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PURPOSE AND APPROACH

During the last five years of exploring how to develop leadership potential in the Manhattan MSOL (Masters of Science in Organizational Leadership) Program, our Manhattan MSOL faculty has discovered the need for methodologies to design an environment of optimum graduate level learning that can be replicated. This document presents some conditions and factors, along with insights and methodologies, for developing leadership as an \textit{intentional environment to produce learning and insights that are transformational}.

My intention in creating this document is to begin a discussion about the elements required to develop leadership in an academic setting. My goal is to gain more insight into the complexity of this leadership phenomenon, more specifically, cultivating an awareness to recognize and identify some fundamental components required for developing leadership. My purpose is not to explore or understand leaders, per se. Rather, \textit{leadership as a state of being} is the quest, and the Manhattan MSOL faculty and I are intrigued by the level of consciousness required to foster that state of being. We eagerly anticipate greater levels of research, observations, insight and awareness to modify these ideas offered here. Indeed, a rigorous and invigorating debate will emerge from and benefit by this fundamental, albeit ambitious, premise: \textit{to discover the very language or design for developing leadership}, perhaps leading to its own pedagogy or discipline. To begin this process, we must ask: what is leadership; what is education and how does it serve leadership; how do leaders learn to lead; and what are the elements that most impact the process of learning to lead.

A slight digression: The 70’s detective show featuring the sleuth Columbo still rates among my favorite television programs. The way in which Columbo discovers the identity of the criminal is a prime example of managing context. He uses a precise, forensic-like inquiry to reveal how everything exists for a reason, then “connects” all the reasons to develop a context. The Columbo formula: reveal the context and the criminal appears. Columbo is consistently guided by three ontological truths: that a murder consists of means, opportunity and motive. He understands, with an almost Shakespearean insight, the very essence of human nature. Then he simply plods along, asks questions, looks foolish and creates the proper context.

Throughout this document a series of twenty-three Challenges appear as specific areas for inquiry that we’ve identified as essential for designing a pedagogy of leadership development. Although the questions we pose are not as simple as Columbo’s, we are committed to pursuing them with the same diligence and focus as the fictitious detective in the shabby raincoat.
In the spirit of a Columbo-like investigation, as we investigate the context of leadership development—language—the first Challenge appears.

**Challenge 1: To Develop a Language for Leadership.**

An exploration of leadership development begins with establishing a common leadership language. Indeed, the reader will soon notice that certain words in this document communicate meanings that may differ from common (and often unconscious) usage. For instance, the word *commitment* is critical to creating relationships, and articulating goals and plans, yet it is often misunderstood and misapplied. Once the importance of developing a common leadership language is fully internalized, learners have a different access or relationship to words such as *clarity, clear, direct, aligned, excellence, intentional, intention, purpose, growth, development, choice, time and design*, to name a few. These words are key to generating especially powerful and effective language of leadership.

**CONTENT STRUCTURE**

The content of this document is organized into three major sections, with additional pedagogical Challenges interspersed.

Section 1: *Design Framework*—This section explores the context of leadership education as expressed in Challenge 2: Clarify the field of study in leadership. This clarification will require distinguishing between *developing* leadership and studying *about* leadership; and defining the requirements of leadership program design.

Section 2: *Mindsets*—This section explores the process of leadership development through three Mindsets: Reflective, Collaborative and Generative. The Reflective Mindset provides Challenge 3: *Distinguish developing mindsets as distinct from teaching new skills*; and Challenge 4: *Redefine “leader” as a practical philosopher*. The Collaborative Mindset hosts Challenge 5: *Develop a context for alignment*, and Challenge 6: *Redefine teams*. The third leadership development Mindset, Generative, presents Challenge 7: *Internalize systems thinking*.

Section 3: *Learning*—This section explores learning within three realms: interacting with the cohort, interacting with the instructor, and interacting with the content. Inquiry into these learning realms produces numerous challenges for an creating an exemplary leadership development pedagogy: *Apply technology appropriately* (#8); *Redefine commitment* (#9); *Align commitment with practices* (#10); *Redefine the graduate leadership program admission process in alignment with leadership* (#11); *Develop instruments to assess willingness to learn and to adapt to change* (#12); *Define “faculty team”* (#13); *Redefine faculty development* (#14); *Redefine faculty “support”* (#15); *Create and steward context* (#16); *Embrace dynamic learning* (#17); *Develop leadership scholars and scholarship*
(18); Develop faculty and material to enhance a philosophic exploration (19); Attract professional coaches to develop faculty (20); Coordinate the leadership development curriculum with faculty practices (21); Preserve an optimal learning environment through activity coordination (22); and Identify and/or develop instruments to assess both leadership concept mastery and progress in leadership development (23).

SECTION ONE: Design Framework—To explore the learning context

Challenge 2: To clarify this field of study.

Although we have already identified some 70 graduate leadership programs within the United States, this information needs further classification. This exploration includes developing a spectrum for this field and determining the nature of the programs along this spectrum. Thus far, leadership programs seem largely to exist within one of three academic areas: business, theology or education.

Leadership Distinction: Developing leadership is distinct from studying about leadership. Additionally, our research indicates that the most leadership work in education occurs in the domain of studying specific leaders, administrative roles and processes, and leadership dynamics. Here studying leadership is a critical examination to provide clearer understanding about leaders, situations, behaviors, and processes, through examining theories, traits, styles and models of leadership.

Developing leadership, however, requires a shift from understanding to generating leadership. This requires attention to develop the “mind of a leader,” analogous to developing the mind of a doctor or lawyer, which is critical in their respective fields. Based on our defined outcomes (see Diagram C at the end of this document) we have identified three dimensions of the leader’s mind that appear fundamental: Awareness (interaction between attention and intention), Alignment (clearly defined values, paradigms/assumptions, and language) and Action (results, events, patterns, behavior and reactions). Diagram B, also at end of document, illustrates this dynamic. The application of this dynamic develops a particular set of outcomes as detailed in Diagram C.

In addition, leadership development is distinct from management-related programs, which examine the allocation and organization of resources to cope with complexity, to achieve results and complete tasks within a single paradigm. Leadership, however, is an inquiry into the alignment and coordination of meaning, to inspire individuals to operate in uncertainty between paradigms. Ultimately, leaders must act on the courage of their convictions, even and especially, in the face of disagreement, to do what they know to be right.

Our inquiry into developing leaders begins with an understanding of design and seven factors that have emerged for the “design” of this work, beginning with an agreement about design.
Design Definition: A design for leadership development must be highly intentional. In most cases intentions are spoken about as wants, wishes or hopes about the future, so one has "good intentions" which may or may not manifest, and if they do manifest it is by chance, happenstance, or by luck. Conversely, we define intent as analogous to a stated desire from a committed stand. It is bounded by a discipline or deliberateness that includes one’s level of "intentionality"—a committed and clear focus or promise from the depths of responsibility. This includes careful thinking about priorities, parameters and conditions of satisfaction, as well as a high level of agreement about meaning, clearly defined outcomes, and clearly defined terms for success.

Design is different from a plan or scenario. A design is bounded by a common purpose, clear values and intentions. It is analogous to a compass guiding one’s path, based on purpose and values (much like the North Star); a plan is analogous to a map detailing each step and set of options.

- Design demands a high level of intentionality, which includes a clear and defined purpose, intended outcomes, and defined set of values that enable the purpose to exist.
- A design is intentional, not a chance happening. It guides individuals toward the right path in any situation. But this requires a high level of agreement about purpose and intended outcomes. This is different from a plan, which guides individuals toward the right choices or steps, based on a high level of agreement about process. Design focuses on context; plans focus on content. Leaders are designers guided by a defined purpose.

The Design of the Learning Environment: The following seven leadership development factors have emerged over time as essential to "bound" the learning environment for this leadership work. Each is complex and stimulates further exploration, beyond the brief comments provided here.

1) Honor Language: Acknowledge and understand the relationship between facts, experiences and interpretation.
   a) Reality is an interpretation that is socially constructed; language gives us access to the very reality it is used to construct. We need to honor interpretation as uniquely human, and as the way in which we receive the world. Only the level of agreement determines what is a fact and what is an interpretation.
   b) The application of using language to develop leadership requires leadership program faculty to honor the importance of meaning: how it is interpreted, misinterpreted and reinterpreted. Meaning is the "meta-vocabulary"—the domain where intentions reside. It connects to and generates feelings, insights, awareness, emotions, and purpose. Insights, learning, growth and development occur at the level of meaning.
   c) Meaning is engaged through clear distinctions in language that allow the speaker to speak with intention from the depths of responsibility, willing to
be held accountable for one’s speaking; that is, speaking without ambiguity, with purpose and with a level of clarity that generates action, inquiry or agreement.

2) **Foster Generative Action**: Leaders are generative: they create an environment for action and results.
   a) Leaders act in the face of uncertainty and disagreement; they act on the courage of their convictions (meaning); they inspire others to act; they act to enhance performance in others; and they act to connect people, ideas and events in order to generate commitment.
   b) Leadership development requires learners to act on greater levels of awareness and to learn how to clear pathways for others to act generatively.

3) **Honor Complexity and Systems**: The leadership mindset is complex; it holds paradoxes, challenges assumptions, adapts and learns with each interaction; connects disparate elements; and inspires hidden potential (in self and others).
   a) The leadership field is multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary; therefore, we must ground inquiries within a context large enough to explore paradox.
   b) Paradox occurs in systems and honors a system’s view of reality. Emergent leaders learn to view reality as context, not content, and contextualize events by drawing connections to larger contexts.
   c) Honoring paradox deconstructs our thinking orientation from “either/or,” to “both/and,” revealing false dichotomies or perceived contradictions such as: success-failure, complexity-simplicity, freedom-anarchy, control-surrender, order-chaos, stillness-velocity, local-global, part-whole, bounded-free flowing, structure-random, active-passive, lead-follow, constrained-action, plan-spontaneous, scarcity-abundance.

4) **Cultivate Abundance**: The world is governed by something we cannot see or control: information. At the base of information are ideas. Ideas are not scarce but abundant.
   a) The intentional development and connection of ideas engages abundance and creates systems for abundance.
   b) Abundance systems include work that embraces potential, information, ideas, passion, trust and love. Leadership realizes the limitations of scarcity and the systems designed around scarcity.
   c) Abundant learning systems occur as appreciative inquiry, i.e., questions about what works. Focusing on what is working replicates and encourages the point of focus; focus on “what’s broken” provides similar results and is used to validate problem identification.
5) **Honor the Human Condition**: Developing leadership requires a philosophical inquiry that begins with fundamental questions within the philosophical realm of what it means to be human: the province of free will, purpose, values, meaning and commitment.

   a) Honoring the philosophy “Consciousness precedes being” means that any level of being we wish to attain is preceded by a level of consciousness or awareness that matches who we wish to become. That is, we increase our level of awareness (perceive it) to match the level of being we wish to become (be it).

   b) Developing human potential at this level of consciousness involves greater integration and awareness, and engages each dimension of the human condition: cognitive (intellectual), emotional (feelings), physical (senses) and spiritual (intuitive).

   c) Developing leadership mindsets or capacity is distinct from learning a new skill or ability. The capacity (mindset) for continuous learning embraces the ability to learn new skills.

6) **Connect Learning to Experiences**: Leaders cultivate a particular relationship to learning. They understand the learning process as dynamic process: learning, unlearning and relearning.

   a) Leaders engage and develop human potential as creators, constructing generative environments for sustained inquiry.

   b) The development of leadership and leaders occurs within an intentional learning environment in which the learner decides what the learner is willing to learn (Senge). That is, learners bring their own meaning to their learning.

   c) Paradoxically, in order to sustain the free-flowing inquiry, the learning environment must be bounded (Palmer) by an intentional design with clear expectations, clear definitions for success, high level of agreement around meaning, shared values and commitment, and clear and direct modes of communication.

7) **Honor Time**: Time is constant. A cliché about time points to the obvious: we all have the same amount of time. However, time itself is rarely the issue, but what we do within a given period of time.

   a) Leaders use time to reveal who they are by how well they can predict what they can accomplish within a given period of time.

   b) Used well, time becomes an objective guidepost that reveals the relationship of learners to their word. For instance, even if one is not “on time,” the individual operating “in time” is aware of this long before it matters and is able to manage his or her time and word accordingly. In addition, the “in time” individual understands that commitments reflect his/her word; only commitments located “in time” are “real,” and can exist responsibly. This allows the individual to predict his/her own capacity with
greater accuracy; and all commitments (and one’s word) is at all times able to be held to account.

c) Acknowledgement of time takes place through language and clearly defined outcomes, intentions and purpose. Lack of clarity creates misinterpretation, which is inefficient and counterproductive. Leaders learn that the only real “enemy” of time is denial or self-delusion, and to vanquish denial through intentional language.

**Challenge 3:** *Distinguish developing mindsets as distinct from teaching new skills.*

Finally, the factors listed above are chosen, intentionally, to design an environment for developing mindsets, not teaching new skills. As we explore the next two sections, we distinguish only those inquiries that will reach wide and deep with the purpose of developing the transformational mindset from which new skills can be continually embraced. This is an essential idea to highlight at this point as many programs focus on developing skills, teaching new technologies, and acquiring new competences, which are often technique-driven or time-sensitive. This is problematic, as all knowledge is dynamic not static; therefore, traditional approaches steeped in conventional wisdom must be challenged to attain new insights, raise levels of awareness and develop the transformational mindset that continually evolves in a dynamic time.

To internalize the leadership mindset requires special care, rigor and intentionality. Developing the “muscles” and capacity of the mind to learn, unlearn, and relearn new skills with greater speed and facility is analogous to developing one’s physiological body and building physical muscles. This learning dynamic (Diagram A) must be included in every aspect of the student’s learning: faculty, students and curriculum. Much of what we know about development occurs at the contextual level. The way we teach is as important—perhaps more important—than what we teach. Attention to the learning environment must be as intentional as attention to other aspects of curriculum development. And assessment instruments must evaluate how learners internalize information alongside evaluation of their progress.

Credit for much of the work in the next two sections belongs to Henry Mintzberg, Peter Senge, and Parker Palmer, whose work guided the application of research principles in our classrooms. In Section Two, we have identified three mindsets as fundamental for leadership development. There are others that we identified as necessary; however, the constraints of our work allowed us to develop three, so we chose to begin with these. In Section Three, we identify three realms in which learning occurs within the mindsets. It is worth repeating that these findings are based on our observations—observations of the whole program, with faculty teams and from individual student journals, assessments and conversations within sixteen cohorts in conventional and unconventional environments.
SECTION TWO: Mindsets—To explore the developmental process

The MSOL program develops three Mindsets in our learners: Reflective, Collaborative and Generative. These three Mindsets represent the entire journey or process of the MSOL Program. Each Mindset is explored in a semester consisting of four courses; together, the three Mindsets are developed over a period of twelve calendar months.

Reflective Mindset:

- **Meaning:** increased levels of self-awareness.
- **Concepts:** Introspection, self-actualization; philosophy, knowledge and values; identification of meaning through symbols; purpose and commitment; and impediments to change.

The Reflective Mindset develops the capacity for self-awareness and introspection. Again, adhering to the philosophy of *consciousness precedes being*, we raise the learner’s level of awareness to gain new insight. This Mindset explores individual purpose, commitment, meaning and values, by challenging the learner’s assumptions about self and reality. Insecurities—reactions to the perception of threat from change—are explored as the chief impediment to change. Learners identify and generate commitment in themselves and others. They explore: What are their own needs? What are their own beliefs and motivations? and How is meaning constructed in their lives?

**Challenge 4:** Redefine leader as a practical philosopher.

The result of engaging in this Mindset is that learners acknowledge mistakes as part of their learning process. Learners understand their value breakdowns (i.e., those situations in which their identified values are not “in synch” or aligned with their commitments or practices), and how accepting “not knowing” can lead to breakthroughs. Learners become practical philosophers, capable of applying and inspiring values consistently in themselves and others by using language to increase their levels of awareness.

The Collaborative Mindset:

- **Meaning:** Greater levels of collaboration through alignment of values, purpose, and people.
- **Concepts:** Language: speaking and listening; collaboration and shared aspirations; high-performance and meaningful teams; alignment and coordination of meaning.

**Challenge 5:** Develop a context for alignment.

The Collaborative Mindset develops the capacity for alignment, and an inquiry for establishing connections. Connections are critical in our fragmented world that is designed to operate best when disconnected, when viewed in pieces and parts. In this learning, “meaningful connections” occur as “shared” meaning, aspirations, and commitment. In this context “shared” doesn’t mean
that leaders share their vision with others; rather, the leader listens to (observes) others in all their potential and begins to identify the patterns that emerge as a vision, commitment, values, and meaning, and then connects these through language. This requires incredibly refined listening to identify the context for shared aspirations, values, vision, and purpose; and then refined speaking to define shared values, meaning, commitment, and shared expectations. This interactive refinement process is what we mean by alignment.

**Challenge 6: Redefine the context of teams.**

Finally, this process is highly developed when it occurs within teams as engines of human potential. Conventional teams are developed to serve particular functions, rather than as sources for enhancing the human condition. But these purposes need not be at odds: the key is to generate teams that are both meaningful and productive. These teams are sources of inspiration, learning and new insights.

We understand this reconceptualization of teams as context, not content. Teams in this context create the environment for participants to be more, not do more. Again, this is an environment where we can raise awareness to develop a larger, greater sense of self, where participants are inspired to grow and develop beyond the stated tasks or functions. Teams developed in this manner will foster learning environments that promise to be a space of learning and development in which they can look “foolish” as they, Columbo-like, patiently and persistently pursue true learning, and to reflect on what’s already been learned, as well as what is next. In short, teams will create a place where humans can be human to support each other. The result is the capacity for organizations to be accountable and innovative, while providing workers with a sense of belonging.

**The Generative Mindset:**

- **Meaning**: Greater levels of awareness and alignment to act in the face of uncertainty.
- **Concepts**: Language: speaking and listening; organizational philosophy; (character) values and purpose; organizational development, discontinuous change, systems thinking, and learning environments.

This final Mindset develops the capacity for acting in the face of uncertainty. Leaders distinguish action from activity. Generating action and acting on shared core beliefs are critical to sustain an organization in dynamic times. The final Mindset leverages the previous two mindsets in which leaders use awareness to align values and groups to operate at the organizational level. Inaction from leaders kills ideas and innovation, and does not inspire or generate commitment. Educator and activist Parker Palmer talks about action as a spiritual alignment of one’s passion and intentions into service—and that without the ability to act leaders cannot serve.
Challenge 7: *Internalize systems thinking.* Learners begin to develop a systems thinking approach to viewing reality. The systems approach occurs beyond the systems level, beyond analyzing or improving systems, which focuses on the wrong word (“systems”). Instead leaders need to analyze the thinking upon which systems rest. Leaders must identify, challenge and reassess those “subterranean” assumptions regularly in order to recognize the existing context, and identify any needed alterations. At this level leaders are not interested in systems per se; instead, they are interested in how these systems emerged: the thinking, beliefs, assumptions, and paradigms that enable certain behaviors and patterns to emerge, exist and flourish.

The capacity to discern environments at this level requires development of the previous two Mindsets. If accomplished, learners now view mistakes as breakdowns or gaps that are valuable revelations of what is missing between what is and what is desired. Teams enhance this processing: the greater the interaction, the more thoroughly tested the assumptions and information. At this level we are operating in the holistic view essential for large-scale learning and sustained change.

Sustainable change, however, requires positive change that inspires learning, generatively. The best method we’ve identified for refining a systems approach as positive change is *appreciative inquiry* (Barrett). Appreciative inquiry is based on rigorous inquiry and inventory of what works, and how it works. To operate in this context is to view the whole, not for problems or deficiencies, but for what’s actually working. Leaders who apply appreciative inquiry encourage and support the continuation of the positive change and can replicate its effectiveness throughout the system.

However, a leader cannot even initiate an appreciative inquiry when individuals are threatened by anyone who has discovered an idea that works. Previous developmental shifts in the leader’s either/or thinking orientation to a both/and orientation sustain this inquiry. Once established as the norm, learning environments can sustain inquiry, which inspires individual growth and development and generates change—even non-linear change—as a natural byproduct.
SECTION THREE: Learning—To explore the content

Key components to developing all three Mindsets include learning within three realms: interacting with the cohort; interacting with the instructor; and interacting with content. In each realm we will identify and clarify that what we mean by commitment to learn, adapt, grow, develop, and ultimately to transform. Only a leader with a transformational mindset can acquire the necessary skills to build teams, to listen to and speak bold truths, to feel secure when enduring setbacks and to hold himself or herself and others accountable. But first the learner must achieve this transformational mindset, which can only be achieved though an intentional design built on that singular purpose. We have found commitment to be the critical ingredient to sustain meaningful learning and change.

Challenge 8: Apply technology appropriately.

While technology is an incredible enabler to gathering and integrating information—even to connecting ideas—technology cannot replace learning within these three realms. Technology cannot predict or understand the myriad methods that humans use to interact and interpret, and the many various (content and context) applications of language that are uniquely human. Technology can best manage aspects of content; it cannot manage or cope with context, which is the function of human interaction and the province of leadership.

Again, developing leadership (context) is a critical distinction from studying about leadership (content). Technology can be used for the latter, but cannot replace the human interaction and construction of ideas that alter behavior and inspire change, which are so fundamental to leadership development. The latest shift toward distance and on-line learning can adequately assist in designing new models for gathering, discerning and even developing information. But we contend that learning is a uniquely human condition that involves emotional angst, new levels of awareness, symbolic interaction, meaning construction—and looking foolish. Technology cannot replace what can (and does) only occur between humans.

Learning Realm #1: Interacting with Cohort

Developing the cohort may be the keystone to internalizing concepts required for sustained learning. The cohort is the one constant throughout the year-long MSOL journey. Bringing together candidates who are ready, willing and able to engage in this level of study demands considerable care, from the moment we start attracting candidates.

Intentional Recruiting for leaders:

Challenge 9: Redefine Commitment.

We have found that each level of recruitment must be intentional to develop a clear sense of what it means to make a “commitment.” There are
several aspects to developing a cohort: first, we begin with the overall premise that a cohort must be developed with great care and intention within a purpose, in this case an opportunity for each potential cohort member to generate and express his or her commitment. Working within this purpose, we have learned that we must:

a) **Reveal clear expectations**: We need to: be very clear about the purpose of the program, about what commitment means; articulate that one’s commitment will actually drive success more than any other single element; clarify expectations; and give candidates all relevant informant to make a conscious choice.

b) **Reveal personal experiences**: We need to: promote the program through personal contact; and share the program as realizing the opportunity to achieve one’s leadership potential. Alumni assist greatly in this effort. Other influential elements include stories that reveal student experiences and testimonials.

c) **Reveal Distinct nature of this education**: We need to: align all promotional material (ads, web-sites, brochures, phone messages, info sessions, mailings) to distinguish this field of study as distinct from management programs and other business programs; and focus attention on areas of self-awareness, teambuilding, collaboration and change (individually and organizationally).

This clarity will discourage some from entering the program. The hard fact is that this level of inquiry is not designed for everyone, and it is best to be honest and clear about what is expected from the start. Some may return once they’ve determined they can commit; others will decide that this is not the field for them. It is critical to provide clarity so that candidates can make an informed choice.

A current cohort being developed at our Con Ed corporate site reveals this dynamic in progress. The MSOL information session yielded 22 qualified candidates; 13 left with applications, reflecting the next level of interest; 11 scheduled interviews and 8 have actually submitted applications to secure an interview. In most cases this “closing rate” (37%) would seem dismal, but it is essential to admit only those who are ready; otherwise, the cohort as a whole will not develop to their potential.

**Lessons:**

**Challenge 10: Align Commitment with practices.**

Two especially important lessons we’ve learned about the recruitment process are: 1) The recruitment and admission process begins the process of defining leadership, and defining the standards and expectations of what it means to make a commitment as a leader; and 2) Greater care at this level means spending less time on “readiness” issues in the cohort.

Still, commitment is generative: one must possess it and express (demonstrate) it in order to generate it. If the level of commitment from administrators and staff is intentional, candidates will see it and expect similar for
themselves. Our program’s own internal statistics (below) reveal that any deviations from this level of commitment—such as lower expectations of performance—damage the success rate for this kind of work:

Set A: 2000/01: 43 candidates within 4 cohorts admitted, and 31 (72%) graduated.
Set B: 2001/02: 59 candidates within 4 cohorts admitted, and 39 (67%) graduated.
Set C: 2002/03: 41 candidates within 4 cohorts admitted and 37 (91%) graduated. *

* One cohort pending graduation

When we viewed the recruitment, admission and cohort development as three separate functions/processes, as we did with Sets A and B, we learned that “readiness” issues that were not addressed in the recruitment and admission process revealed themselves during cohort development. Set A did not successfully form the teams that could develop projects; and set B formed teams, but experienced problems bonding and trusting to such a degree that major differences became obstacles to learning.

In both sets, learners didn’t bond early enough to make a meaningful difference. There were breakdowns in learning and in many cases the “developmental” aspect was retarded. Faculty had to continually “weed out” candidates, and in many cases this wasn’t completed until the end of the second semester, fully two-thirds the way through the program.

In Set C, when we operated in a holistic manner, as a single system of expectations, team projects were completed and teams bonded and enhanced learning. This is most notable, as we were able to introduce new material and experiments within Set C.

**Challenge 11: Redefine the admission process as aligned with leadership.**

As we discovered, there are some pointed challenges to sustain such a program at this level of development.

- First, our standards and methods do not “fit” into conventional norms for recruitment and admission, which are usually separate, distinct and disconnected from each other. We must view the processes as an entire system and we must be more intentional at each step.

- Second, while standardized methods and tests (GRE, GMAT) work well to establish one’s intellectual capacity, these are unable to assess candidates for maturity, commitment to teamwork, commitment to learning, and commitment to change. However, these elements must be revealed in an admission process.

- Finally, institutions must be prepared to lose anywhere from 50% to 70% of those who initially express interest in this field. This can be accomplished in two ways: indirectly, by revealing expectations from the first contact and developing a process that enables self-selection, or directly, by simply rejecting candidates after the interview process.
Attention to Experiences:

**Challenge 12: Develop instruments to assess willingness to learn and adapt to change.**

Once candidates complete the application process—designed to identify and dissuade those unable to meet deadlines, follow instructions and be proactive—we move into the interview process. This process is designed to reveal candidates’ readiness and experiences through use of their completed application packets. At this time we also clarify our expectations about this program’s focus on personal development as well as leadership study.

We’ve learned to select candidates for each cohort based on elements such as formal experience with leadership or management positions, informal leadership experience, and teaching experience, and then we look for qualities such as cultural experiences, sense of humor, experience with setbacks and failure, the ability to receive feedback and coaching, and the willingness to make and achieve a commitment. These are all difficult items to interview for, which is why we have two faculty members interview each candidate. In this admission process, assessing candidates’ readiness requires great care, a realization that clearly indicates the need to create instruments to assess candidates’ willingness to learn and adapt to change.

**Developing a cohort team:**

Once accepted, candidates are prepared with pre-program assignments and specific requests to accept leadership roles on the first day of class. They must also identify and reveal certain issues they wish to work on during the year. They are coached through this process to establish a standard for the desired and expected interaction. From the onset, students are encouraged to share personal stories and experiences. Within the first month, students begin to bond and, in most cases, hold each other accountable. When this occurs, we can begin the work of developing leadership potential.

To summarize and underscore Challenges 11 and 12: A rigorous application process is essential to establish a program standard. Other methods of admission, involving separate and disconnected processes, have sent mixed messages, and placed faculty (many of them adjuncts) in the position of weeding out students. We learned that these processes were counter-productive: students were slow to bond (if at all); faculty became frustrated with students not ready for this level of work and commitment; and consequently, the cohort was not a vehicle for true learning, which inhibited the development of leadership potential. Our integrated admission process clarifies readiness to enhance learning. Moreover, since candidates are informed that they were selected for their potential to graduate, the cohort takes risks much earlier, and begins to pull for each other and to work together to develop successful cohort outcomes.
Learning Realm #2: Interacting with instructor

Faculty Teams:

Faculty for a leadership program requires development as a learning community. There are many unique demands on such a faculty: experience in successfully working in teams; ability to hold philosophical inquiries; ability to model and embrace the program’s core values; and to recognize, identify and develop leadership potential.

To begin, we select our faculty not only for their academic expertise, but their commitment to embrace the program’s narrative: to increase self-awareness in order to collaborate; to develop others; and to inspire change for organizational stakeholders. This requires viewing each individual course within the whole program narrative. In this context, our faculty become keenly aware of how each individual contribution relates to the program’s purpose and outcomes (see Diagram C); how specific theories work within each Mindset; and most critical, how individual faculty (who s/he is “being” in the classroom) impact the final outcome of developing leaders (Diagram C). To accomplish this daunting task, faculty must work with each other within a team-learning environment. Much like the program’s teachings, faculty embrace the notion of learning from everyone—from each colleague and from each student—and demonstrate the ability to operate in a dynamic environment (see Diagram A).

Challenge 13: Define Faculty Team.

Our notion of a “faculty team” seems at odds within an academic setting. Most “full-time” faculty have long ago become experts in their field: very specialized, narrow, deep and disconnected from larger “conversations.” As such, most eschew opportunities to ask for or receive contributions from anyone outside their “field” or “expertise.” This includes consultation about content or teaching methodology. This is problematic in a program with a single, unified narrative. Candidly, we have found few full-time faculty willing or able to collaborate. Therefore, it’s become important and necessary to develop faculty for such an inquiry.

We’ve found that adjunct faculty tend to be more available for this kind of development; they are less invested in being “experts” and are eager to learn new material and innovative ways to facilitate it. In addition, by their very nature, adjunct faculty are open to and often excited about learning new methods and material to apply to their professional lives. Once they internalize these new techniques, they tend to apply them to relevant experiences to facilitate student learning.

Faculty Development:

Challenge 14: Redefine Faculty Development.

The Challenge is to establish and develop faculty, intentionally, in a learning environment. Development at this level is far beyond course manuals and basic guidelines. In the information age, faculty are the primary source of information for learners; they have the most influence in shaping and molding
content into context. This includes techniques and methodologies to learn how to frame questions and sustain inquiries, which can lead to appreciative inquiry and coaching. Some of the work can be developed outside the classroom, but our greatest successes with faculty development have occurred within the classrooms through co-teaching, assisting or observation. Co-teaching also models teamwork and collaboration, which students readily observe. At their best, faculty teams are willing to share ownership of their class with other instructors and with their students.

Long ago—through a series of missteps—we realized some of these team benefits. In an accelerated program with month-long courses, MSOL faculty were unable to develop the level of relationship with students that leads to deeper learning and insights necessary to internalize concepts. Then we decided to require each instructor to accept responsibility for two of the program’s twelve courses, and to consult with each other about their observations. Since there are only about six different faculty assigned per cohort, this re-thinking immediately reduced some impediments to learning. Faculty developed relationships with students, knowing they would reprise their instructor roles with the same cohorts. Students used faculty for consultation between their courses. More practically, students didn’t have to adjust to twelve different instructors, and faculty did not experience a “get acquainted” learning curve with each course to discern individual and group dynamics, a process which, in a month-long course, can consume significant time and energy. Our revised process created deeper connections between faculty and students, reduced fears and learning obstacles, and enabled the exploration of deeper questions that enhanced cohort bonding.

The upshot is that this team environment enables the faculty team to create a common language. This has been demonstrated and reflected as shared meaning, values, commitment, expectations, and ultimately a shared vision with the ability to hold each other accountable. This faculty team connects with something larger than their individual courses. They are ready to support each other and to uphold the high standards and expectations of excellence, critical for any leadership program.

Challenge 15: Redefine faculty “support.”

Faculty require meaningful support to be exceptional teachers (leaders!) and to take risks in the classroom. Faculty will act boldly and exceptionally if they feel supported in taking risks. In the Manhattan MSOL Program faculty are expected to demand excellence from their students. We’ve discovered that when a problem arises, honest conversations enable us to gain new insights for future application; often adjustments occur before the next cohort is admitted.

Applying information and learning in such a dynamic process acknowledges the importance and value of the instructor’s contribution. This point deserves greater expansion in another document. For now, we want to note that our notion of acknowledgment differs from simple recognition or compliments. Acknowledgment is a language act that “grants being” to what is (being noticed or observed); it is a process by which another “gets” who s/he is
to/for the acknowledger. Acknowledgement provides that faculty are “noticed” or paid attention to as they really are, connecting their existence to a larger meaning. At this level, acknowledgment is generative; it encourages repetition of the very act that is being acknowledged. Sadly, the only time the ritual of acknowledgement occurs regularly in our society is at funerals, as a memoriam, when we tell the deceased who they were for us, what they meant to us.

As such, this kind of support simply does not exist in every day “normal” living. This is unfortunate, as acknowledgement is generative, and doesn’t strain a budget. The level of acknowledgment we are talking about here is beyond transactional communication. It is contextual; it works at the level of relatedness, and is critical in any kind of learning community. Like George Bailey in the classic Christmas film, “It’s a Wonderful Life,” most people simply do not believe that anyone really is aware of the impact—or even mere presence—of their existence. However, when this is acknowledged, people shift, and their contribution is “connected” to greater meaning.

In addition to this level of acknowledgement, we have found adjunct faculty require extra support in two areas: student assessment and evaluation; and getting past “not knowing,” when one can get defensive, which facilitates learning new material. Again, specifics cannot be addressed in this space; however, we’ve found that in both areas described above faculty appreciate clear direction and parameters, clear pathways to success, and honest communication. In these areas of uncertainty we’ve discovered that having a faculty team assists in a most fundamental and most overlooked manner of support—allowing individual instructors to be human. In each instance we’ve experienced, individual faculty who were willing to share stories and experiences about best methods alleviated insecurities, mollified fears, and was generative, giving permission for everyone to act in kind.

Methods of Instruction:

Much of the focus on curriculum content occurs later in this document. But, to develop human potential, two principles are worth addressing at this time. Instruction must be “experiential”—constructed within the experiences (lives) of the learners—and coaching must occur within an appreciative inquiry method.

Challenge 16: Create and steward context.

Working to create and steward context requires that instructors embrace and internalize the program’s values and then “make real” values such as inquiry, commitment, service, collaboration and integrity through exercises within individual courses. We have learned that during the year-long journey students yearn to identify and apply these seemingly abstract concepts in their everyday life. When they can make these connections, they begin to question their own assumptions; they begin the process of learning as transformation.

Rather than developing theories and imparting information as content, instructors in this inquiry develop the principles and framework through which students process material—to use information to develop context. Here the
instructor is steward of developing the learning environment through reinforcing the basic design principles; all theories, material and relevant experiences then are developed within this context.

**Challenge 17: Embrace dynamic learning.**

The difficulty in the kind of education we are proposing and practicing is related to the nature of questions in our society. Students come to this work as problem solvers who believe in the primacy of answers and the weakness of questions. To combat this, faculty are developed to listen for questions not asked, to ask questions that provoke deeper questions, and to craft questions that are generative. This work is the work of unlearning and relearning (see Diagram A). Our instructors facilitate and coach based on appreciative learning methods, which also models for students how to inquire about what’s working, and to test best methods for replicating what’s working.

To develop—rather than instruct—a cohort means creatively “playing” with material: to understand it with a thoroughness and flexibility that promotes constructing lessons “inside” the students real-life experiences, and adapting lessons based on those “experiences” as they occur within the cohort. Faculty-as-team assists in constructing these experiences; still, it is important that instructors understand and are able to process the full value of each creative instructional experiment. Interacting and reflecting with other instructors assists in this effort.

Experiential learning also encourages faculty to rely on students to assist with their own learning. This aspect is too comprehensive to detail in this limited space. In sum, faculty design experiments and exercises to work with the curriculum and to unfold in the students’ lives; then instructors encourage students to share their findings with the entire cohort. Listening to how students interpret exercises and experiences is far more revealing as an indicator of their developmental progress than any assessment or test. This kind of interplay or “dance” requires commitment to the program's purpose (its reason for existing), and intended outcomes (Diagram C).

**Challenge 18: Develop leadership scholars and scholarship.**

Even with the presence of skilled, committed adjuncts, there is still a critical need for full-time faculty as scholars and adept researchers to explore certain questions and generate inquiries such as:

- The relationship between ethical systems and ethical people. The philosophical inquiry about values and purpose, and how they impact organizational futures.
- The way we design human systems for management and discourage leadership. How clear alignment of values in an organization is often mistaken as "cultish" and not culture.
- The connection between courage and commitment and their fundamental link to leadership and sustained transformation.
- The complex factors that engage leaders to promote the very ambiguity that encourages inaction, and how it stifles growth and causes decay in individuals and organizations.

- The importance of intention and attention in creating transformational learning environments, and how to apply language as the medium of transformation.

These are just some of questions we have discovered that demand the rigor of full-time scholars interested in connecting disciplines, who are willing to explore these larger questions in a collaborative environment, and who can facilitate learning within all four human dimensions: cognitive, emotional, physical and spiritual. It is likely that this faculty will come from such traditions as the humanities, philosophy, or literature, in which understanding context and practices of inquiry are part of the discipline’s nature.

Once they operate in a collaborative manner, faculty can embrace three unique and complimentary roles: (1) the scholarly instructor who develops new inquiries and ideas; (2) the facilitator who recognizes, identifies and develops potential from within the cohort and individuals; and (3) the coach who clears pathways for action and generates action. Diagram A details how these roles interact to create a transformational learning environment. This environment is marked by its capacity for learning at all levels: faculty-to-student, student-to-student, and student-to-faculty.

A faculty community operating at this level transforms individual instructors from problem-solvers to learners; validation shifts from “fixing” someone to serving another as a learner; and identity shifts from helping and rescuing students to developing leaders.

Learning Realm #3: Interacting with curriculum content

The curriculum content in the MSOL Program facilitates learning within three realms: philosophic, scientific, and practical. Each realm occurs, to a degree, in all three Mindsets (as detailed in Section Two of this document).

Philosophic Realm:

To develop our three Mindsets, it is essential that our learners explore their thinking patterns, assumptions and beliefs. Rigorous inquiry is critical, not to change any of these elements, but to identify and acknowledge them. We have found learners have collapsed many concepts and experiences with beliefs; that certain beliefs are resisted or embraced because of misperceptions; or that misidentifying beliefs or unknown assumptions causes incredible misperceptions. Before any real change can occur, learners must become aware of the “landscape” that is their mind or true self (consciousness before being). This requires taking inventory. This occurs most in the first Mindset, but also occurs to some degree in the second and third Mindsets.

Challenge 19: Develop faculty and material to enhance a philosophic exploration.
In the philosophic realm learners are coached to explore an ontological inquiry: the nature of being or classification of meaning. This exploration distinguishes beyond personality to the development of character, to develop an inquiry about who we are being, apart from what we do. With Zen-like discipline, students learn the value of being present in the moment and connect the choices and actions to reflect who they are.

Further, learners examine distinctions between Eastern and Western philosophical traditions: we begin to question linear and holistic viewpoints and assess the limitation of the Newtonian-Cartesian paradigm from which our Western traditions are based. In addition, the human condition is explored through the philosophy of knowledge, meaning, values, ethics, morals and purpose, which leads to critical questions: How am I existing? What is my purpose? How am I motivated? and, What is my individual commitment and power? Without this level of clarity, it is difficult for learners—students and faculty—to be authentic when assessing our own leadership.

Two particular outcomes occur within this philosophic realm: increased self-awareness and a practical application of philosophy. Students assess themselves through reflection and introspection about their authenticity in “how they exist,” and commit themselves to their continual learning, growth and development.

**Scientific realm:**

In the scientific realm, learners study paradigms and how they shape our view of whatever is observable. We explore methods of observation and refine our ability to gather and apply information, and to measure evidence. Learners become adept at understanding epistemological inquiries about how we know what we know, and how we test information. In addition, learners examine theories of leadership, behavior, and personality within research and theories of human development and learning.

This realm also explores individual and organizational behavior, information theory, and organizational development and methods for identifying and measuring large-scale change. Our learners develop an understanding about systems thinking, methods for effective communications, and skills required to develop groups and teams.

Finally, we explore certain linguistics practices (pragmatics) and speech-act theory to reveal how language constructs reality by identifying important distinctions in language. This is an area that deserves significant additional exploration. How we perceive and interpret our reality has more to do with our choices and cause of action than any other aspect of the human condition. We explore the sociological perspective of symbolic interactionism or the social constructivist view and begin to see the relationship between words, language, and meaning and existence.
Practical realm:

In the practical realm, emerging leaders apply research, gather evidence, and interpret their own experiences. Students learn from setbacks (some intentional) and develop a framework to apply the other two realms for further growth and development. The purpose for this learning is to examine how each area of study applies to their lives to assess their own growth and development.

**Challenge 20:** Attract professional coaches to develop faculty.

In this realm the instructor creates the time and space for learning to occur through learners’ experiences. Through experiments, and revealing of shared experiences, the learner begins to reconstitute his or her life. Through coaching and application of the previous two realms, learners begin to change their assumptions, question their beliefs about their world, and to enhance their performance. This is the beginning of self-realization, and the beginning of their own personal transformation.

As we’ve discovered, once coached, students develop the capacity to work in teams and develop projects that withstand scrutiny. They learn how to give and receive feedback, and how to hold themselves and others accountable. The MSOL Program enables and encourages this exploration through the application of two team projects. Our students learn to apply principles and to create teams that are both meaningful and productive—the very teams that are sustainable.

**Curriculum content:**

**Challenge 21:** Coordinate the leadership development curriculum with faculty practices.

To support this mandate, two aspects have served us well in the Manhattan MSOL Program: bounded and focused learning, which provide a depth and breadth to the year-long learning. Here the faculty develops ideal examples for students to explore throughout their year-long journey. Instructors present exemplary individuals and organizations to teach or facilitate the cohort within related topics; learners become acquainted with how theories apply to these individuals and organizations in order to apply them to their own lives. Moreover, these models provide a sense of how the work of leadership occurs in real life situations: that it is practical and can be adapted to individual and organizational lives. Consequently, students become inspired to adapt some of the larger lessons of these subjects to make changes in their lives.

These ideal subjects or examples create important observations and discussions within the cohort, and the instructors have a specific universe from which to apply lessons, theories, principles and models. Given our reliance on a pool of adjunct faculty, this method of delivering content has proven to be quite efficient: learners become familiar with many facets of research and evidence within two to three subjects/examples to apply to their learning. Given our month long courses, learners need not begin anew with each course, which only allows them to skim the surface of any subject; whereas, our method encourages
learners to deepen their inquiry within each new course, while carrying over their prior study of exemplary leaders and organizations, to explore new levels of insight from a new perspective. Again, this inquiry supports many of our design principles: specifically, learners remain in sustained inquiry; learners begin to gain a holistic view, and learners can construct the learning in their own lives. This kind of coordination of content and learning is possible as a result of faculty teams.

In addition to this depth of learning, we have chosen to provide the breadth of learning by exposing students to a wide spectrum of researchers and thinkers in the field of leadership. During their MSOL year, learners are exposed to and encouraged to explore the work of such thinkers as: Chris Argyris, Frank Barrett, James Collins, Daryl Conner, Steven Covey, Max De Pree, Peter F. Drucker, Fernando Flores, Jeffrey Ford and Laurie Ford, Daniel Goleman, Joe Jaworski, Robert Kagen and Lisa Lehahey, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, John Kotter, James Kouzes and Barry Pozner, Henry Mintzberg, Parker Palmer, Michael Porter, Peter Senge, Noel Tichy, Margaret Wheatley and Abraham Zaleznik, to name a few. Exposure to these thinkers and researchers offers students a breadth of information and perspectives to apply to their deeper work with these subjects/examples.

**Challenge 21: Preserve the learning environment through activity coordination.**

Finally, we must acknowledge that in a year-long accelerated program with month-long courses, we cannot deliver curriculum content, much less accomplish learning, in the same fashion as standard programs with 13-16 week courses. But if we remove redundancies, work as a faculty team, coordinate material, practice consistent learning methodologies, and develop the framework through which to process the work, learners will develop. Indeed, a large asset of our program is our ability to focus the learner’s attention on one course at a time. We have found this formula to be very successful to deepen the learner’s education in leadership.

**Assessment**

**Challenge 23: To identify and/or develop instruments to assess both leadership mastery and progress in leadership development.**

The area of authentic leadership assessment remains a work in progress. We are not satisfied that our traditional forms of assessment accurately discern the known elements required for leadership: the integration of the four dimensions (cognitive, emotional, physical and spiritual) for the human condition. We are exploring many different instruments to assess learners’ actions, dispositions, and performances, and some traditional elements such as thinking, writing, and analytical skills. We remain dedicated to developing the tools that can assess the learner’s progress, and unlock his or her potential for further leadership development.
SUMMARY:
Here is a list of the 23 Challenges for designing a pedagogy in leadership development warranting extensive further study as described in the previous pages:

**Challenge 1:** *Develop a language for leadership.*

**Challenge 2:** *Clarify the field of study in leadership.*

**Challenge 3:** *Distinguish developing mindsets as distinct from teaching new skills.*

**Challenge 4:** *Redefine the leader as a practical philosopher.*

**Challenge 5:** *Develop a context for alignment.*

**Challenge 6:** *Redefine teams.*

**Challenge 7:** *Internalize systems thinking.*

**Challenge 8:** *Apply technology appropriately.*

**Challenge 9:** *Redefine commitment.*

**Challenge 10:** *Align commitment with practices.*

**Challenge 11:** *Redefine the admission process as aligned with leadership.*

**Challenge 12:** *Develop instruments to assess willingness to learn and adapt to change.*

**Challenge 13:** *Define” faculty team.”*

**Challenge 14:** *Redefine faculty development.*

**Challenge 15:** *Redefine faculty “support.”*

**Challenge 16:** *Create and steward context.*

**Challenge 17:** *Embrace dynamic learning.*

**Challenge 18:** *Develop leadership scholars and scholarship.*

**Challenge 19:** *Develop faculty and material to enhance a philosophic exploration.*

**Challenge 20:** *Attract professional coaches to develop faculty.*

**Challenge 21:** *Coordinate the leadership development curriculum with faculty practices.*

**Challenge 22:** *Preserve the learning environment through activity coordination.*

**Challenge 23:** *Identify and/or develop instruments to assess both leadership content mastery and progress in leadership development.*

* The content and text of this document was edited by writer and educator Kathy Szaj, M.Ed., Adjunct MSOL Faculty, Mercy Manhattan College
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### Diagram A: Teaching Models:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A- Informational</th>
<th>B- Formational</th>
<th>C- Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Instruct student</td>
<td>Develop student</td>
<td>Develop student as continuous learners, through dynamic process of learning and unlearning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent</strong></td>
<td>To know content</td>
<td>Interactive Content</td>
<td>Altering context: Learning → Change → New learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Style</strong></td>
<td>Transactional learning</td>
<td>Experiential Learning - Facilitative</td>
<td>Experiential &amp; dynamic: View experiences with new perspectives to integrate new information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic</strong></td>
<td>Instructor to student – “I teach you”</td>
<td>Instructor and student together – “We teach and develop each other.”</td>
<td>Instructor and student, together; and student-to-student facilitated by instructor. -- “Through learning we evolve together to new learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum-focused (readings, texts), lecture driven. Learning through imparting information through texts and instructor who interprets info.</td>
<td>Students exposed to original thinking/material and exercises. Learning constructed through experiences.</td>
<td>Students exposed to original thinking/material, exercises, and language to foster learning and unlearning; students learn to continually view experiences with new perspectives and to integrate new information. Capacity to develop potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course structure</strong></td>
<td>Fragmented, deeper connection of material left to students.</td>
<td>Integrated; Student and Faculty learn topics; each course connected to module/program</td>
<td>In addition to “formational,” operate within dynamic process. Student and faculty learn topics and apply interpretations, together; integrate new learning. Evolutionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Role/Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>To teach single course and impart information about listed topics</td>
<td>To develop connections between courses; leverage previous learning, and connect current learning to module(s) and program.</td>
<td>In addition to “formational,” operate within dynamic process: Possess capacity to integrate new information (especially from students) and apply new interpretations. Operate as faculty teams to exchange learning and information to assist students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
<td>Student learns about topics as demonstrated by ability to describe topics.</td>
<td>Students assisted in developing connection between courses, module, able to leverage learning into whole program view.</td>
<td>In addition to “formational,” develop students to integrate and learn anew with each “interaction.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Model/Process</strong></td>
<td>Assignments, readings, and tests; written research papers that reflects application of research; participation while in class.</td>
<td>Exercises; team projects; assessments – a) self (student), b) developmental/behavioral (instructor) and c) peer reviews (cohort); position papers that measure ability to build and support sustained argument.</td>
<td>In addition to “formational,” add two-way dynamic and interactive assessments: Students assess instructors in same learning and experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagram B

A – the span of one’s focus
B – the subject of one’s focus

(1) Clarity of values. Coordination and classification of meaning, symbols and needs.

(2) Clarity of thinking. Paradigms, mental models, assumptions and design. The systems, structures, coordination (symbolic interaction and coordination) to organize assumptions, beliefs.

(3) Clarity of language: speaking and listening (symbolic manifestation), expression of meaning.
Outcome (a): Who We Develop:

We develop emergent leaders who are generative thinkers and continuous learners, able to transform environments through a foundation of service and commitment.

What this means:

We use the term “generative thinkers” to describe those who engage in a sustainable process of rigorous thinking that spurs new thinking, i.e., provokes questions, tests assumptions, and cultivates the spirit of inquiry in oneself and others.

Within that same perspective the term “continuous learners” describes those leaders whose learning never stops, as they continually integrate and internalize new information and knowledge to achieve new levels of awareness and new avenues of insight. Learning in this context comprises wonder, inquiry, and exploration -- quite distinct from “having to know,” problem solving, or needing to possess the right answer.

The phrase “new leadership contexts through a foundation of service and commitment,” describes a mindset and level of conscientiousness in which the leader now stewards and fosters the commitment that leads the leader to serve.

In this context leadership is a dimension of human potential that demonstrates a high level of confidence and self-realization, paradoxically enabling the leader to act with humility, “surrendering” to a larger purpose and a larger commitment to be led by this purpose.
MSOL Outcome (b): The Emergent Leader:

1) **Who: the Emergent Leader:**
   a) The leader is self-aware, which requires deep introspection: a commitment to self-reflection and self-realization, drawing on the mental, physical, intellectual and spiritual dimensions of the self.
   b) The leader embraces and integrates a set of consistent values.
   c) The leader is a designer adept in the alignment, translation, and coordination of meaning, through skilled observation, listening and speaking.
   d) The leader cultivates shared aspirations, meaning, experiences and values, generating a shared commitment to articulate a desired future and to enroll others into a defined future.
   e) The leader is a continuous leader who fosters spaces for learning. The leader sees new information in all relationships, collaborative efforts, conversations, data, and mistakes, and has the capacity to learn from each interaction and experience.

2) **What: the Leadership Practices* of the Emergent leader**
   a) **Models the Way:** The leader: a) Sets a personal example of what is expected; b) Makes certain that people adhere to agreed-upon standards; c) Follows through on promises and commitments; d) Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect people’s performance; and d) Builds consensus around cohort values.
   b) **Inspires a Shared Vision:** The leader: a) Describes a compelling image of the future; b) Appeals to others to share dream of the future; c) Shows others how their interests can be realized; d) Paints a “big picture” of group aspirations; and e) Speaks with conviction about the meaning of others’ work.
   c) **Challenges the Process:** The leader: a) Seeks challenging opportunities to test skills; b) Challenges people to try new approaches; c) Asks “What can we learn?”; d) Makes certain that goals, plans, and milestones are set; and e) Experiments and takes risks.
   d) **Enables Others to Act:** The leader: a) Develops cooperative relationships; b) Actively listens to diverse points of view; c) Treats others with dignity and respect; d) Supports decisions other people make; and e) Ensures that others grow in the program.
   e) **Encourages the Heart:** The leader: a) Praises people for a job well done; b) Expresses confidence in people’s abilities; c) Creatively rewards people for their contributions; d) Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments; and e) Gives team members appreciation and support.

3) **How: Emergent Leaders Operate:**
   a) Leaders generate their own commitment and inspire commitment in others.
   b) Leaders identify, clarify, stand for, and practice a consistent set of values.
   c) Leaders build teams and maintain team spirit;
   d) Leaders actively and consistently build and express trust with individuals through:
      i) Expressing clear intentions through words and deeds;
      ii) Clarifying and articulating clear agreements through intentional speaking and listening; and
      iii) Acknowledging others’ contributions.
   e) Leaders collaborate to bring forth a desired future.
   f) Leaders identify, articulate and lead change; and
   g) Leaders envision, articulate and enroll others into a desired future.
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