. Practices that are effective in one area are not consistently extended, adapted, or scaled across others. Each unit advances its work, but the institution as a whole moves less cohesively than the quality of its analysis would suggest.

Over time, this pattern shapes how progress is experienced. The College becomes a place where thoughtful responses are distributed rather than aligned. Movement occurs, but it does not always build upon itself. The absence of stronger coordination means that gains in one area do not reliably reinforce gains in another. What is missing is not effort or insight, but the connective structure that allows those elements to accumulate into shared institutional direction.

What early implementation is likely to reveal

As Vision 2030 moves further into implementation, these cultural conditions are likely to surface in recognizable ways. Commitment may be expressed with a degree of caution, particularly in the early stages. Engagement may take the form of participation before it becomes ownership. Existing practices may be explained and defended through the lens of experience. Outcome-focused evaluation may feel more difficult to sustain than

encouragement. Teams may continue to work with energy and seriousness, though not always in synchrony with one another.

These responses should not be read as rejection of the vision. They are better understood as patterned ways of processing change that have developed over time. They reflect how the institution has learned to respond when expectations shift and new ways of working are introduced. When viewed in that light, they become less a barrier to be overcome and more a set of conditions to be understood.

Reading these signals clearly matters. They offer early indication of where execution is likely to gain traction and where it may lose coherence. They point to where expectations remain implicit, where ownership is still forming, and where coordination may need to be strengthened. In that sense, early implementation does more than test the strategy. It reveals how the institution's existing habits interact with the demands of the work, and where those habits may need to evolve for progress to be sustained.

From insight to sustained action

The deeper question, then, is not whether Tri-C cares enough to improve. The evidence suggests that it does. Nor is the question whether the institution is capable of understanding its challenges. It clearly is. The question is whether the College can build stronger habits of ownership, candor, coordination, and follow-through so that the intelligence already present in the organization converts more reliably into sustained progress.

Tri-C's culture reflects commitment, care, and substantial professional capability. It also reflects patterns that can slow change when execution depends on early ownership, evaluative clarity, and cross-unit coherence. The task ahead is not to replace those patterns with something unfamiliar. It is to strengthen the conditions under which the College already does its best work so that those strengths carry more consistently into practice.

This involves a shift in emphasis. The work is less about generating additional insight and more about how existing insight is used. It involves clarifying ownership at the point where ideas become action, strengthening the connection between feedback and adjustment, and ensuring that work across units aligns in ways that reinforce rather than fragment effort. Progress, in this sense, becomes less dependent on individual initiative and more on shared institutional habits.

Culture, in this sense, is not an abstract concern. It is the medium through which change either gathers force or gradually thins out as it moves across the institution. At Tri-C, the next stage of institutional progress will depend less on identifying new directions and more on ensuring that direction, once established, is carried forward with enough clarity and consistency to become shared, durable action.

Conclusion

Taken together, these patterns describe a college with considerable strengths and a clear understanding of its work. Tri-C brings intellectual seriousness to its challenges. It reflects deeply on student outcomes, engages its people in meaningful dialogue, and approaches its mission with care and commitment. The cultural dynamics surfaced in this assessment do not diminish those strengths. They help explain why translating them into consistent, institution-wide progress can be difficult.

What becomes visible across these sections is a recurring theme. Insight develops more quickly than action. Agreement forms more readily than ownership. Effort is distributed more widely than it is aligned. None of these conditions are unusual in complex institutions, though together they shape the pace and coherence with which change can take hold.

The significance of this moment lies in the convergence of clarity and expectation. Vision 2030 provides direction. The College's own research has clarified where progress is most needed. The cultural assessment adds a third layer, making visible the conditions under which that progress will either accumulate or dissipate. When these elements are read together, the institutional question becomes more precise.

The work ahead is not simply to advance a set of strategic priorities. It is to strengthen the connection between how the College understands its challenges and how it responds to them in practice. That connection lives in everyday routines, in how work is coordinated, in how feedback is used, and in how responsibility is defined and carried forward.

At Tri-C, the opportunity sits in that connection. The College does not need to discover what matters. It has already done much of that work. The question is how consistently that understanding can be translated into action that is shared, sustained, and cumulative over time.

Sources

Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning*. Allyn and Bacon. https://archive.org/details/overcomingorgani0000argy

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383.

Heifetz, R. A., Linsky, M., & Grashow, A. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press. https://hbr.org/product/the-practice-of-adaptive-leadership/1480-HBK-ENG

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press. https://hbr.org/book/leading-change/9781422186435

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2000). *The knowing–doing gap: How smart companies turn knowledge into action*. Harvard Business School Press. https://hbr.org/product/the-knowing-doing-gap/4163

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2016). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley. https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Organizational+Culture+and+Leadership%2C+5th+Edition-p-9781119212041

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage Publications. https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/sensemaking-in-organizations/book4954