**MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980-2011.**
Series F: CIJE Accrual, 1981-2011, undated.
Subseries 1: Barry Holtz, 1988-2005, undated.

| Box | Folder |
| --- | --- |
| 72 | 5 |

Leadership training approaches (JEWEL), 1998.



3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
513.487.3000
AmericanJewishArchives.org

## Objective

Visionary lay and professional leadership are crucial for bringing about meaningful change in Jewish Education. Leaders inspire, shape, alter and transform communities, institutions and people. Currently, there are limited opportunities for the preparation and on-going development of Jewish educational leaders. The purpose of JEWEL is to provide an integrated approach to the recruitment, placement and development of professional and lay leaders who are able to vitalize, energize and influence Jewish life in North America.

# JEWEL STRAWMAN

## EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

- Classroom learning ➞ Practice ➞ Reflection ➞ Classroom
- Interactive and experimental learning in the classroom
- Peer-to-peer sharing of ideas
- Dual Focus: Developing a personal vision and gaining the skills to implement [How to do this needs a lot of thought.]
- Multi-disciplinary inputs
- Jewish ideas integrated into learning -- not an afterthought

## CONCEPT

JEWEL is engaged in 7 activities:

① Recruiting and placement service (lay/professional)
② Network of training institutions - perhaps supplemented by JEWEL summer programs or conferences
③ "Fast track" Fellows Programs (lay/professional)
④ Long-term Development Programs (lay/professional)
⑤ Conferences/Retreats (lay/professional)
⑥ Networks
⑦ Institutional lay/professional programs

These are described below.

## ① RECRUITING AND PLACEMENT

JEWEL will maintain a recruiting and placement office that will do the following:

PROFESSIONAL

- Career library, job and personnel database
- Career counseling for entry-level and mid-career Jewish educators (especially JEWEL graduates)
- Active search for people interested in career changes into Jewish education
- Consulting on senior personnel planning with institutions and communities
- Recruiting and placement for JEWEL programs

LAY

- Active searches for lay leaders to become involved in Jewish education
- Recruiting and placement for JEWEL lay programs
- Database
- "Matching" service

## ② "NETWORK" OF TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

JEWEL will develop a network of institutions involved in degree programs for people entering Jewish education. This could include places like JTS, HUC, Boston Hebrew College, etc. It might also include Harvard, Stanford, University of Wisconsin, Vanderbilt, etc.

JEWEL would set up some guiding principles (as was done in the Danforthr Project) and perhaps some curriculum, standards or other specifications (e.g., X hours of mentoring and field work must be part of the program). To pull this off, there would probably have to be some funding.

JEWEL might offer supplemental summer seminars or week long conferences for students in these programs.

## ③ "FAST TRACK" FELLOWS PROGRAM

This program identifies 10 to 15 promising professionals each year. Half are junior fellows. They are early career people transitioning into Jewish education from other fields. The other half are senior fellows, who are either in the field already or transitioning in at a senior level (KAB's). There are top notch people with superior education and a track record of excellence. The Fellows Program places them in 2-year positions in Jewish education where they are mentored by someone with real talent and vision.

Examples of placements include:

- Assistant to Gail Dorph at CIJE
- Assistant to Richard Joel at Hillel
- Assistant to Dvorah Steinmetz
- Assistant to Rachel Cowan at Cummings Foundation

The Fellows Program contributes $30,000 toward their compensation. The sponsoring institution pays the balance. The fellows also participate in an educational program. The program starts with a summer program which alternates between the U.S. and Jerusalem (CAPE). During the year, there are monthly three-day sessions. Also, for those with weaker Jewish background, there are special Jewish study programs during the year.

The lay leadership Fellows Program sets up similar mentoring relationships between active senior lay leaders in Jewish education and more junior lay leaders. The senior lay leaders attend one two-week seminar program in Israel and six long-weekend sessions in the U.S.

### ④ LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

JEWEL runs 3 to 5 year development programs for mid-career professionals in Jewish education. This includes Principals, JCC directors, Camp directors, BJE directors, Continuity Program directors, etc. These professionals from different fields learn together. The program involves one month each summer and 25 learning days throughout the year. A special track of this program is offered where child care is provided to allow people with young families to attend.

The curriculum has 3 major parts:

1. Jewish study
2. Development of a personal educational vision
3. Development of tools for effective leadership

It is important to note, however, that Jewish study is integrated into items 2 and 3 as well.

The cost of these programs is split between JEWEL and the institution where the student works. All students receive a certificate of completion and become part of the very active alumni network of JEWEL.

JEWEL also offers custom-tailored programs for several organizations who have contracted with JEWEL to manage their leadership development programs and several more narrowly focused programs such as the Teacher Education Institute, a 2-year program for people responsible for the professional development of teachers.

All students at JEWEL are encouraged to spend at least one summer at CAPE in Jerusalem. There is scholarship money available for this.

The long-term development program for lay leadership takes place within communities. JEWEL offers these programs in 15 different communities plus 8 that join through long distance learning (teleconferencing and e-mail). These programs include, monthly, one-day sessions for 3 years plus a two-week program in Israel.

## ⑤ CONFERENCES AND RETREATS

JEWEL organizes and sponsors conferences and retreats for lay leaders and professionals in various arenas of Jewish education.

Examples of recent conferences include:

- Global conference on Rabbinic Education
- Conference of Continuity Program Directors
- Conference of members of Family Foundations funding Jewish education
- Conference of Community Day High School Principals and Lay Leaders

## ⑥ NETWORKS

JEWEL helps facilitate metworking among its alumni. There is an active web-site as well as local meetings of program alumni.

JEWEL occasionally brings together all of the alumni from a program to meet with each other. For example, last year we held a meeting of the 6 cohorts of TEI to discuss progress and update them on new thinking in professional development.

## ⑦ INSTITUTIONAL LAY/PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

JEWEL offers standard custom programs for lay/professional groups from institutional settings.

Topics include:

- Lay/professional working relationships
- Change management
- Strategic planning

as well as content-oriented programs specific to the type of institutions.

## FACILITIES

JEWEL has a conference center facility based in New York (Boston?) within 45 minutes drive of th airport. Since many JEWEL programs will be held weekends and during the summer, 1/3 to ½ of th capacity of th retreat center will be rented out for corporate programs. Jewish business owners and managers will be encouraged to use this facility as a way to support the Jewish community.

## STAFFING

JEWEL has 3 to 4 full-time faculty members, 30 to 40 adjunct faculty members, a full-time Director plus administrative personnel. There is no tenure.

## FUNDING

JEWEL is funded by a partnership of 30 major foundations and over 1,000 private donors. Most JEWEL programs are specifically sponsored by one or two donors. In addition JEWEL receives income from fees for attending its conferences, seminar and programs.

TEMPLATE FOR WORKPLAN PROJECTS

**Project Name** JEWEL Pilot Planning
**Team: Team Leader** Gail Dorph/Ellen Goldring
**Leadership team** Karen Barth, Sarah Feinberg, Cippi Harte
**Extended planning team** Pearl Beck, Sally Gottesman, Elie Holzer, Barry Holtz, Dan Pekarsky, Nessa Rapoport, Leah Strigler, Research Director

| | PERSONNEL | SUPPORT/ ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS | BEGINNING/ ENDING DATES |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:** Create descriptive document which describes goals, characteristics and parameters of program | EG/GZD | | 8/98—10/98 |
| SUB TASKS: | | | |
| • Describe goals, characteristics and parameters of program | EG/GZD | | |
| **TASK:** Create recruitment piece describing program | EG/GZD/NR | | 10/98—1/99 |
| SUB TASKS: | | | |
| • Write/edit | | Distribute to team | |
| • Design | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:**<br>Identify and recruit program participants | | GZD/BWH/LZS +PT | | 9/98—3/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Create criteria for application and acceptance of participants | | • | |
| | • Develop application procedure | | | |
| | • Develop fee structure | | | |
| | • Interview potential participants | | • Travel/hotel arrangements<br>• Budget<br>• Expense reports | |
| **TASK:**<br>Develop Curriculum | | EG/GZD/BWH/EH + faculty team | | 9/98—on-going |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Develop modules/ideas on the following topics:<br>*Development of personal vision*<br>• *Jewish texts and philosophy*<br>• *Educational theory and practice*<br>• *Creating learning communities*<br>*Leading an institution* | | Gather/duplicate/ distribute materials to team members | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • *Person Leadership Development (e.g. 360 degree feedback)*<br>• *Goals/vision work*<br>• *Change processes*<br>• *The challenge of substance* | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Develop computer problem-based learning module | | EG | | |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Buy equipment | | | |
| | • | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Identify and recruit faculty | | EG/GZD | | 10/98-10/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Develop administrative team | | | |
| | • Develop faculty team | | | |
| | • Identify core faculty | | | |
| | • Identify adjunct faculty | | | |
| | • Identify field faculty | | | |
| | • Identify expert consultants | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Work with faculty group to design curriculum, internships, etc. | | EG/GZD/Faculty team | | 2/99, 4/99, 5/99, 6/99, 8/99, 10/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • | | • Budget | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Travel/hotel arrangments<br>• Expense reports<br>• Consultant forms | |
| **TASK:**<br>Site arrangements | | | | 9/98-3/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Decide venue (university/conference center) | | | |
| | • Research/visit/choose site | | • Budget<br>• Travel/hotel arrangements<br>• Contracts | |
| **TASK:**<br>Develop communication strategy | | GZD/NR/EG | | 9/98--?? |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • | | | |
| | • | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Logistical frame for the program | | | | |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Decide on university connection | | | |
| | • Create a modus vivendi for working with university | | Coordinate meetings | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:**<br>Develop funding proposal and budget | | KAB | | 8/98—2/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Develop administrative structure and requirements for the program | | | | 8/98—10/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Develop evaluation plan | | SS/EG/GZD | | |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Planning meetings | | EG/GZD/? | | (2 days each month)<br>9/98, 10/98, 11/98, 12/98, 1/99, 2/99, 3/99, 4/99, 5/99, 6/99, 7/99, 8/99, 9/99, 10/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • | | • Travel/hotel arrangements<br>• Budget<br>• Expense reports | |
| | • | | | |

TEMPLATE FOR WORKPLAN PROJECTS

**Project Name** JEWEL Planning
**Team: Team Leader** Ellen Goldring/Gail Dorph
**Leadership team** Karen Barth, Sarah Feinberg, Cippi Harte
**Extended planning team** Pearl Beck, Sally Gottesman, Elie Holzer, Barry Holtz, Dan Pekarsky, Nessa Rapoport, Leah Strigler, Research Director

| | PERSONNEL | SUPPORT/ ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS | BEGINNING/ ENDING DATES |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:** Scans (Ed. Leadership, Mandel Programs in Israel, Not-for-profit management, volunteer/board development, business) | | | July 98-October 98 |
| SUB TASKS: | | | |
| • Collect, monitor scans (additional questions) | LT | • Thank you notes<br>• Consultation forms/honoraria<br>• Distribute documents | |
| • Interview key informants | LT | | |
| • Synthesize scans | | | 12/98 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:**<br>Data collection for professional and lay leadership programs in Jewish community | | | | 7/98—12/98 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Review interview protocol | SG, EG | | 8/98 |
| | • Review ALOHA documents | SDF, EG | | 8/98-11/98 |
| | • Interview program directors | SG | • Set up/coordinate interviews | 8/98—9/98 |
| | • Write summary document | SG | • Duplicate document<br>• Fax/mail document to team<br>• Thank you notes to participants | 10-98—11/98 |
| **TASK:**<br>Lay Leadership Research | | Pearl Beck | | 7/98—3/2000 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Interview key informants | | • Set up/coordinate interviews | 7/98—12/98 |
| | • Create interim reports for leadership team | | • Duplicate document<br>• Fax/mail document to team<br>• Thank you notes to participants | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:**<br>Consultations with CIJE Staff | | | | |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Plan two meetings to review documents and their implications | | • Travel/hotel arrangements<br>• Budget/ consultation forms<br>• Set up meeting room<br>• Order food | 8/98, 12/98, 2/99 |
| | • Create agenda | EG/GZD | • Distribute agenda | |
| | • Gather and create appropriate documents | EG/GZD | • Collect/distribute documents | |
| **TASK:**<br>Develop School of Thought of **Jewish** Educational Leadership | | EH | | 9/98—2/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Scan Jewish educational leadership (collect/monitor)<br>  • Programs<br>  • People | | • Thank you notes<br>• Consultation/ honoraria forms<br>• Duplicate/ distribute documents | |
| | • Interview key informants | | Set up/coordinate interviews | |
| | • Synthesize the underpinnings of Jewish educational leadership | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TASK:**<br>Learn about "knowledge and use" of Jewish content in leadership | | EH | | 9/98—2/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Interview key informants | | | |
| | • Write summary report | | | |
| **TASK:**<br>Explore historical/halachic underpinnings of Jewish educational leadership | | BWH | | |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Plan and implement two consultations | | | 12/98, 3/98 |
| | • Invite Art Green and Sarna to present at consultation | | | 10/98 |
| | • Write preliminary paper for consultation | | | 11/98, 1/99 |
| **TASK:**<br>Study Group—Jewish texts and educational leadership | | EH | | September 98-June 99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Plan sessions | | • Duplicate/ distribute texts to study group | |
| | • Write up: What did we learn from Milwaukee Pilot | DNP, NR | | November 98 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • Keep on-going notes of texts studied and issues raised | | | |
| | • Create a proposal for text study strategy for JEWEL pilot | | | |
| **TASK:** Best Practices Site Visits | | EG, GZD, ADH, KAB, PCH | | 10/98—4/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Determine sites to visit | | | |
| | • Visit sites | | • Coordinate dates<br>• Travel/hotel arrangements<br>• Expense reports | |
| | • Write brief report on lessons learned/implications for JEWEL | | • Duplicate/ distribute report | |
| **TASK:** Community needs assessment date | | | | 1/99—12/99?? |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Review/revise template | SG, leadership team | • Duplicate/ distribute template | |
| | • Interview key informants | SG | • Setup/coordinate interviews | |
| | • Write summary report of lessons learned | SG | • Duplicate/ distribute report | |
| **TASK:** Create Revised JEWEL Strawman | | EG, KAB | Duplicate/distribute | 1/99 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| **TASK:** Create a business plan for JEWEL | | KAB, TBD | Duplicate/distribute | 1/99—6/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Research models of collaborative structures (university/other) | | • | |
| | • investigate pros, cons, and costs of alternative sites | | • | |
| | • Lay out key "business" issues and hold a workshop to discuss | | • | |
| | • Research costs, pros and cons of potential costs/revenues | | • | |
| | • Draft plan, review, revise | | • | |
| **TASK:** Develop/implement a communication plan | | NR | | 6/99—12/99 |
| | SUB TASKS: | | | |
| | • Update letters to board members | | | Bimonthly |

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

NOT FOR QUOTATION

# Development of Nonprofit Sector Leaders and Managers: A Review of Educational Approaches

Dennis R. Young, Case Western Reserve University

August, 1998

## Overview

This paper offers an overview of educational programming now in place to prepare individuals for careers as managers and leaders of private, not-for-profit organizations in the United States and to develop the leadership and management capacities of current nonprofit managers and leaders. The focus here is on programming directed to personnel in the private, nonprofit sector as a whole, especially those working in public benefit organizations such as those with 501(c)3 or 501(c)4 tax exempt status. No specific attention is given here to specialized programming for particular nonprofit subfields such as health care, social work, education or the arts. Moreover, attention is focused largely on educational programming provided through colleges and universities. Thus, specific programming offered by professional and trade associations, management support organizations or consultants is not given close attention except as it is provided in partnership with university programs. This limitation is necessary to confine the present paper to a manageable scope. It is by no means meant to minimize the importance of educational programming for nonprofit organization leadership and management by such organizations. Associations, for example, allocate significant proportions of their expenditures to member education (Nonprofit Times, July 1998)).

The purpose of this paper is to provide the Council for Initiatives in Jewish

Education (CIJE) with a sense of the thinking behind various approaches to leadership and management education in the nonprofit sector, so that CIJE can judge the applicability of these ideas to the domain of leadership in Jewish education. Despite the specific emphasis here on university-based programming, the portfolio of offerings described here is rich and diverse, and offers many possibilities for CIJE's possible consideration. Moreover, given that Jewish education can be seen as a proper subsector within the nonprofit domain, the various educational approaches to management and leadership described here are appropriate for CIJE's consideration.

**Background**

The field of university-based nonprofit management and leadership education has grown rapidly since the early 1980s. The evolution of thinking in this field, and the proliferation of programs, is documented in two books that bracket the early days and the current state of continued rapid growth (see O'Neill and Young, 1988 and O'Neill and Fletcher, 1998). Today, more than seventy universities in the U.S. have substantial educational programming for nonprofit managers and leaders at the graduate level (Wish and Mirabella, 1998). While most of these educational offerings are found within masters degree programs directed towards entry and middle level managerial staff, the menu is actually quite diverse, encompassing several different schools of thought, several alternative student target groups, a variety of curricular models and different modes of program delivery. This variety of approaches is sketched below.

**Schools of Thought**

University-based nonprofit management and leadership education has developed on the basis of at least four intermingled, underlying philosophies:

1) Before the 1980s, nonprofit management and leadership was not

conceptualized as a field of study in itself. Rather, education in this arena was fragmented and specialized into certain major subfields of professional administration such as social work administration, arts administration, higher education administration and health care administration. These streams of educational programming for administration continue to prosper in parallel with the new developments in nonprofit management education. The educational philosophy under this model is that the particular subfield in unique and requires its own special approach. The nonprofit manager in this paradigm may be thought of as a "clinical professional/adminstrator" - a social worker, artist, physician or educator - who has taken on responsibilities of administration in the natural course of his or her professional career but does not necessarily think of herself or himself as primarily a manager.

2) Many nonprofit management and leadership programs in the U.S. have developed within the framework of graduate programs in public administration. In this context, nonprofit management and leadership is considered a variant of a career in public service and the commonalities between service in government and work in the not-for-profit sector are emphasized. This model is seen as increasingly relevant as government downsizes its own operations and carries out much of the public's business through financing and contracting with private, nonprofit organizations, or indeed by withdrawing from certain areas of service delivery, such as employment and income support for former welfare clients, and ceding responsibility to the private sector. Thus, in the public administration paradigm, the manager/leader is seen as a public servant *per se* attuned to carrying out the public's business in the public interest - whether inside or outside government.

3) Several of the new university programs in nonprofit management and

leadership education start from the premise that nonprofit organizations are essentially businesses with public or semi-public missions. They must compete successfully in the marketplace for their sustenance, they must break even financially or fail, and they must be competently managed. This view is embraced especially by education programs that have developed in a business school context. It is reenforced by current trends indicating that fee revenue and commercial sources of income have been steadily growing as a proportion of nonprofit revenues and now constitute the largest single component of such income, ahead of charitable contributions and grants from government (Salamon, 1992). A new emphasis on social entrepreneurship as a productive approach to social problem solving also reenforces this educational philosophy (Dees, 1998; Shore 1995). In the business paradigm, the nonprofit manager is viewed as a manager *per se*, responsible for running the nonprofit "business" effectively and efficiently to promote its mission in the context of its particular economic environment.

4) Many of the new programs, especially those that have developed under independent auspices (outside schools of business or public administration) or in interdisciplinary contexts, have conceived of nonprofit management and leadership education as a unique and holistic field of study, applicable across the whole nonprofit sector and substantially different from business management *or* education for public service. In this view, nonprofits are driven by a wide variety of missions conceived independently of government, embued with special values such as voluntarism, charitable giving and community service, governed by volunteer boards, and responsive and accountable to numerous, diverse societal groups that have come together voluntarily to pursue their collective goals. Under this philosophy, leaders and managers of nonprofit organizations require

their own particular brand of education which emphasizes the historical context and value-basis of the sector, and the unique aspects of managing these particular types of organizations. In this paradigm, the nonprofit manager is seen as an inspirational, galvanizing leader and responsible steward of the organization's resources, charged with defining the vision of the organization, getting its various constituencies to work together, articulating its social and moral values, and managing the organization in a manner that respects and promotes those values.

While the four metaphorical conceptions of the nonprofit manager - as clinical professional, as public servant, as business manager and as galvanizing leader - capture the essence of the different contemporary approaches to university-based nonprofit management education, their manifestations are not dramatically distinct in practice. All educational programs, no matter what their philosophical basis, tend to combine these different perspectives to some extent. Still, these metaphors are helpful in understanding why nonprofit management education programs vary so much from university to university and from one field of service to another.

It is also worth noting that these distinctions apply most strongly to education of paid managerial staff of nonprofit organizations. There is more consensus surrounding the conception of volunteer leaders who serve as trustees of nonprofit organizations, than there is for professional management. While in practice, nonprofit boards of trustees are seen to vary greatly in effectiveness and widely in need of improvement, it is generally understood that trustees serve as voluntary stewards of their organizations, responsible for ensuring corporate and financial integrity, setting corporate direction, and addressing organizational mission as effectively as possible. (The for-profit notion of board members as paid corporate directors, while practiced in some quarters of the nonprofit sector, is generally frowned upon in this sector.) Most educational

programming addressed to trustees underlines these basic ideas, while also providing trustees with background in practical skills such as strategic planning and fund raising.

**Curricula**

The four alternative paradigms reflect themselves to varying degrees in the nonprofit management and leadership curricula offered by various university programs across the country. Curricular content in these programs can be divided into six broad categories of subject matter. Most programs have at least a smattering from each category, but emphasis on any given category varies widely and depends on a program's particular philosophy and auspice, student body, and overall intensity and comprehensiveness. The following is a brief summary of the major conceptual categories of educational subject matter to be found in university programs for nonprofit managers and leaders. (See Wish and Mirabella, 1998 for an alternative classification system and exampes of course titles):

1) *Core Management and Leadership Skills and Principles*: This curricula component addresses nonprofits as organizations *per se*, recognizing that nonprofits share common attributes and principles of management and leadership with many other kinds of organizations. Hence, this component covers basic ideas of organizational theory, leadership theory, human resources management, financial management and accounting, marketing, and strategic planning. It also includes fundamental analytical skills generally considered important for successful nonprofit management and leadership, including statistical analysis, research methods, computer skills, and economic analysis.

2) *Historical, Theoretical and Policy Context:* This component of nonprofit curricula is intended to provide leaders and managers with broader, longer term perspectives on the context and traditions of the nonprofit sector and its relations

to other sectors. Subject matter here includes the history of charity and philanthropy, the size and scope of the sector in the U.S. and internationally, the public policy context of nonprofits and why they developed as a special legal form, and the various economic and social theories explaining why nonprofit organizations exist in a market economy and democratic society. Programs that emphasize nonprofit careers as forms of public service stress the interrelationship between nonprofit organizations and government, the role of nonprofits in influencing public policy and the impacts of public policy on nonprofit organizations.

3) *Values*. This segment of nonprofit curricula emphasizes the uniqueness of nonprofit organizations and the special value basis of the sector, including charitable, religious, community and social values embodied in nonprofit organizations, and the nature and importance of ethical standards and accountability in the nonprofit sector. This curricular component also emphasizes the special character of nonprofit trusteeship and the role of mission as the primary performance criterion of nonprofits, compared to the more instrumental role that mission plays in the business and government sectors.

4) *Special Mechanics of Nonprofit Organizations*. Many educational offerings for nonprofit managers emphasize the special practical skills that distinguish the management and leadership of a nonprofit organization from that of business management or administration of a government bureau. These skills include charitable fund raising, managing volunteers, managing funds from a panoply of sources - donations, sales, grants, investment income, etc., adhering to special legal and governmental reporting requirements, managing a variety of stakeholder groups, and operating within the framework of a volunteer governing board. Curricular offerings in this category strengthen the "nuts and bolts" skill

capacities of nonprofit managers by adapting core management and leadership skills and principles to the particular context of nonprofit operations.

5) *Experiential Learning*. Most university-based programs in nonprofit management and leadership recognize that learning is best motivated and mastered by relating it closely to the contexts where it applies. Thus, students at every level are encouraged to bring their experiences to the classroom in the form of examples and term projects that address problems and issues within organizations where they have worked. Nonprofit curricula also increasingly utilize case studies, especially as published case studies specific to nonprofit organizations become more widely available through journals such as *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* and special projects such as the nonprofit case study collection of the University of San Francisco.

In addition to integrating experiential learning into extant coursework, many programs offer various explicit field work components. These include team projects in which groups of students work with nonprofit organizations in the community on a consultation basis, supervised individual student internships, and mentoring relationships established between students and senior nonprofit managers. Such arrangements, in addition to providing practical learning experiences, often help students establish important contacts for future career advancement.

6) *Issues and Applications*. Given the wide variety of fields spanned by nonprofit organizations, and the need for students to advance their knowledge and skills in specific contexts, some programs offer electives that allow students to specialize in particular service areas or on particular issues. Thus, otherwise generic programs in nonprofit management and leadership may offer special courses in arts management, social services administration, or health care administration.

Alternatively, programs emphasizing the public service philosophy might offer courses on special issues such as tax policy or government contracting. Similarly, nonprofit curricula emphasizing the business philosophy might offer special course work in social entrepreneurship or social marketing. In general, a wide variety of special topics is possible within the framework of nonprofit management education, depending on the interests of the students and faculty and the resources available to pursue these interests.

As indicated, the emphasis on these various curricular components can be expected to vary, depending on the educational philosophy of the program. Table 1 summarizes this idea. The X's in the cells of the matrix indicate the curricular components that programs based on each of the four educational paradigms of nonprofit management are likely to emphasize. Double X's indicate special emphasis. As previously noted, there is substantial overlap in the specific curricula emanating from the different approaches. Still, differences emerge in both the degree of emphasis on particular curricular components as well as in the overall intensity of focus of a given program on the nonprofit sector *per se* versus public policy, business or a given professional field such as social work or health care. (For details of curricular differences among nonprofit management programs based on public administration, business administration, social work, and stand-alone generic nonprofit management, see Wish and Mirabella, 1998.)

**TABLE 1**

| Paradigm/ Curriculum Component | Professional | Public Servant | Business Manager | Galvanizing Leader |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Core Mgmt Skills | | X | XX | X |
| History/Theory/Policy | | XX | | XX |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Values** | X | | | XX |
| **Special Mechanics** | X | X | X | X |
| **Experiential** | X | X | X | X |
| **Issues/ Applications** | XX | X | | |

Currently there is no professional consensus on what is the best curriculum or best degree programs for a careeer in nonprofit management. Haas and Robinson (1998) indicate that from the perspective of nonprofit employers there is no single degree of choice, that the relatively new concept of specialized degrees and certificates in nonprofit management is generally well-received, and that employers in larger organizations tend to prefer the more traditional programs based in public administration, business administration or a given service profession.

**Levels and Formats**

While most attention to date in university-based nonprofit management and leadership education has been focused on the professional masters degree level, there is in fact substantial variation in both the types of educational programs offered and the types of students who attend these offerings. Students who attend nonprofit management and leadership educational programs may be roughly divided into the following four categories:

*Top Executive Leaders*. This group encompasses the chief executive officers and other top professional staff of major nonprofit organizations such as national associations, fund raising federations, or large institutions such as hospitals, universities and museums. These individuals may be considered the professional leadership of important segments of the nonprofit sector, nationally, regionally or within particular communities.

> Such individuals are unlikely to have the time or inclination to attend intensive degree programs but often seek less time consuming educational experiences that enhance their skills and perspectives.

*Executive and Professional Staff*. These are the top management people of smaller and moderate sized nonprofit organizations and middle managers in larger nonprofit organizations. These individuals may be attracted to graduate degree and certificate programs that enhance their basic skills and offer credentials for advancing their careers, as well as to less time-intensive and less formal educational offerings.

*Aspiring Nonprofit Managers*. These are generally younger individuals who are interested in pursuing careers in the nonprofit sector. They are likely to have some work and volunteer experience in nonprofit organizations and may be attracted to either undergraduate or graduate programs in nonprofit management, depending on their current educational status.

*Volunteer Leaders and Trustees*. Board members obviously play a critical role in the stewardship of nonprofit organizations of all types and sizes. These individuals derive from a wide variety of business, professional and other backgrounds and most are engaged in nonprofit work only on a part-time and voluntary basis. While many trustees are interested in educating themselves to their board responsibilities, and while many nonprofit executives see the value in developing the capacities of their boards, finding the appropriate modes for trustee education constitutes an important challenge. Various short term workshops and training programs have recently emerged to address this challenge.

Clearly the educational interests and constraints of these diverse nonprofit management and leadership groups require a variety of educational options. The

following is a rough description of the spectrum of educational formats in which nonprofit management and leadership education is offered. The spectrum runs from programs involving intensive university involvement, to programs that involve universities only peripherally or not at all, and from programs requiring substantial time commitments by participants to those that require only a few hours:

*Doctoral Programs*. There are few if any doctoral programs in study of the nonprofit sector *per se*, but various programs are available that allow students to focus their doctoral studies on nonprofit management and leadership issues. Most of these are based in disciplinary departments such as history, social work, economics, sociology or management. Examples include the economics doctoral program at Indiana Univerisity and the social policy/history program at Case Western Reserve University. There are also some interdisciplinary "practicing doctorate" programs that allow students to shape their own course of study to focus on the issues they face in practice. Examples include the doctoral program of the Union Institute and the Executive Doctorate in Management program of Case Western Reserve University, both of which serve significant numbers of nonprofit sector leaders. The latter programs also allow students to continue to work while they pursue their studies. As such, these programs can accommodate high level professional staff and even top leadership of nonprofit organizations.

*Professional Masters Degree Programs*. As suggested above, these programs come in a variety of forms, including concentrations of MPA and MBA programs, majors or concentrations in professional masters programs in social work, health care or the arts, and holistic, generically focused nonprofit management degree programs in nonprofit management such as the Master of Nonprofit Organizations (MNO) program of Case Western Reserve University or the

Master of Nonprofit Administration (MNA) of the University of San Francisco. The MPA option is featured at many schools including Indiana University, the Bloch School of the University of Missouri/Kansas City, the Humphrey Institute of the University of Minnesota, and Center for Public Service of Seton Hall University. The MBA concentration is featured at the Haas School of the University of California/Berkeley and the business school of the University of St. Thomas in Minnesota. Moreover, business schools at universities including Stanford and Northwestern feature combined concentrations in the public and nonprofit management. Harvard University has recently instituted concentrations in both its MBA program in the Harvard Business School and in its MPA program in the Kennedy School of Government. A variation of the professional masters degree is the executive masters degree designed to provide a more intensive and usually higher priced accelerated masters program for experienced MBAs or MPAs. While there are few if any executive MBAs focusing on nonprofit management, the executive MPA program at Baruch College, City University of New York serves substantial numbers of nonprofit executives. Finally, it should be noted that many professional masters programs without formal nonprofit concentrations are now offering individual courses in nonprofit management. For example, the Yale School of Management offers such courses and has served many students from the nonprofit sector in recent years.

*Undergraduate Coursework.* The nonprofit sector has been widely neglected in undergraduate education. However, progress is now being made in introducing coursework on the nonprofit sector into undergraduate offerings. For example, at Case Western Reserve University undergraduates may enroll in introductory nonprofit sector courses in economics and history. *American Humanics* is notable for its work in nonprofit management at the undergraduate level. This

not-for profit organization works in partnership with several dozen college and universities to institute undergraduate courses in nonprofit management and offer internships leading to careers in youth serving organizations such as the Boy Scouts.

*Certificate Programs*. Some universities offer formal certificate programs in nonprofit management or in specialized areas such as fund raising. Some of these programs, such as the Certificate in Nonprofit Management of the Mandel Center at Case Western Reserve University, offer credit-bearing coursework which may be used towards a masters degree program. While most certificate programs attract local clientele, some programs such as CWRU's national certificate program and George Mason University's (GMU) internet-based certificate program, attract students on a national and international basis. Most certificate programs, such as those of CWRU, GMU and the University of San Francisco (USF), are generically focused on nonprofit management. Others are more specialized, including the certificates in fund raising of USF and of the Fund Raising School of the Center on Philanthropy of Indiana University.

It should be noted that the concept of a "certificate" is much less standardized than that of a university degree. Some certificates involve credit-bearing coursework and others do not. Moreover, the requirements for achieving a certificate vary widely. Certificate programs in nonprofit management are also gaining popularity outside the formal university context. Professional societies such as ASAE and NSFRE have long provided certifications in association management and fund raising, respectively, sometimes utilizing university-based coursework as credit towards these certifications. Recently, the The Learning Institute for Nonprofit Organizations, part of the Society for Nonprofit Organizations in Wisconsin, announced "the first

national certificate program in nonprofit leadership and management", provided in partnership with the PBS Adult Learning Service and co-sponsored by United Way of America. This program does not draw on academic resources but features eight lectures by distinguished practitioners broadcast by satellite. It offers participants options for certificates of participation or certificates of excellence, the latter including continuing education units (CEUs) creditable towards professional licensure requirements. The program bears some resemblance to an earlier satellite program series offered by the Peter F. Drucker Foundation which also provided participants with certificates of participation and CEU credits.

Certificate programs such as those of the Learning Institute, George Mason's internet-based program, and the Mandel Center's national certificate program, signal a growing trend towards "distance learning" in nonprofit management education. The Open University in the United Kingdom has pioneered distance learning techniques for university education in general, and has offered a masters degree concentration in nonprofit management via distance learning for several years now (see Smith, 1994).

*Fellows Programs*. Some universities offer international fellows programs that attract high (doctoral) level students, advanced practitioners and other leaders to study nonprofit sector issues in the United States. Examples include the international fellows programs of the Institute for Policy Studies of Johns Hopkins University and the Center for the Study of Philanthropy of the City University of New York. Another interesting example is the exchange program of the Cleveland International Program which sometimes places professionals from other countries within research or educational programs associated with nonprofit management or social work at Case Western Reserve University.

Outside the university context, the Peter F. Drucker Foundation has also instituted the new Frances Hesselbein Community Innovation Fellows Program. This competitive program selects four outstanding nonprofit sector leaders in the U.S. each year to participate in special educational programs of the Drucker Foundation designed to advance their professional development.

*Contractual and In-Service Programs*. University centers sometimes work intensively with particular nonprofit organizations or associations to offer customized educational programming for the members of those organizations. For example, the Mandel Center has developed specialized programs, ranging from a few days to several weeks in duration, for such national associations as the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., Boys and Girls Clubs of America, the Jewish Community Centers Association, and Opera America, as well as for local organizations such as the the Jewish Federation of Cleveland. These programs customize the general curricula and faculty capacities of the Mandel Center's graduate programs to the particular interests and needs of the individual client organizations. Some of these programs resulted in "certificates of completion" for those who successfully participate in the programs. (For example, participants in the Girl Scouts program receive certificates of completion jointly issued by the Mandel Center and Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.) Often, such contractual programs are extensions of existing in-service programs of national associations that wish to upgrade the quality and scope of their training services to members. Such was the case with the Girl Scouts and the JCCA which maintain extensive educational program offerings for their memberships, or with the National Health Council which recently enhanced its annual leadership program for executives and board chairs of national voluntary health associations by inviting presentations of various scholars contracted through the

Mandel Center. Historically, the National Academy for Voluntarism of United Way of America has also contracted with academic scholars from various schools to provide in-service coursework in management and leadership of United Ways and other nonprofit organizations.

*Short Courses and Workshops.* University centers such as the Mandel Center or the Institute for Policy Studies of Johns Hopkins University, professional support organizations such as the National Center for Nonprofit Boards, or professional associations such as the National Society of Fund Raising Executives or the American Society of Association Executives periodically offer short courses and noncredit workshops on particular subjects such as trusteeship, fund raising, or financial management. Such workshops are often focused on specific skills such as grant writing or board development.

*Conferences and Think Tanks.* University centers such as the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, the Mandel Center at CWRU or the Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management at the University of San Francisco, regularly sponsor conferences on general topics such as devolution, nonprofit management education, the involvement of nonprofit organizations in the marketplace, or other contemporary issues. While these events may showcase the work of university faculty, they also engage important speakers from the world of practice and they provide a framework for two-way exchange of information and ideas between academic and nonprofit sector leaders.

Professional organizations such as the National Center on Nonprofit Boards or the Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Mangement also offer such conference programming, focused on topics of management and governance skills and capacities. Alternatively, scholarly associations such as the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action

(ARNOVA), the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) or the Academy of Management offer a variety of research-oriented presentations of interest to nonprofit managers and leaders, within the context of their annual conferences, while professional membership associations such as the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE) and the National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE) offer a variety of practical workships as well as academic presentations within their annual membership meetings.

An interesting variant of the conference format is the "think tank" program in which a small group of top nonprofit leaders and academic scholars is invited to deliberate on a topic of special interest to the field. Examples include recent think tanks held by the Mandel Center and funded by the Lilly Endowment on issues including nonprofit sector accountability, and boundaries of the nonprofit sector, regional programs on devolution sponsored by the Humphrey Insitute of the University of Minnesota and the Center on Philanthropy of Indiana University, and the recent convening of nonprofit and academic leaders by the American Assembly of Columbia University and the Center on Philanthropy of Indiana University to deliberate on the future of the nonprofit sector. Some of these events have resulted in formal publications and joint resolutions of conference participants. (See American Assembly, 1998 and the Special Issue of *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 1995).

The foregoing variety in content and format allows, to a substantial extent, the different nonprofit management and leadership constituencies to find educational combinations that best suit their particular needs for conceptual as well as skill development. While there is no one-to-one fit of particular constituent groups to specific types of program offerings, there is some sorting of groups by the types of

programs that best suit them. Table 2 below, provides a rough sketch of the landscape of program offerings by constituent groups. The X's in the boxes suggest which modes of educational programming are best adapted to each of the constituency groups. Double X's indicate particular suitability of a given group to a specific type of program offering:

TABLE 2

| Group/ Program | Top Leaders | Professional Staff | Aspiring Nonprofit Managers | Volunteer Leaders |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Doctoral** | X | X | | |
| **Masters** | | XX | XX | |
| **Undergrad** | | | X | |
| **Certificate** | | XX | | |
| **Fellows** | X | X | | |
| **Contractual** | XX | XX | | X |
| **Workshops** | | XX | | XX |
| **Conferences** | XX | X | | X |

**Major Trends and Future Directions**

The last decade has witnessed a number of trends in education of nonprofit managers and leaders, including:

* Exponential growth of university programs addressed to nonprofit management and leadership, and emergence of this field of study as having its own identity, distinct from management and leadership in the business and government sectors;

* Increasing collaboration between nonprofit organizations and associations on the one hand, and university programs on the other;

* A growing recognition that education of nonprofit managers *per se* is not sufficient to improve the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations. In particular, the role of boards of directors has become broadly recognized as critical element in nonprofit effectiveness and trustee education is emerging as an important priority;

* A growing recognition that ethics, values and accountability are as important as

business skills in the effective leadership of nonprofit organizations.

The latter two points are worth some further elaboration. The movement towards graduate education of nonprofit managers began in the early 1980s with an emphasis on finding ways to make nonprofit organizations more efficient by training professional managers in business methods and management techniques. Over the years, nonprofits have indeed become more businesslike, relying more heavily on earned income, emphasizing the marketing of their products and services, engaging in strategic planning, and in other ways. However, the nonprofit sector has also recently been plagued with highly visible scandals in major nonprofit nonprofit institutions such as United Way of America, Covenant House and the NAACP, and public confidence in nonprofit institutions has declined. While by no means pervasive, these scandals and other problems have highlighted both ineffectiveness of some boards of trustees in dealing with issues of corporate integrity, and difficulties nonprofits sometimes experience in adhering to their special values and maintaining their public trust. Hence, educational programs for leaders and managers have begun to broaden their scope beyond professional management, to include volunteer trustees and to make ethics, values and accountability more prominent in their curricula. The issue of how to respond to market-based and governmental incentives while remaining true to mission represents a growing conundrum for the future of nonprofit organizations and in the education of its managers and leaders.

A major issue for the future is whether, nonprofit leadership and management education will continue to develop in its own way, or whether it will ultimately become reintegrated with management and leadership education for business and the public sector. There are reasons to suggest that either could occur. On the one hand, the field of nonprofit management and leadership development could grow more and more distinct from business and public sector programming as the special character of the

sector becomes more widely appreciated and as research knowledge and educational materials particular to the nonprofit sector become more abundant. On the other hand, the borderlines between sectors continue to blur and nonprofit leaders must become more adept at boundary spanning. Arguments can be made that nonprofit leaders must be mobile across government-nonprofit borders if the new partnerships between government and nonprofits are to prosper and if government continues to devolve its responsibilities to local communities and the private sector. Similarly, as nonprofits put more emphasis on sales income and commercial initiatives, and as the "social enterprise" movement produces organizational configurations that confound easy distinctions of nonprofit versus for-profit, the argument for a more generic approach to management and leadership which crosses business/nonprofit lines becomes stronger.

**Best Practices**

The field of nonprofit management and leadership education is still a young and evolving one, so there are few principles yet set in stone. The following are a few tenets around which there is probably general consensus among nonprofit educators and leaders:

* Education for nonprofit leadership and management requires not just skill proficiency in management techniques but also an understanding of the special value context and social role of nonprofit organizations;
* Education for nonprofit leadership and management cannot be solely academic but must be integrated with field work and job experience;
* Education for nonprofit leadership and management cannot be solely generic but must be tuned to the practical differences of running nonprofits versus other types of organizations, including the unique ways in which nonprofits raise and spend money, the manner in which they are governed, the way in which they

recruit and reward people, the special economic, legal, political and social environments to which they must respond, and the special missions they address;

* Education for nonprofit leadership and management must acknowledge that the nonprofit sector itself is extremely diverse and provisions must be made to accommodate the varying needs of smaller versus larger nonprofit organizations, and organizations in such different fields of service as the arts, religion, social service, health care and environmental conservation. Differences among service producing versus advocacy organizations, and between smaller, less formal, solely volunteer organizations and those that employ professional staffs, must also be accommodated.

It also probably too early to identify "exemplary programs" of nonprofit leadership and management education in any definitive way at this stage of development. There are some programs that have been recognized by peers as leaders over the past decade, but in many ways the field has been led collectively by academic leaders through institutions such as the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, ARNOVA and Independent Sector. Just for purposes of illustration, and at the risk of leaving deserving programs out, the following programs can be cited as exemplary in various ways:

* The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University: This program administers the well known Fund Raising School, has developed a new Masters of Philanthropic Studies that emphasizes the value basis of the nonprofit sector, and has developed a nonprofit management concentration in the MPA program of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs which promises to become a major source of graduates in the field of nonprofit management and leadership.

* The Mandel Center at Case Western Reserve University: This program has

pioneered the Master of Nonprofit Organizations (MNO) degree, a professional credential equivalent to the MBA or MPA but designed solely for nonprofit managers and leaders. It has also developed a creditbearing Certificate in Nonprofit Management in two versions - one of which attracts students nationwide and internationally. The Mandel Center has also pioneered think tank programs that have allowed national sector leaders to deliberate on major issues affecting them, and also various local seminar, lecture and workshop programs for trustees and nonprofit managers on issues such as government devolution, accountability, and cross-fertilization of management ideas between nonprofits and business.

*The Institute for Nonprofit Organization Management of the University of San Francisco was the first to create a separate degree program for nonprofit managers, its Masters of Nonprofit Administration. USF has also distinguished itself by convening national and regional conferences for nonprofit leaders and scholars on diverse topics including nonprofit management education, and the role of ethnic groups and women in the nonprofit sector.

* The Institute for Policy Studies of Johns Hopkins University is the leading center for the study of the nonprofit sector on an international basis. It has pioneered fellows programs for visiting nonprofit leaders and scholars and is currently developing a graduate nonprofit management program that focuses on the partnership between nonprofits and government.

Many other accomplished programs could be cited including those of the University of Missouri/Kansas City, Seton Hall University and the New School for Social Research. In addition, exciting developments are taking place at Harvard University at both the Kennedy School of Government and the Harvard Business School, which may provide models for nonprofit management and leadership development in the future. In

all, the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (NACC) now includes more than two dozen directors of university-based nonprofit management and leadership programs, all of which have contributed to the field's development in some important way.

## REFERENCES

"Associations Spend 25% of Income on Education", Nonprofit Times, July 1998, p.5

J. Gregory Dees, "Enterprising Nonprofits", Harvard Business Review, January-February 1998, pp.55-67

Peter J. Haas and Maynard Robinson, "The Views of Nonprofit Executives on Educating Nonprofit Managers", Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 1998 (forthcoming)

Michael O'Neill and Kathleen Fletcher (eds.), Nonprofit Management Education: U.S. and World Perspectives, Greenwood Publishing Company, 1998

Michael O'Neill and Dennis R. Young (eds.), Educating Managers of Nonprofit Organizations, , Praeger Publishers, 1988.

Roseanne M. Mirabella and Naomi B. Wish, "Educational Impact of Graduate Nonprofit Degree Programs of Community Based Organizations: Perspectives of Multiple Stakeholders", draft, Seton Hall University, December 1997

Lester M. Salamon, America's Nonprofit Sector, The Foundation Center, 1992

Bill Shore, Revolution of the Heart, Riverhead Books, 1995

John Palmer Smith, "Nonprofit Management Education Through Distance Learning", Book Review, Nonprofit Management and Leadership, Vol.5, No.1, Fall 1994

*Special Issue: Dilemmas of Nonprofit Accountability*, Nonprofit Management and Leadership, Vol.6, No.2, Winter 1995

"Trust, Service and the Common Purpose: Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in a Changing America", Indiana University Center on Philanthropy and the American Assembly, April, 1998

Naomi B. Wish and Roseanne M. Mirabella, "Nonprofit Management Education: Current Offerings and Practices in University-Based Programs", Research Report, Nonprofit Management and Leadership, forthcoming 1998

Dennis R. Young, "Nonprofit Management Studies in the United States: The State of the Art", Case Western Reserve University, November 1997

cije.17a

# Scan of Programs: Educational Leadership

## Background Paper Prepared for Council of Innovative Jewish Education May 1998

By

Mike Milstein, University of New Mexico

### Introduction

> Whether they shift us in positive or negative directions, whether they are instantaneous or developmental, paradigm shifts move us from one way of seeing the world to another. And these shifts create powerful change. Our paradigms, correct or incorrect, are the sources of our attitudes and behaviors and ultimately our relationships with others. Stephen R. Covey

This comment by Covey speaks well for the paradigm shift that has been percolating in a minority of the approximately 500 higher education institutions that have programs for the preparation of educational leaders. This report summarizes on what these cutting edge programs are doing and learning. The report encompasses the following sections: background, current trends, emerging trends and best practices, and exemplary programs. It also includes a brief listing of individuals who can be contacted about developments in the field as well as a selected bibliography.

### Background

Formal preparation of educational administrators has gone through several phases. For the first half of this century preparation was provided in colleges of education by retired school administrators who shared their professional experiences with novices. During the 1950s major reforms were initiated, with the support of philanthropic organizations such as the Kellogg Foundation and the Ford Foundation. From the 1950s

until the 1980s the emphasis shifted away from preparation dominated by retired practitioners to professors who may or may not have had experiences as educational leaders. Their approach has been to present theoretical models and information derived from the behavioral sciences on the assumption that, given sufficient theory and knowledge, program graduates would be able to their learning to the development and improvement of their leadership practices.

The 1980s was a decade of severe criticism of public education. Criticism of schools was followed by criticism of the way that higher education institutions have been preparing educational administrators as well as other educational professionals. This led to significant debates about what constitutes an appropriate preparation program for educational leaders:

> Even those responsible for the preparation of administrators soon began to join the negative chorus. In fact, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, which was supported by the body that represents many of the more comprehensive university-based training programs, the University Council for Educational Administration, played a leading role in this criticism. The commission was particularly critical of the practioner-related elements of preparation programs, which it said were marked by 'lack of a definition of good educational leadership...lack of collaboration between school districts and universities...lack of systematic professional development for school administrators...lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experiences" (1987, pp. xvi-xvii, as quoted in Milstein, et. al. 1991).

More than ten years after the Commission's report, many of the approximately 500 preparation programs in the United States are still rooted in the behavioral sciences knowledge/theory movement. This approach still dominates thinking, even though "evidence from nearly all fronts led to the conclusion that the focus on the behavioral sciences...resulted in a glaring absence of consideration of the problems faced by practicing administrators" (Murphy and Forsyth, eds., 1998 manuscript). However over that same time period some preparation programs have been reconceptualized based upon

a basic question: What constitutes meaningful preparation for leadership in education? The growing body of evidence of positive outcomes achieved by these cutting edge programs is pressing other preparation programs to reconsider their extensive reliance on behavioral sciences frameworks.

## Current Trends

There is a sense of urgency to rethink the way educational leaders are prepared. This urgency can be traced to several realities, including 1) the rapid economic and social shifts which educational leaders need to understand if they are going to be able to guide the development of vision, direction, and support for their organizations; 2) the unique preparation--practical and problem focused, that is required for effective leadership; and 3) the reality that those seeking this preparation are likely to be under significant time constraints as mature adults with the many family and job-related responsibilities and pressures that typify this life-stage group.

These realities have challenged those who are responsible for designing and managing leadership preparation program to be creative and to be willing to take the risks that are required to break out of the behavioral science/theory focused status quo. Over the past decade an increasing number of universities have taken up this challenge.

The single most important stimulus for this effort has been the Danforth Foundation of St. Louis, Missouri which decided to use its resources (in the form of "seed monies") during the last half of the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s, to challenge universities to examine their preparation programs and move toward practical, hands-on, problem focused designs for leadership preparation. Over the time period of 1986 and 1991 the Foundation identified 22 universities across the nation that agreed to change their

programs, focusing particularly on meaningful and in-depth clinical experiences (Milstein and Associates, 1993).

In 1993 the Foundation decided to assess the impact of its efforts. A survey of participating universities was conducted and an in-depth case study was conducted at five of these institutions (Milstein and Associates, 1993). Figure One summarizes the major differences between "traditional" preparation programs and those that have been engaged in the Danforth program redesign experience. (See Figure One at end of paper).

Figure One provides a synopsis of the major shifts that are emerging in the Danforth-related preparation programs. Key elements include:

- **Active identification, recruitment, and support of candidates.** Current educational leaders are being asked to identify exceptional candidates and encourage them to participate in preparation programs. They are also playing more active roles during the time that candidates are involved—e.g., mentoring and teaching. As a result, candidates who complete leadership preparation programs are more likely to be hired for administrative roles because they come from organizations that promote their candidacy and provide laboratory settings for them to test their skills and knowledge.
- **Coordination and articulation of preparation programs elements.** Academic seminars and field experiences are more closely integrated. Rather than the traditional smorgasbord of activities, taken whenever it fits the needs and availability of students, programs are designed to maximize learning by sequencing and interrelating courses, imbedding reflection about clinical experiences in the discourse that takes place in campus seminars, and, conversely, bringing seminar experiences into the schools when feasible and appropriate.
- **Emphasis on cohorts.** Learning in ongoing groups enhances outcomes for students. The bonding and support that develops can make a big difference in the quality of the experience, the probability of completing the preparation program, and, may remain as an important source of strength for most participants long after formal preparation is completed.
- **Program design discussed frequently and openly by faculty members who also actively seek input from educational administrators.** There is a culture of inquiry, an attitude that preparation programs require formative as well as summative evaluation and that changes are likely to be needed as environmental conditions change. For example, during the past few years, some institutions are beginning to include community-based experiences as part of preparation because it is becoming more apparent that schools need to develop positive and meaningful partnerships with their communities.

- **Resources are provided by all partners**—students, universities, and school systems. Mutual responsibility as well as the mutual benefit is becoming more clearly understood. As a result, there is more effort to establish more equitable resource inputs among the several partners. A side benefit of this effort is that school systems have more potential to impact the way that educational leaders are prepared.
- **Instruction shifting from didactic, lecture style, to interactive classroom dynamics, which are often, initiated by students.** As students work in cohorts and become more involved in clinical experiences that require significant reflection, there is pressure to develop academic seminars that are based on adult learning principles. Professors are being challenged to be "relevant" and join with students in meaningful reflection about site-based experiences.
- **Clinical experiences as central elements of preparation.** Candidates are getting more "on the job" training time, having more diversified experiences, along with more opportunities to reflect with peers, professors, and mentors about their clinical experiences.
- **"Practitioner-scholars," educators who have extensive experience as leaders and who also can conduct research, publish and teach at the graduate level) provide guidance for students.** Practitioner-scholars have legitimacy on campus and in schools. They also tend to exhibit more enthusiasm for the work of supervision and student advisement clinical experiences than do other professors.

Three other trends are worth noting. First, there is an effort to establish meaningful distinctions between preparation programs for novices (i.e., those without administrative experience who are normally enrolled in Masters or Educational Specialist programs) and those who are more advanced (i.e., those with administrative experience and prior leadership training). The novice requires extensive preparation concerning fundamentals—e.g., budget development, school plant management, instructional leadership, and school-community relations. Advanced level students need opportunities to reflect on their extensive experiences and to develop conceptual frameworks, or mind maps that can enhance their ability to lead. Novices needs to focus on basics while advanced students need to focus on synthesizing their experiences. The novice's preparation focuses on transactional leadership, while advanced preparation should focus on transformational leadership.

Second, at the doctoral level of preparation, there is a long over-due effort to differentiate the Ed.D from the Ph.D. The Ed.D should include content and experiences (e.g., emphasis on practitioner research and clinical experiences) that make it the degree of choice of educational leaders who intend to stay in practitioner roles when they complete their programs. The Ph.D should include content and experiences (e.g., emphasis on basic research and theory) that make it the degree of choice of students whose career track is the professorship or a policy analysis position in settings such as school districts, state education agencies or the federal government. In the past, this doctoral program distinction has been minimal or non-existent at most universities. As a result of the effort to differentiate doctoral academic offerings by degrees, along with the fact that most candidates are currently in educational leadership roles and intend to stay in this kind of role, the Ed.D is now the most commonly offered degree.

Third, there is more emphasis on continuing professional development once formal preparation is completed. It is becoming more apparent that educational leaders will never be finished with their professional development. In this era of instant communications, rapidly changing demographics, shifting occupational patterns, and global economies, society and communities present educational leaders with a seemingly bottomless array of rapidly changing challenges. As a result, universities are experimenting with a variety of continuing education opportunities for their graduates and for others—e.g., principal centers, intensive seminars designed around cutting edge topics and focused offerings developed in partnerships with school districts.

## Emerging Trends and Best Practices

There are two engines that are driving emerging trends in the preparation of leaders for educational organizations. One is from "outside"—i.e., the field and its governing structure, and one is from within the preparation fraternity itself. At this point in time, it is difficult to identify any widespread agreement about "best practices," but there is a vigorous debate, being driven from both within and without, that may lead a consensus about best practices.

From "outside" a coalition of powerful organizations has formed over the past decade. As a result of the University Council for Educational Administration 1987 study noted earlier, a National Policy Board for Educational Administration was formed to bring the diverse interest groups to the same table. It includes such organizations as the American Association of School Administrators, the elementary and secondary principals associations, and the National School Boards Association, along with the University Council for Educational Administration. Having a shared setting and agenda provided the opportunity to examine priorities and identify skills, knowledge, and behaviors that should be exhibited by the nation's educational leaders. In turn, over the past five years the National Policy Board has worked closely with the Council of Chief State School Officers to develop a common set of standards for educational leaders. In 1996 the Council debated and agreed upon a set of standards for school leaders that is presently being implemented in certification and licensure requirements in states across the country (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). These standards are centered on shifting definitions of leadership that focus on student learning, collaboration, and an emphasis on assessment and

evaluation. Further, the standards are viewed as highly interrelated rather than discrete areas.

From within university preparation program faculties, the lessons derived over the past decade, as well as the increasing expectations by external initiatives such as the standards drive noted above, have helped to shape an agenda for preparation program reform. Restine (1997) has identified six principles that are likely to guide program design initiatives for the foreseeable future:

> First, activities and experiences should focus on problems of practice that facilitate the transfer of knowledge and skills to workplace settings. Second, instruction by university professors should be supplemented by practitioners to expand learning resources, promote networking with practicing administrators and maintain a connection to current administrative problems. Third, curriculum and instructional methods should encourage students to take increased responsibility for their own learning. Fourth, learning experiences should emphasize cooperation and teamwork among students working toward common goals. Fifth, curriculum and instructional activities should emphasize action, implementation, and evaluation as well as analysis and reflection. And sixth, students should receive diagnostic feedback from multiple sources and should develop the ability to assess their own performance. (pp. 120-121).

Other trends that can be added to the listing include:

- Moving away from residency requirements at the doctoral level;
- Increasing focus on partnerships (e.g., advisory groups, faculty/practitioner team teaching, mentoring);
- Greater uses of technology (e.g., distance learning, e mail, simulations);
- Closer examination of the relationship between leadership practices and student outcomes.

To varying degrees, "cutting edge" preparation programs are engaged in crafting meaningful programmatic responses to the emerging agenda identified from the field and from within the preparation community itself. In addition regional and national conferences are bringing professors from educational administration programs together to explore programmatic priorities and changing design features. Finally, a

growing literature base is being developed to disseminate the principles and goals that are being pursued and the outcomes that are being derived (see reference section for a sampling of this literature).

## Exemplary Programs

What is an exemplary program? As emphasized, there is no single, uniform belief system about 'best practices" let alone about exemplary programs. In part this is because leadership preparation reform efforts are still in an early phase of development and in part because of the large number (about 500) of higher education institutions engaged in preparing educational leaders.

From this writer's perspective, "exemplary programs" are those that are shifting their emphasis away from presenting behavioral science methods and findings with the assumption that participants will be able to make the necessary translations to leadership requirements. Instead, exemplary programs are those that emphasize hands-on learning, varying from simulations and case studies to intensive clinical experiences, as well as behavioral science content and methods. There are a growing number of these exemplary programs. A few examples include:

- Stanford, which has pioneered problem-based learning approaches (Bridges, 1992).
- Teachers College, Columbia University, which has pioneered intensive weekend and summer learning experiences. More recently Harvard has also become a leader in this effort.
- The University of Colorado and the University of New Mexico, which have reconfigured their doctoral programs around the development of academic portfolios.
- The universities that participated in the Danforth principal preparation program (e.g., Brigham Young, Central Florida, Connecticut, Alabama, Washington, and New Mexico). These institutions have created partnerships with school districts,

repackaged their instructional designs, brought students together as cohorts, and put greater emphasis on clinical experiences.

The funding base for these programs varies. Some are private and some are public institutions. Some have significant endowment bases. Some have developed partnership agreements with school systems and, occasionally, with foundations. The norm, however, is a combination of student fees and institutional support that comes from state treasuries.

## Contact Persons

There are many individuals who have been involved in the evolution of preparation programs for educational leaders. However, a few stand out as being most directly engaged in the discussion through much of the past decade:

- Bruce Barnett, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Northern Colorado
- Nelda Cambron-McCabe, Department of Educational Leadership, Miami University (Ohio)
- Donn Gresso, Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis,East Tennessee State University
- Martha McCarthy, Educational Leadership Department, Indiana University
- Joseph Murphy, Department of Educational Leadership, Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

## Bibliography

Bridges, E.M., Hallinger, P. (1992). Problem based learning for administrators. ERIC Clearing House on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders. Washington, DC, Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996.

Donmoyer, R. Imber, M. and Scheursch, J. J. (Eds.) (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives. Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Griffiths, D.E., Stout, R.T., and Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.). (1988). Leaders for America's schools: the report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Milstein, M. M., and Associates. Changing the Way We Prepare Educational Leaders. Newbury Park, California, Corwin Press, 1993.

Milstein, M. M., Bobroff, B. M., and Restine, L. N. Internship Programs in Educational Administration. New York, Teachers College Press, 1991.

McCarthy, M. M., and Kuh, G. D. (1997). Continuity and change: the educational leadership professorate. Columbia, MO: The University Council for Educational Administration.

Muleen, T.A., Cambron-McCabe, N.H., and Anderson, B.J. (Eds.) (1994). Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation. Norwood, JN: Ablex.

Murphy, J. (Editor). Preparing Tomorrow's School Leaders: Alternative Designs. University Park, Pennsylvania, UCEA, Inc., 1993.

Murphy, J. (1992). The landscape of leadership preparation. Newbury Park, California, Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. and Forsyth, P (Eds.) (manuscript, 1998). Educational administration: A decade of reform. Newbury Park, California, Corwin Press. (To be published in 1998 or 1999).

"New Ways of Training for School Leadership," Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 72, Number 2, 1997 (Issue Editor, Naftaly Glasman).

Restine, N. "Learning and development in the context(s) of leadership preparation," Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 72, Number 2, 1997, pp. 117-130.

Figure 1 Traditional and Danforth Field-Based Programs

| *Categories* | *Traditional* | *Field Based* |
|---|---|---|
| Participant sponsorship | None, other than recommendation forms | Usually by district committee, superintendent and/or principal |
| Recruitment | None usually | By districts and university |
| Admissions | Review of file, which emphasizes academic potential and is typically limited to transcripts, recommendations, standard exams | File with academic potential evidence is supplemented by evidence of leadership potential (educational platform, essay on leadership, interviews, assessment centers) |
| Advisement | Relatively little at M.A. or Ed.S. level, and limited to university faculty members | Extensive by coordinator as well as by field and site supervisors |
| Coordination | Minimal—usually limited to course scheduling by chairperson | Extensive—includes all stages of the effort, recruitment to placement |
| Student progression through program | At individual pace and typically over 3 or 4 years | At a predetermined pace and typically over 15 months to 2 years |
| Student grouping | None except by chance | In cohorts and usually extends beyond classes to include reflective seminars and other settings |
| Student evaluation | Course grades and sometimes an oral or written exam at end of the program | Course grades, but also regular feedback by coordinator as well as field and site supervisors, student reflection, and end-of-program exams |
| Program evaluation | Usually when an external review occurs, to comply with requests for information, and done by faculty members | Regularly and involves students, alumni, field administrators, as well as faculty members |
| Placement | Minimal involvement by faculty, beyond maintaining job-related information | Active advisement and networking by coordinator with program graduates and hiring school districts |
| Resources | Provided by students (tuition) and university (salaries and overhead support) | Provided by students (tuition, materials, and supplies), university (salaries, overhead support, space, coordinator load reduction), school districts (release time funds) |
| Partnerships | University dominated if done at all, infrequent meetings | Broad based, toward equal roles in decision making, frequent meetings |
| Program design and development | By faculty and not typically reviewed often | Done collaboratively and modified on basis of feedback |
| Academic program | Emphasis on theory and content, deductive approach | Balance between theory and practice, inductive approach |
| Instruction | Didactic, with professor as knowledge giver and student playing a passive role; professors do most of instructing, usually as individuals | Adult learning oriented with student playing a proactive role; practitioners as well as professors as instructors, often in teams |
| Field experiences/ internships | Not usually required; vary widely in quality and time on task | Integral part of program, effort to ensure high quality and sufficient time-on-task |
| Field supervision | Often haphazard and infrequent, responsibility without load reduction and done by junior or adjunct faculty | Planned visits done frequently, usually with load reduction and involving senior faculty members |
| Site supervision | Usually by chance or circumstances, with little or no preparation for the role | Carefully selected supervisors who are given training and encouraged to act as mentors |

Source: Mike M. Milstein and Associates. Changing the way we prepare educational leaders. Newbury Park, California, Corwin Press, 1993.

# JEWEL Leadership Scan for Business

**Dr. Terry Bacon**

## Scan of Programs

Leadership development in business *is* big business. In 1997, U.S. corporations spent more than $45 billion on management and leadership development, an increase of $10 billion annually from a decade ago. Of this $45 billion, corporations spent about $12 billion educating their senior executives in leadership. In total, major corporations like General Electric, AT&T, Microsoft, Motorola, and Intel each train about one thousand managers a year in the knowledge, skills, and behaviors of effective leadership and management. When you factor in the cost of the time executives spend in leadership training, the annual investment that business and industry make in leadership development easily exceeds $100 billion.

In business, leadership development is not motivated by altruism or by the humanistic ideals of a liberal education. Rather it is driven by the need to thrive in a highly competitive and increasingly global marketplace. To prevail, corporations are compelled to optimize every aspect of their operations, including their leadership. The evidence that leadership can have a significant impact on a corporation's performance is clear in Roberto Goizueta's leadership at Coca-Cola, Lou Gerstner's leadership at IBM, and Jack Welch's leadership at General Electric. In each case, the total market value of the corporations these men led increased dramatically after they assumed command.

Indeed, leadership is considered so important that many corporations have created their own corporate universities to develop the leadership of their high-potential employees. Shell created such a program in 1993 even though it was outperforming every other energy company in the world. When companies are struggling, as Kodak is today, the reason cited most frequently is a leadership failure. Finally, in a study of executive derailment sponsored by the Center for Creative Leadership, researchers learned that the most frequent reason for executive failure was poor leadership and interpersonal skills.

**Current Trends in Leadership Preparation and Development**

Today, there are five major schools of thought on the preparation and development of business leaders. I will refer to these approaches as (1) skill and trait study, as exemplified by Harvard's Advanced Management Program; (2) kinesthetic learning and personal challenge, as practiced by Outward Bound; (3) action learning, which was developed at General Electric's Crotonville center; (4) assessment, feedback, and simulation, which is represented by Lore International Institute's customized programs and to some extent by the Center for Creative Leadership; and (5) self-study, coaching, and mentoring, which is practiced in many corporations and is exemplified by private executive coaches and counselors.

**Skill and trait study**—This approach reflects the traditional, academic study of the competencies needed to perform the tasks of leadership and management. It evolved from the classic studies of great leaders and assumes that leadership can be learned by studying and then emulating the traits and best practices of past leaders or institutions known for their leadership effectiveness, including political, religious, social, and

military leaders. Leadership development programs based on this approach sometimes use historical texts like Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* and Machiavelli's *The Prince* as primary sources.

This school of thought also assumes that one becomes a better business leader by mastering the technical aspects of business management, such as finance, marketing, operations management, and quality improvement. Consequently, most of the current practitioners of this approach are the business schools in large universities: Stanford Business School, University of Chicago School of Business, The Wharton School (University of Pennsylvania), Sloan School of Management (MIT), and Harvard. All offer week-long or months-long programs for executives designed to improve their business leadership by immersing them in case study-based discussions of various business problems. The goals of these programs are to enrich the participants' understanding of business leadership issues and, to a limited extent, to build skills in certain key areas of business management.

On the plus side, these programs enable visiting executives to discuss leadership issues with their contemporaries, and the case study method can stimulate thought-provoking discussions of real business problems. On the negative side, (1) the programs are mainly delivered by academics who, although accomplished in their fields of study, are not practicing business leaders and have, at best, an arm's length understanding of leadership in business; (2) most of these programs are too short to have significant, lasting impact; and (3) the evidence suggests that the *cognitive* study of leadership has little impact on people's actual leadership capabilities. In short, *discussing* leadership does not make one a better leader.

The curriculum focuses on business issues but often includes such topics as succession planning, motivating people, leading innovation, and developing other leaders. The class methods are primarily lecture and small group discussion of case studies and problems. The participants are recruited primarily through mass mailings of brochures and program catalogs. Because the participants are practicing executives, there are few other functions connected to the programs, such as placement. In fact, this is true of the vast majority of business leadership programs.

**Kinesthetic learning and personal challenge**—At the other end of the spectrum are the so-called "ropes courses" delivered by such groups as Outward Bound and the Pecos River Learning Center. Like the academic programs, these outdoors courses are offered as open enrollment programs (open to anyone) in a variety of settings. Outward Bound's programs are designed to "inspire respect for self, care for others, responsibility to the community, and sensitivity to the environment." Their primary assumption is that the experiences people have in challenging environments and activities, such as white-water rafting, mountain climbing, and desert survival, help them learn the skills in decision making, risk taking, and problem solving they need back in life and at work.

In the longest of these programs, participants are immersed in an eight-day outdoor excursion into the wilderness where they learn survival skills, are physically challenged by demanding tasks (such as rappelling from a cliff or crossing a chasm on a rope bridge), and participate in individual and group problem solving and decision making. The goals of such programs are to instill confidence in people's abilities to master the challenges and to motivate them to take more risks. The shortest versions of these programs are day-long outdoor activities for small teams that include creative

problem solving (e.g., teams creating complex geometric figures with ropes while blindfolded) and group challenges, such as climbing tall walls without aids.

Through personal challenges, programs like Outward Bound hope to give participants a heightened sense of self, the capacity to persevere, and the courage to overcome their own reluctance. They also hope to instill greater respect for the natural environment and the sense that leaders are stewards of their environment, the institutions they serve, and themselves. The ideal outcome is a transformed self, and this no doubt occurs for some people. However, there is widespread belief in the business community that the link between wilderness survival experiences and business leadership is tenuous at best, and many people who have gone through such programs see little connection between their day-to-day leadership challenges and their wilderness experience—though they recall the event fondly.

**Action learning**—One of the latest trends in leadership development is action learning, which was developed by Noel Tichy at the University of Michigan in cooperation with General Electric's management and leadership development center in Crotonville, NY. A number of corporations have adopted it as a model of executive development. In a typical action learning program, a group of mid-level executives is divided into teams and the teams are given the responsibility for solving a real—and difficult—business problem.

During the action learning period, which can last for one to six months, the learners immerse themselves in the problem; receive instruction in problem solving, leadership, decision making, and business analysis from business school professors or corporate mentors; and gather and analyze real data on the problem. At the conclusion of

their action learning program, they must present their solution to the corporation's top executives. Their assumptions, analysis, and conclusions receive thorough scrutiny.

Without question, action learning is extremely effective at developing better business thinkers, analysts, and leaders—in part because of the remarkable commitment participants and their institutions make to the learning process. There is no set curriculum; participants ask for and receive whatever training and guidance they need to solve the problem. So these programs have the virtue of being customized for every team of participants. Clearly, this approach requires an extraordinary investment from the corporation sponsoring it, so the participants are typically selected from the group of mid-level executives who are considered to have the highest potential for advancement and contribution to the firm.

**Assessment and simulation**—Another of the current trends in business leadership development is the use of 360-degree feedback assessments and simulations. Two exemplary practitioners are the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) and Lore International Institute. Both institutions assume that leadership is contextual and personal, that people can't learn to become better leaders in the abstract. In assessment and simulation programs, the emphasis is on the individual leader, and the goals are to help each person maximize his or her leadership potential.

This school of thought emphasizes assessment and feedback as a means of developing greater self-knowledge. Leaders who are aware of their strengths and weaknesses are better able to capitalize on their strengths and mitigate or work around their shortcomings. Also, because leaders lead through the consent of their followers, it's helpful for leaders to know how their followers perceive them. So this school uses 360-

degree leadership assessments, which provide feedback to leaders from their boss, peers, subordinates or followers, and sometimes clients. These assessments, such as the *Lore Leadership Assessment* and CCL's *Benchmarks*, are based on researched models of business leadership and offer program participants a comprehensive view of themselves as leaders.

During the training program, participants experience leadership problems and challenges through case-study-based role play exercises, usually in small teams. In Lore's customized programs, the case studies are tailored to the participants, so they are enacting the kinds of situations they encounter in real life, and they receive continuous feedback on their performance.

Programs like these have two key goals: (1) to help participants assess themselves as leaders by showing them how they and others evaluated their skills using a validated model of leadership and (2) to help them build their leadership skills through experiential learning situations that are as close to reality as the program designers can get. Such programs can be for entry-level leaders or for more experienced leaders. The curricula are variable. For example, CCL offers some standard open-enrollment leadership programs with a fixed curriculum, which is described later. Lore develops customized leadership programs for clients, so the design and structure of each program differ based on the client's and the participant's program needs. CCL's open-enrollment program participants are recruited through direct mail brochures; Lore's customized programs are typically provided to specific corporations, which recruit or select participants based on the training needs identified in each unit of the corporation.

**Self-study, coaching, and mentoring**—Finally, a number of corporations use some form of self-study plus coaching and mentoring to develop their leaders. The prevailing attitude in most businesses is that business leaders are built largely through experience. Education and training play an important role, but there is no substitute for the experience gained as executives complete a variety of different assignments and learn the business by performing in different functions. In the course of an early career, a developing business leader will usually act as a team leader, project manager, functional manager, and perhaps regional manager. Each different assignment presents new challenges, increases in the scope of responsibility, and the need to learn how different functions operate and how they all work together.

An essential part of this learning process is self-study and personalized guidance through coaches and mentors. Coaching is considered so important that many organizations formalize the relationship. In McKinsey & Company, for instance, every professional has a development group leader (DGL) who is responsible for helping the professional shape his or her career and choices of assignment. In many parts of General Electric, up-and-coming professionals are assigned mentors, who meet with them regularly and providing coaching and other developmental assistance. Motorola carries the process further. They've created an Application Consulting Team that follows trainees back into the workplace and helps them apply what they've learned.

The principal goal of coaching and mentoring programs is to provide individualized assistance to developing business leaders from people who have already come up through the ranks and learned the lessons. In the more formal programs, such as General Electric's, candidates are selected from the large pool of lower- and middle-level

executives and professionals. In some companies, such as Fluor Daniel and Brown & Root, the candidates for special attention are selected based on their designation as "high potentials." High potentials in these companies move on a fast track through the training and development cycle and usually receive personal attention from the CEO and other senior executives.

**Past Trends in Leadership Preparation and Development**

Leadership programs in business have traditionally been rooted in business skills, such as finance and marketing. Many were appropriately called "mini-MBA" programs because they sought to give participants the skills and analytical tools that students typically receive in an MBA (Masters of Business Administration) program. In the past five years, however, there has been a glut of MBA graduates from the nation's business schools, and companies have recognized that business education is not leadership education. Having business skill is a prerequisite for business leadership because it lays the technical foundation for the kinds of problems business leaders must solve. However, business skill alone is not a sufficient criterion for business leadership.

There's perhaps no better evidence of the movement away from mini-MBA programs than the changes in Harvard's Advanced Management Program, which is the leading business school program for executives. In 1987, one-third of the participants in this program were non-U.S. residents; today, two-thirds are non-U.S. residents, and that percentage is growing. As other, less-developed countries send their developing leaders to Harvard and other business school executive programs, U.S. firms are increasingly relying on action learning and assessment/simulation programs to develop their leaders.

Today, the prevailing perspective is that business leaders must develop *in situ*—that the benefits of diverse leadership experiences, combined with feedback, are more powerful than abstract discussions of leadership traits or academic knowledge of leadership skills. The leader in the field, making sound business decisions and leading teams and units effectively, is the best teacher of those who aspire to become strong business leaders, and the best experience for those developing leaders is trial by fire.

Consequently, one of the trends in the past five years has been for senior executives in companies to play an active role in leadership development. In Intel Corporation, for example, all executives are expected to devote some time to training and development. Until he retired, Intel CEO Andy Grove taught several courses each year and was an active coach for a number of more junior executives. Jack Welch continues to teach classes at GE's Crotonville campus. He claims that it's one of the most fulfilling parts of his job. Although executive participation in leadership programs is by no means universal in the business world, it has been one key trend in recent years.

**Future Directions in the Field of Business Leadership Development**

In the future, leadership development in business is likely to move in these directions:

1. ***The distinction between leadership and management will become more important.*** A number of authors, notably Harvard's John Kotter, have identified the differences between leadership and management, but this distinction is not always clear in leadership development programs. However, the movement away from strongly hierarchical organizations is likely to increase the need for leadership at all levels, where people must act and

accomplish their goals without the mantle of authority. The growing empowerment of the workforce and delayering of organizations will mean that more future leaders will have to operate without managerial prerogatives, so leadership without authority will grow in importance.

2. ***Leadership development will move away from the classroom***. Programs will increasingly focus on learning through action, and classroom time will be devoted to small team work, case study discussions, role play exercises, simulations, and presentations. Lectures by authorities will play an increasingly smaller role and will perhaps vanish altogether in some programs. The emphasis will shift, as it has already in a number of programs, to self-conscious *learning by doing*. Participants will be expected to act like leaders and will receive feedback and coaching based on their performance. Further, leadership programs are likely to become more boundaryless, which means that it won't always be clear when the program's in session and when it's not, where the program is taking place and where it isn't. Instead, programs will become more integrated into the participant's daily work life, and learning and teaching will take place continuously.
3. ***Technical skills will remain important, but the emphasis will shift to leadership skills***. Increasingly, programs will recognize that possessing good business skills is a necessary but insufficient condition for good leadership. Future leadership programs will likely differentiate between the two and as program designers become more comfortable with pure leadership development, they will probably deliver the skill sets separately. In other

words, there will be mini-MBA or business skill programs that aspire to teach business skills rather than leadership. And there will be leadership programs that assume that participants already have the business skills and thus focus on their leadership skills. Pure leadership programs will become increasingly experiential as program designers concentrate on the "soft skills" of leadership, which can be learned and improved only through the enacting and reenacting of those skills.

4. ***The commitment to lifelong learning will grow***. Leadership program directors have long recognized that there are no quick fixes for leadership problems and that leadership development is a decades-long endeavor. However, the programs in place have not always reflected this perspective. Until recently, most companies offered discrete 2- to 3-day programs on leadership and did not track a leader's development through the long term. The most advanced organizations are now viewing leadership development as a lifelong learning process. At Motorola University and GE Crotonville, programs are in place to guide developing leaders at various points in their careers. Perhaps the most advanced is McKinsey & Company's leadership curriculum, which begins with an Introductory Leadership Program for new hires and includes a series of programs at various points along a consultant's tenure, culminating in a highly advanced Client Leadership Workshop. The growing view is that leadership development is never finished and that the best business leaders are continuous, lifelong learners.

5. ***Leadership development will become more integrated into human resource management functions***. Finally, leadership training will be integrated into other human resource functions as corporations recognize the value of managing the total human resource. Specifically, training and education will be an outgrowth of the performance management system, which includes career planning, goal setting, performance appraisal, compensation management, and training. In the future, assignments and goals are likely to be based on an executive's performance appraisal and will reflect 360-degree feedback on various aspects of his/her performance, including leadership. Executives will have specific development needs identified and addressed through a variety of training and development interventions, and overseeing their development will be their formally designated mentors and coaches. This kind of integrated development system exists in some organizations today, but most corporations have not yet achieved full integration of these human resource and leadership development functions.

## Best Practices in Business Leadership Development

### Successful Program Approaches

A successful leadership development program in business is one that has a significant impact on participants' leadership knowledge and skills. That impact should be evident in improved organizational performance, so there should be a measurable gain in the performance of each group or unit a participant leads after he/she has completed

the development program. To accomplish these results, successful programs generally have the following characteristics:

1. ***They reflect and reinforce the organization's business strategies and culture.*** In successful programs, the course purpose, design, methods, and content are aligned with the sponsoring organization's goals, needs, business strategies, and culture. The program is viewed as an instrument of strategy, so every aspect of it reflects the leadership needs of the corporation. For instance, a start-up high-tech company would need a leadership development program that fostered entrepreneurial leadership, and the content would include leading innovation, motivating technical people, and managing rapid growth. However, a stable consumer goods corporation like Johnson & Johnson would need a program that focused on motivating an existing workforce, improving quality and customer service, and managing globalization. In business leadership development, one size does not fit all. Successful programs help achieve the corporation's strategic goals and are very specific to each different corporation's needs and culture.
2. ***They result in long-term retention of knowledge and skills***. Successful programs are designed for lasting personal and organizational impact. They use methodologies like 360-degree feedback, intense role plays, public performances, and challenging case studies to enhance learning and personal change. Consequently, the most successful programs are not easy for participants. They might include a golfing break midweek, but the rest of the event is intensive and exhausting.

3. ***They permit individual, real-time customization***. The difference between computer skills training and leadership training is that in the former each participant needs to learn the same thing. In leadership training, every participant has different needs, so the most successful programs allow individual, real-time customization of the program. Each participant should have a personal development plan that is identified early in the program, is shaped by the program's events, and allows participants to modify exercises so their particular needs are addressed each time. Obviously, this kind of design requires flexibility and constant focus on what participants are learning and what they still need to learn.
4. ***They build self-knowledge and are feedback intensive***. Leadership is a situationally-based exercise of a leader's knowledge, power base, technical and interpersonal skills, and personality, so the most successful programs are intensely personal and illuminating. They build the developing leader's awareness of his/her leadership style and effectiveness through 360-degree assessments and a feedback-rich environment during exercises and simulations. Generally, the more extensive the feedback, the greater the learning, although feedback can reach a point of diminishing returns. So the best programs balance feedback with other types of learning activities that are less self-focused.
5. ***They have direct application to real-world business leadership problems and challenges.*** The best programs are not abstract exercises in leadership; the applications to the participants' real-world leadership issues are immediate

and apparent. Generally speaking, the more the participants have to deduce how the program's learnings apply to them, the less effective the program is. To remove any doubt, the most successful programs are either based on their real-life work problems and challenges or are conducted within their actual environment (e.g., the action learning programs described earlier).

6. ***They include reinforcement after the program and are part of a long-term development plan***. Finally, the most successful programs do not end. They include mechanisms for reinforcement of the learnings and follow-up for participants. Further, they are part of the participants' long-term development plan, which typically will include further education and training as well as work experiences and coaching and mentoring.

## Three Exemplary Programs

The three exemplary programs cited below reflect the range of leadership development programs available to executives and other business professionals.

### Center for Creative Leadership (CCL)

The flagship program for CCL is the Leadership Development Program (LDP). Now over twenty years old and delivered at twelve sites worldwide, this program has stood the test of time and has proven to be applicable in a broad range of business and industrial organizations. Its objectives are to build self-confidence, increase motivation and the ability to set and achieve organizational goals, stimulate personal and career growth through self-directed development, and improve management skills by identifying strengths and weaknesses as perceived by others.

The program lasts six days and includes a variety of self-assessments and 360-degree leadership and personality surveys. It also features two types of post-program feedback: a self-assessment of progress three months later and an assessment by the participants' colleagues on their ability to meet post-program developmental goals. During the program, participants meet with a psychologist counselor for several hours to review their individual feedback and reflect on their development needs and goals. They also work in small teams with some of their peers and give and receive feedback to those peers late in the program.

The program's agenda is as follows:

Day 1 Introduction to the program; group and individual assessment activities

Day 2 The dynamic context of leadership in organizations; performance development (situational leadership and management)

Day 3 Decision making and effective team building

Day 4 Enhancing the learning process; looking at life experiences as patterns of learning; how participants themselves learn in different circumstances

Day 5 One-on-one staff feedback; peer feedback

Day 6 Goal setting and developing individual leadership effectiveness after the program; evaluation and closing

The LDP's most unique feature is its extensive battery of pre-program assessments and the hours spent in one-on-one feedback with a counselor. The program is also unique in that it includes numerous simulations and other small-team activities (although it has no role plays). It is one of the best programs for stimulating participants' assessments of themselves as leaders. However, the lecture/discussion

format of some of the program segments is not exceptional, and the quality of each program depends on the effectiveness of the faculty delivering each program segment. Nonetheless, the LDP is considered to be an exemplary program of its type: an uncustomized, open-enrollment leadership course. CCL has a strong business focus and is well regarded as a nonprofit, research-based institution.

The LDP is offered in a variety of locations, including Greensboro; Colorado Springs; San Diego; St. Petersburg, Florida; San Antonio; College Park, Maryland; Hartford; Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario; Brussels; Berkhamsted, England; Mexico City; and Mt. Eliza, Australia. The program cost is $5,100 per participant. For further information, contact CCL at 336-545-2810.

**Harvard University**

Harvard Business School offers a number of programs in general management and leadership and is one of the leading academic institutions that provides leadership development education for business people. One of their more unique leadership programs is entitled Leadership in Professional Service Firms (LPSF), a one-week course that focuses on a specific application of business leadership and is therefore more useful than most general business school leadership courses.

The LPSF, like all Harvard programs, makes extensive use of the case study method. Participants are assigned to small case-study teams and work intensively through the program reading and discussing cases and learning about leadership from immersion in the case study problems. Interacting with peers during case study

discussions and problem solving is considered to be one of the highlights of the program.

The LPSF explores a number of issues regarding leadership in professional service firms:

- Balancing personal management responsibility with professional activities
- Developing an effective firm strategy
- Marketing the firm's services
- Maintaining and building client relationships
- Developing new products and practice areas
- Developing the capabilities of professionals
- Motivating and sustaining a highly skilled professional staff
- Controlling quality and costs to improve profitability
- Managing firm growth domestically and internationally
- Building the firm's culture

As the program content indicates, the LPSF is heavily focused on building technical business skills. During the week, participants read cases, discuss the cases in small teams, give case study presentations, and attend lectures on the above topics by the Harvard Business School (HBS) faculty. What makes the program so powerful is the very high quality of the faculty. HBS is extraordinarily active in research and publishing on business topics. The *Harvard Business Review* is one of the nation's leading journals on business thought, and the faculty at the LPSF includes professors who have published extensively in their fields. So attending the LPSF can be an enriching experience for business leaders in professional service

firms. It permits the kind of reflection and introspection that most business leaders rarely have time for, and the lectures and faculty-led discussions are thought provoking and illuminating.

The LPSF is an open-enrollment program, but enrollment is limited. Harvard accepts applications over its web site and also advertises through direct mail. The preferred applicants are leaders in large and middle-sized firms, and the firms must sponsor the program participants. The fees are $6,000 (winter) and $6,300 (summer) and include tuition, books and case materials, accommodations, and most meals. For further information, contact Harvard Business School's Executive Education department at (617) 495-6226.

**Lore International Institute**

Lore International Institute is a worldwide training and education firm that offers customized programs in leadership development. It has no standard programs because all are modified for the sponsoring organization. An example of one of Lore's leadership programs is the Client Leadership Workshop (CLW) it developed with and for one of the world's leading management and business consulting firms.

The CLW is a six-day intensive program for mid- to senior-level professionals. What makes it unique is its highly experiential design and emphasis on self-directed learning. Prior to attending the program, participants complete a 360-degree customized leadership assessment that includes feedback from clients as well as feedback from peers, subordinates, and superiors. On the opening day of the

program, participants meet one on one with professional counselors who review and discuss their assessment results and help them define their learning objectives.

This program is very feedback intensive. In addition to the 360-degree assessment, participants receive feedback many times each day after case study role plays. They are assigned to small client service teams and give each other feedback after each case study performance, and they receive a substantial amount of feedback and coaching from the faculty. The ratio of faculty to students is 1:2, so each participant receives an extraordinary amount of personal attention throughout the week.

The complete agenda is as follows:

Day 1 Program introduction; one-on-one feedback and leadership counseling; case study introductions; client service team kickoff

Day 2 Program frameworks and methods on building trust with clients; case study role plays on trust building; coaching techniques and skills practice in client service teams; learning logs

Day 3 Building alignment with clients; case study role plays on misalignment; entrepreneurial leadership; leading an entrepreneurial CEO; assessing team collaboration; team interpersonal and leadership feedback; learning logs

Day 4 Motivating clients to action; case study role plays on collaborative leadership; coaching an ineffective CEO; learning logs

Day 5 Acting with courage; coaching and skills practice using write-your-own-role-plays; transferring leadership skills back on the job; learning logs

Day 6 One-on-one leadership counseling and learning review from the week; further coaching and skills practice; key takeaways

Several other key features of this program make it unique and very effective. First, there is virtually no lecture; most program learnings and leadership concepts

evolve from the role plays and case study simulations. Consequently, what each participant learns is different and is based on his/her performance and development needs. Second, the learning for each person emerges from his/her reflections and role-play performance and from extensive feedback. Also, the role plays are done in a play-replay fashion. Each participant plays the role, receives feedback, and then replays the role while acting on the feedback. This learning process enables participants to act on their feedback right away and to experience the difference in impact, which makes the learning visceral and immediate. Third, the process is self-conscious. Before every program activity, participants identify their learning needs; after each role play and program segment, they identify what they've learned, and they record and reflect on their learnings in a learning log.

Learnings are tied to their individual leadership assessments and are reinforced in their many meetings with faculty. In addition, they learn much from observing and sharing feedback and observations with their peers on their client service teams. Finally, the case study method is used, but the participants use these case studies as the basis for role play experiences rather than for an intellectual discussion. At the end of the week, they write and enact their own role play situation and thus transfer their learnings to a context that is immediately relevant to them.

Typically, half the faculty members are professional instructors and counselors and the other half are senior members of the sponsoring organization. Program costs may include a one-time customization fee of as much as $100,000, and each program typically costs about $50,000 for 16 participants, or about $3,125 per participant, plus expenses and materials. Because of the extraordinary amount of

customization, these programs are not available on an open-enrollment basis but must be sponsored by an organization with a strong commitment to the development of a significant group of leaders. For further information on Lore's executive programs, contact Dr. Donald Novak at (970) 385-4955.

**Contacts in the Field of Business Leadership**

The following people are noteworthy for their knowledge of leadership development programs in the institutions they serve, and they would be good contacts for further discussions about leadership development in business:

Warren Bennis, Chairman, Leadership Institute, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089
213-740-0766.

John Kotter, Professor, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA 02163
617-495-6529

Jay Lorsch, Professor and Faculty Chair of the LPSF (Leadership in Professional Service Firms), Harvard Business School, Boston, MA
617-495-6413

Morgan W. McCall, Jr., Professor of Management and Organization, University of Southern California, Marshall School of Business, Los Angeles, CA 90089
213-740-0746

Cynthia McCauley, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC 27438
336-286-4573

Russ S. Moxley, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC 27438
336-286-4016

Donald Novak, Director of Executive Programs, Lore International Institute, Durango, CO 81301
970-385-4955

Noel Tichy, Professor of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management, University of Michigan Business School, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
734-764-1289

Ellen Van Velsor, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC 27438
336-286-4433

## Annotated Bibliography

American Management Association. *Leadership Development: Programs and Practices, Future Directions, Examples, and Models.* NY: AMACOM Press, 1998.

*A report on a survey-based assessment of leadership assessment and development in corporations with case examples from 3Com, Abbott Labs, Chevron, Fortis Financial Group, Unisys, and UPS.*

Bass, Bernard M. *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, 3rd edition.* NY: The Free Press, 1990.

*An exhaustive compendium of theories and research on leadership in business. A virtual encyclopedia of information on the classic approaches to leadership: trait study, power, leadership as transaction, leadership and management, and situational moderators.*

Bennis, Warren and Nanus, Burt. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge, 2nd Ed.* NY: HarperBusiness, 1997.

*Warren Bennis is one of the deans of leadership development, and this book with Burt Nanus is an excellent basic text on leadership.*

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership.* NY: Harper & Row, 1978.

*The classic study of leadership, with an emphasis on its moral dimensions. Burns mainly studies political leaders, but this is a profound and essential primer for understanding modern leadership in all domains.*

Conger, Jay A. *Learning to Lead: The Art of Transforming Managers into Leaders.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

*An interesting exploration of different leadership development programs by an author who attended five different ones. He discusses the differences in approaches and effectiveness.*

Farkas, Charles M. and De Backer, Philippe. *Maximum Leadership: The World's Leading CEOs Share Their Five Strategies for Success.* NY: Henry Holt and Company, 1996.

*A Bain & Company-sponsored study that promotes a multi-dimensional approach to business leadership and includes much discussion of current business leaders and institutions.*

Fitzgerald, Catherine and Kirby, Linda K., ed. *Developing Leaders: Research and Applications of Psychological Type and Leadership Development.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing, 1997.

*An exhaustive look at the correlations between psychological type and leadership. Useful principally for its research value.*

Gardner, Howard. *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership.* NY: BasicBooks, 1995.

*A great leader study by Harvard's Howard Gardner. A well-written and insightful history by an eclectic scholar.*

Gardner, John. *On Leadership.* NY: The Free Press, 1990.

*A fine study of the nature and functions of leadership by one of the preeminent thinkers in the field of business leadership.*

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* NY: Paulist Press, 1977.

*Another of the classic texts on leadership. Broad in its scope, the book posits that great leaders are servants to their followers and that true leadership derives from the legitimate power granted by peers to leaders who are first among equals.*

Heifetz, Ronald A. *Leadership Without Easy Answers.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

*An excellent study of the challenge leaders face and the demands placed upon them by followers.*

Kotter, John P. *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management.* NY: The Free Press, 1990.

*One of the finest discussions of the difference between leadership and management and about the origins of leadership.*

Kotter, John P. *Power and Influence: Beyond Formal Authority.* NY: The Free Press, 1985.

*An excellent exploration of the need for leadership at all levels and how lower-level leaders become effective without having formal authority over those they seek to influence.*

Kouzes, James M. and Posner, Barry Z. *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

*One of the most popular and widely read leadership texts of the last decade. It suffers from being too simplistic but does offer a concise model of effective leadership in business.*

Luecke, Richard. *Scuttle Your Ships Before Advancing: And Other Lessons from History on Leadership and Change for Today's Managers.* NY: Oxford University Press, 1994.

*A fascinating study of leadership through the examination of historical leaders like Cortez, Louis XI, Luther, Demming, Yamamoto, and Hadrian.*

McCall, Morgan, Jr.; Lombardo, Michael M.; and Morrison, Ann M. *The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1988.

*A superb study of the role of experience in developing business leaders. A seminal text in this area.*

McCall, Morgan W., Jr. *High Flyers: Developing the Next Generation of Leaders.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1998.

*A thorough and engrossing study of leadership development in business. It focuses specifically on leadership development as an element of business strategy.*

McCauley, Cynthia D.; Moxley, Russ S.; and Van Velsor, Ellen, eds. *Handbook of Leadership Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

*A recently published examination of leadership development from members of the Center for Creative Leadership. Research based and comprehensive in scope, this is an excellent overview business leadership development.*

Spears, Larry C., ed. *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers.* NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1995.

*A collection of essays on the nature and impact of Robert Greenleaf's theories of servant leadership.*

Tichy Noel M. *The Leadership Engine: How Winning Companies Build Leaders at Every Level.* NY: HarperBusiness, 1997.

*An excellent look at the impact of leadership in business by Noel Tichy, a University of Michigan professor who has worked extensively with Jack Welch at General Electric.*

Wheatley, Margaret J. *Leadership and the New Science: Learning about Organization from an Orderly Universe.* San Francisco: Berrett-Kochler Publishers, 1994.

*A somewhat trendy but nonetheless interesting discussion of leadership as viewed from the perspective of quantum mechanics and other principles of the new physics.*

Wills, Garry. *Certain Trumpets: The Nature of Leadership*. NY: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

*One of the finest great leader studies ever written. Wills is a professor at Northwestern University and a Pulitzer Prize-winning author, and it shows.*

To: Colleagues
From: Ellen Goldring

In order to further our discussions about our perspective for a JEWEL pilot program, I have attempted to summarize the discussion from our last planning meeting in September. We will use this as a jumping off point for our meeting on Monday.

PILOT PROGRAM FOR PROFESSIONAL JEWISH INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS: Course of Study

**Personal Vision of Good Jewish Education**: Participants will develop a guiding ***personal*** vision of good Jewish education. They will explore such questions as, What can defining characteristics of "good Jewish education" be? What are core beliefs, values and attitudes that can guide Jewish education? What is a personal vision? Why is a personal vision important anyway? Clarification of individual guiding principles will be a central part of study. What are the core beliefs, values and attitudes for each participant, etc. What is the distinctive 'Jewish' aspect of a personal vision for JEWISH education, beyond the obvious? Both the aims and processes of Jewish education will be addressed.

*****For each topic in our course of study, we said we would draw upon the following domains. We acknowledged that we did not want to force categories, nor make artificial decision. Thus, these domains serve as guides for choosing materials, curricula, etc.*

**What should a leader know?**
KNOWLEDGE: Jewish: text study, history, Jewish thought,
Education: Great educational visions (Dewey), great practitioners with guiding visions (Roland Barth)
Management/Leadership-Visions of Great Leaders, role of personal vision in organizations, examples and principles
P/H:

**What should a leader be able to do?**
SKILLS: We have defined the core competences or skills as:
Communicating
Conceptualizing
Problem Solving
Making Value Judgements/Decisions
Interacting

****We need to clearly define and articulate what we mean by each one.*
*We need to decide two things:*
*1)Are we committed to a developmental approach (the Alverno College model)? That is, can we clearly articulate, operationalize, and measure different levels of each of these competences?*

*2) Can we and do we want to articualte different aspects of the core competences for each of the "parts" of the corse of study? For example, do we believe that there are specific skills in communicating a personal vision, conceptualizing a personal vision, that would be different than, lets say, communicating an institutional vision, or a change process (different 'parts' of the course of study)?*

**What should a leader be?**
Dispositions: We have defined the key dispositions as: (TAKEN FROM HARVARD DOCUMENT)

Ethical Commitment
Commitment to Continuous Personal Improvement
Self Esteem
Orientation to Action

****We need to reaffirm our commitment to these.[We spent less time on this]. We need to ask ourselves what is/should be distinctly Jewish about them and incorporate this into our articulations and definitions.*
*We need to ask ourselves if these are also developmental and whether they are general or differ according to different 'parts' of the program.*

**Institutional Visions of Good Jewish Education**: Participants will understand the elements and importance of a powerful institutional vision. They will translate personal visions of good Jewish education into institutional visions. How can an institution express its Jewish outlook, goals, aims? What are the elements of an institutional vision? How can institutional visions be evaluated, assessed and compared? What is the role of the educational leader in guiding institutions toward an institutional vison? How are stakeholders involved?

Knowledge:
Skills:
Dispositions:

**Theories of Change:** Participants will explore change processes and strategic planning models to understand and design implementation strategies for change. They will plan the implementation of their personal and institutional visions of good Jewish educationr. What is the role of the educational leader in institutional change? What are different models for achieving educational and institutional change? What are Jewish perspectives on change? The centrality of vison will be stressed throughout.

Knowledge:
Skills:
Dispositions:

**Implementation:** Participants will manage and implement a major change project in their institutions. They will set in motion the process of implementing their personal and institutional visions for Jewish education.

Knowledge:
Skills:
Dispositions:

**Research and Evaluation:** Is the implementation successful? Have goals been achieved? How can success be measured? What is the role of research and evaluation in monitoring institutional transformation? How can research and evaluation inform decision making? What are feedback loops for revising personal and institutional visions?

Knowledge:
Skills:
Dispositions:

My suggestion would be to take one of the these modules (personal vision, institutional vision, change, etc) and design a problem based learning experience to test out the general model/ideas.