

# 43290 85256

## Order\_8120590\_Change\_Continual\_Improvement\_and\_the\_...

 Assignment

 Class

 University

### Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::1:3007148559

Submission Date

Sep 13, 2024, 3:30 PM UTC

Download Date

Sep 13, 2024, 3:30 PM UTC

File Name

Order\_8120590\_Change\_Continual\_Improvement\_and\_the\_Role\_of\_Ethical.docx

File Size

21.8 KB

4 Pages

646 Words

3,561 Characters

## 0% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

**Caution: Review required.**

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

### Detection Groups



#### 1 AI-generated only 0%

Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.



#### 2 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%

Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

#### Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

### Frequently Asked Questions

#### How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (\*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

#### What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



## **Change, Continual Improvement and the Role of Ethical Behavior and Relational Trust**

Name

Institution

Course

Lecturer/Professor

Date

## **Change, Continual Improvement and the Role of Ethical Behavior and Relational Trust**

According to Dues (2023), the notion of continual improvement refers to a concerted and ongoing effort to make processes, products, and even services better incrementally and over time. This implies that at the core of continual improvement are enhancements that are small but consistent as opposed to large scale and implemented/instigated at once. According to Dues (2023), the roots of the notion of continuous improvements go back to continuous learning and adaptations, usually for the purposes of long-term and sustainable success. On the other hand, Dues (2023) holds that the characteristics of the notion of change that differentiates it from continuous improvement is that the former is not just significant in its scope but is also an abrupt shift as far as processes, structures, and strategies are concerned. According to Dues (2023), change can be orchestrated by external factors and may demand substantive adjustments. This is not to mention its ability to be disruptive. Therefore, while continual improvement is gradual and focuses on small changes that grow over time, change is immediate and implies some degree of shift in direction or strategy. I prefer continual improvement thanks to its ability to allow for steady progress without the disruption that often accompanies change. According to DuFour et al. (2024), Continued improvement also tends to be sustainable, which makes me prefer it over change.

Factors that distinguish continual improvement from change are, among other things, pace, scope, impact, and disruptions. Continual improvement is slow and steady as far as its pace is concerned. According to Kaplan and Owings (2023), scholars like Michael Fullan liken continual improvement to a journey whose ultimate outcome lies in its parts. On the other hand, change is rapid and demands quick, if not immediate, adaptation. When it comes to scope, continual improvement is narrow and specific, while change can be broad. Similarly, the

impacts of continual improvement are only felt when they are considered cumulatively, while change has transformative consequences that are felt immediately. According to Kaplan and Owings (2023), these notions are also captured in various conceptual models of change by scholars like KURT LEWIN, CHRIS ARGYRIS, ROBERT CHIN, etc., all of whom tried to understand and explain the concept in detail.

Being results oriented dovetails more with the notion of continual improvement as the latter places more emphasis on small, steady and specific achievements. The incremental nature of continual improvement implies that it allows for repeated assessment and adjustment as necessary. According to Dues (2023), the overall net effects is that efforts are always geared towards intended results.

Trust is critical when it comes to transitioning to result-oriented and continual improvement among staff because it guarantees a safe environment where all can collaborate (Dues et al., 2023). According to DuFour et al. (2024), in high-trust environments, staff are more willing to embrace new practices and focus on achieving shared goals. The overall net effect is a reduction in resistance and enhancement of mutual support, all of which are key when it comes to successful continual improvements. These notions are also reiterated by Kaplan and Owings (2023), who hold that trust results in not just honest and open communication but also tangible support that ensures continual improvements can be sustained over time for its cumulative impacts to be felt/realized.

## References

- Dues, J. A. (2023). *Win-win: W. Edwards Deming, the system of profound knowledge, and the science of improving schools*. Myers Education Press.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R. B., Eaker, R. E., Many, T. W., & Mattos, M. W. (2024). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work* (4th ed.). Solution Tree.
- Kaplan, L. S., & Owings, W. A. (2023). *Introduction to the principalship: Theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge: New York.