MOVING HIGHER EDUCATION TO ITS NEXT STAGE:

A New Set of Societal Challenges, a New Stage of Life, and a Call to Action for Universities

Rosabeth Moss Kanter
Ernest L. Arbuckle Professor

Rakesh Khurana
Associate Professor

Nitin Nohria
Richard P. Chapman Professor

Harvard Business School

October 25, 2005

Acknowledgements: David Gergen has been an insightful participant in the development of these ideas. Valuable comments and criticisms were provided by colleagues in many Schools across Harvard University, including Mary Jo Bane, Barry Bloom, Derek Bok, David Ellwood, Allen Grossman, Ronald Heifetz, Howard Koh, Dutch Leonard, Kathleen McCartney, Robert Mnookin, Joseph Nye, and Howard Stevenson. Helpful contributions were also made by Tom Tierney and Jeff Bradach of Bridgespan Group and Harvard research associates Robert Tichio, Mike Kernish, Noah Kindler, Ryan Raffaelli and Daniel Penrice, along with faculty assistants Cheryl Daigle, Emily Hall and Alison Comings.

Working Paper

Executive Summary

This paper describes a new model for universities: a third stage of education (beyond undergraduate and graduate/professional schools) to prepare experienced leaders, in the period of their lives once called "retirement," for service activities addressing societal problems. This white paper is a proposal for universities to develop what could be the next great innovation in American (and global) higher education, on par with the creation of the modern graduate and professional school in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It is a vision rooted in the notion that the purpose of the university is to serve society, and societal change demands innovation.

The rationale for this particular initiative at this particular moment in history lies at the intersection of three phenomena:

- an evolving university concerned with its societal mission;
- a global problem agenda which requires the development of new cross-profession knowledge and leadership competencies and can benefit from action by experienced leaders; and
- changing demographics which make available a population of accomplished leaders who are interested in service in the productive years following their primary income-earning career.

Part One (**pages 3-9**) provides a brief history of American universities. New schools have been created by universities when societal change has revealed knowledge gaps, giving rise to new fields and/or education in new professions. There has been little change in the basic forms and offerings of universities since the 1980s, despite the emergence of new technologies in a globalizing world and questions about the relevance of universities.

Part Two (**pages 10-22**) describes an emergent set of societal challenges calling for new knowledge and leadership, which research universities are uniquely positioned to provide. Problems such as poverty, global health, basic education, or environmental quality are systemic in nature, have political as well as technical dimensions, and tend to require cross-sector and cross-profession collaboration. But there is a knowledge gap about how to develop and implement solutions, which should be filled by integrative research and educational innovation.

Part Three (**pages 23-27**) offers data about demographic change: an aging but healthier population in the developed world that includes accomplished leaders increasingly interested in service – especially solving problems such as those outlined above. Many in this group seek meaningful contributions rather than income, but there is an absence of established pathways. The opportunity this population presents has not been addressed by higher education.

Part Four (**pages 28-34**) calls for bold action. In the past, American universities have tackled major challenges/opportunities not with incremental changes within existing structures but by founding whole new schools. We urge universities (including our home institution, Harvard University) to create new graduate/professional schools to educate experienced leaders who wish to tackle societal and global problems in their next phase of life. Such third-stage schools – **Schools for Advanced Institutional Leadership** – will offer more than retraining for transitions to new careers, although they could also serve that purpose. Rather, third-stage schools will set a distinctive intellectual agenda by focusing on the knowledge required to lead social institutions and address global challenges. We describe our model for this innovation.

Part One: University and Society in America

The modern American university is arguably one of the most, innovative, dynamic, and efficacious instruments of human progress in the history of the world. Ever since the late eighteenth century, when the founding of the nation's first medical school (at what would become the University of Pennsylvania) began the transformation of the colonial college of yore to the "multiversity" (in Clark Kerr's famous term) of today, America's institutions of higher learning have continuously invented new forms of education to keep pace with a changing world.

It is a commonplace that the world is currently undergoing a period of social, economic, and cultural transformation comparable in magnitude to the original scientific and industrial revolutions in Europe or the European colonization of what we now call the developing world. We believe that the American university, in the meantime, is on the cusp of the third great transformation in its relatively brief history.

The first transformation occurred in the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, reaching its greatest intensity in the years between the Civil War and World War I.[1] During this period, universities (no longer just the religious and liberal arts colleges that had existed since the seventeenth century) began to be established in significant numbers. American higher education shifted from its previous model of primarily moral education to a more secular and practical orientation. Access to higher education began to be expanded beyond the (male) offspring of clerical, professional, and mercantile elites. Graduate and professional education became part of the university's mission; along with research and public service.

The second major transformation in the American university occurred in the thirty-five years following the end of World War II, a period known not so much for innovation as for expansion. During this period the American research university ceased looking to Europe for guidance and became both something *sui generis* and a model for the rest of the world. Several forces made the university one of the central institutions of American industrial society: the GI Bill, innovations in university financing, the merging of the university's activities with those of the government and corporations, and a middle class that embraced higher education as a means to occupational and social advancement. Universities expanded to educate enormous numbers of students and conduct research in a vast range of subject areas.

Much that has happened over the last twenty-five years suggests that universities are now in the midst of another transition from one period of their history to the next. Indeed it is difficult to imagine how this could not be so, given the sweeping changes taking place in the world at large. Changes in both the university and society in recent years present both a challenge to the

[1] This section draws heavily on several histories and texts about the American university, including Richard Hofstadter, C. De Witt Hardy, and Commission on Financing Higher Education., *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* (New York,: Columbia University Press, 1952), Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago,: University of Chicago Press, 1965). The discussion on the post-War university draws extensively on Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, 5th ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001). Data on changes in university funding is excerpted from Roger L. Geiger, *Knowledge and Money : Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004).

continued relevance of universities and an opportunity for them to undertake a fundamental institutional innovation, comparable in extent and significance to the development of graduate education as something essentially different from undergraduate education.

Renewing and strengthening the university's historic commitment to education and research in the service of society requires, first of all, that we understand how the connection between the university and the larger American society has formed and evolved over nearly two centuries. The purpose of this section is not simply to chronicle the causes and activities in which the university has participated. It is, rather, to consider the development of the American university in relation to the larger social developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Hence this section of the paper explores the implications of fundamental social change since the early nineteenth century for the university's primary activities of teaching, research, and public service, as many of these activities have been driven by changing societal structures and needs.

The history of the American university can be divided roughly into three periods: the pre-university era of the Colonial period and the Early Republic; the rise of the American university; and the post-World War II era. The first phase is characterized by "piety" and "character formation". The second period was concerned with "utility" and "research". The third period has been dominated by imperatives of "growth" and "institutionalization."

The Colonial Period and the Early Republic

The first three American colleges—Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary—were all founded as religious institutions, as were virtually all of their earliest successors. Their notion of education was one rooted in piety and character formation. Young men from socially prominent families were taught Latin, Greek, the Bible, and natural philosophy, all required subjects in the grooming of a Christian gentleman.[2] The colonial college's primary objective, as stated in Harvard's founding documents, was to "let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well, the main end of his life and studies is, *to know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life*."[3] Those graduates who did not become clergymen generally entered one of the other two professions then recognized as such (i.e., law or medicine).

Academic standards were not rigorous. There was no such thing as an academic career. Faculty (or "tutors," as they were often called), taught all subjects. The college classroom was a kind of waiting room where "young teachers tended to view their work as temporary until something better came along, that middle-aged men sought [as] an interlude or an escape from the rigors of an active profession such as the ministry, and the elderly found [as] a berth for retirement."[4] Even though what was then the College of Philadelphia opened its medical school in 1765, and began offering lectures in law in 1790, these institutions had no connection to research, nor did any of them provide professional education in any recognizably modern sense. They concentrated almost exclusively on what we here call "first-stage" education.

---

[2] Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York,: Columbia University Press, 1955), Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*.
[3] Samuel Eliot Morison, History of Harvard University, Appendix D, p. 434
[4] Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism : The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*, 1st ed. (New York: Norton, 1976)., p. 269

Two other features of these early American colleges are noteworthy: their independence of the state, and their essentially local character and influence. While state incorporation laws were important to assuring that American colleges (and their university successors) could survive in perpetuity, almost all of the earliest colleges developed as extensions of private religious bodies,[5] governed by boards of trustees initially primarily of clergymen, and later including a mix of clergy and laymen, often prominent alumni. The impact of the early colleges and universities was mostly local, and they played a peripheral role in the collective life of the nation.

These institutions of higher education were useful in their own times and places, helping shape an elite that could administer a community-based, patrician-dominated, pre-industrial society.[6] Yet by the early nineteenth century, new kinds of educational institutions were beginning to appear. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had set aside public lands in what was then the Northwest Territory for the support of public education, a provision that resulted in the founding of several state universities (e.g., the University of Michigan, founded in 1817). These institutions signaled the first significant expansion of access to higher education in America as well as a gradual transformation in Americans' sense of its fundamental purpose.

In 1825, according to the historian of universities, Lawrence R. Veysey, one Harvard professor wrote to Thomas Jefferson to tell him that "discontent is beginning to prevail in relation to the system pursued at all our colleges in New England which, being substantially the same that existed here a century and a half ago, can hardly be suited to our present circumstances and wants." A small but increasingly vocal group recognized that the congeries of small denominational colleges dispersed throughout America was fundamentally limited in its capabilities. Their small size, fixed curriculum, and closed structure were ill-suited to a society that was experiencing the first wave of industrialization and becoming more complex and urban. The letter presciently called for adapting the university to a society in transformation.

The Rise of the Modern University: 1862-1917

As a consequence of the founding of most of the first state universities in the early nineteenth century, higher education in America was already beginning to take on a more practical cast when, in the midst of the Civil War, Congress passed, and President Lincoln signed, the Morrill Act of 1862. This law—which created the mechanism for the founding of the nation's land-grant colleges—specifically designated agriculture and the "mechanical arts" as subjects for academic study in these new institutions. The new emphasis on "useful" education and research was carried over into the ensuing decades, when the growing belief that universities in a democratic society needed to offer practical benefits to the public, together with the increasing organization and prestige of science and the inspiration of the German research university, gave birth to the new institution of the American research university, of which Johns Hopkins (founded in 1876) is the classic exemplar.[7]

---

[5] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States,* Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*.

[6] Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism : The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*.

[7] On the influence of the German research university on the creation of its American counterpart, see *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860–1920*, ed. by Alexandra Oleson & John Voss. (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), pp. x–xiv.

The creation of the new American research university was but the most visible manifestation of an academic revolution that took place in a fluid, often turbulent social context, involving the whole American population and almost all of its major social institutions.[8] It was not just that a rapidly expanding population and economy created demand for more access to higher education and more opportunities for practical training within the university. As Americans undertook what one prominent historian of the Progressive era has called the "search for order" amid the massive dislocations caused by the creation of a national economy, the rise of giant corporations, the appearance of a new urban working class in fast-growing cities, the displacement of traditional economic and social elites, and other changes of comparable magnitude,[9] society began to view institutions including science, the professions, and the university as instruments for the creation of nothing less than a whole new social order. Like the institutions of science and the professions in the late nineteenth century—with which its own development was closely intertwined – the university legitimated itself by performing utilitarian functions and appealing to widely held values. Indeed, the university's longstanding role as a provider of moral education and the quasi-sacred associations of the institution in an era when the scholar's search for truth filled a spiritual void left by a decline of religious faith, combined to make the university an icon of many of society's most deeply held beliefs and aspirations.[10]

Many of the changes in the university in this period derived from leaders' efforts to align their institutions with a society undergoing profound transformation. Harvard's President Charles W. Eliot, for example, introduced Harvard College's elective curriculum and committed the University to the full-fledged provision of "second stage" education by establishing the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, overseeing the renewal of existing professional schools, and developing new ones—thereby showing that old institutions could adapt to new circumstances. Johns Hopkins' Daniel Coit Gilman made academic research the central mission of his new university, a priority that would soon reverberate throughout the American university system.

Meanwhile, as research became a necessary qualification for a university career and part of the professor's career path, the natural sciences (eventually joined by the social sciences) displaced the humanities atop the academic pecking order, with scientists beginning to enjoy more dedicated resources as well as higher salaries and status.[11] Nor were such changes merely internal in scope and impact. At the University of Wisconsin, for instance, the "Wisconsin idea" cast academic researchers in the role of expert advisors to legislators and public policymakers. In a revolution that appears inevitable in historical retrospect, the American university declared that it would no longer be an ivory tower but would serve as a vital resource for society.

With its triple mission of teaching, research, and public service, the new American research university quickly met with enthusiastic support from both public and private sectors.

---

[8] Kerr, *The Uses of the University*.
[9] Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877–1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967).
[10] Lawrence Veysey writes: "Higher education, it was hoped, might affect the conduct of public affairs in at least three ways. First, the university would make each of its graduates into a force for civic virtue. Second, it would train a group of political leaders who would take a knightly plunge into 'real life' and clean it up. Finally, through scientifically oriented scholarship, rational substitutes could be found for political procedures subject to personal influence." [Need citation.] [Shils, 1965].
[11] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*.

By demonstrating their usefulness to society, universities benefited from both taxpayer support and unprecedented private philanthropy from a new economic elite. The nation's new industrial fortunes funded the expansion and creation of new departments and professional schools. Individuals such as John D. Rockefeller and Leland Stanford established whole new universities. The Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations, meanwhile, used the leverage of financial support for universities to achieve goals like the raising of hiring standards and compensation for faculty.

By the eve of America's entry into World War I, the basic scaffolding of the modern American university was in place and certain standardized features stood out strongly. Specialized disciplinary departments and pre-professional programs had begun attracting students away from the liberal arts that traditionally were the heart of undergraduate education. Vast libraries and new research institutes marked a shift of resources from teaching to research. Undergraduate education remained the heart of the university only in rhetoric, as attention and effort shifted to graduate and professional schools dedicated to turning out highly trained specialists. Academia as a career replaced academia as a calling.

The Boom Years: 1945–1980

The thirty-five years following the end of World War II were in many ways the golden age of the American university. As noted above, these were years of tremendous expansion, as rapidly increasing numbers of students streamed through universities' gates in search of economic and social advancement. New sources of funding fueled research, primarily, at first, from the federal government, although with increasing contributions from private industry.[12]

The idea that the university should be "useful" to society took on a new cast in the wake of World War II, when university-based science and technology research in had aided to the war effort. Amid Cold War competition with the Soviet Union, university research related to national security concerns played an important role not only technically, but in policy formation.[13] More faculty members began moving between the worlds of academe and government, as exemplified by the careers of individuals such as John Kenneth Galbraith and Henry Kissinger.

The university exerted a potent influence on the labor market; educational attainment determined career prospects and life chances. Education became one of the primary vehicles of social mobility. Access to the highest positions of political power and economic influence was coming to depend, at least partially, upon formal education credentials.[14]

In his book *The Uses of the University*, published in 1963, University of California president Clark Kerr coined the term *multiversity* to describe "the federal-grant university, the new educational complex, that was displacing the old land-grant college . . . [and] was destined to become the core site for 'knowledge production and consumption' in the emerging

[12] Kerr, *The Uses of the University*.
[13] Edward Shils, "The Intellectuals and the Powers: Some Perspectives for Comparative Analysis," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 1, no. 1 (1958).
[14] The role of human capital in determining economic and social stratification is an extensive sub-field. We will not review it here, for an example of a review see David B. Grusky, *Social Stratification : Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2001).

knowledge-based economy."[15] As Kerr acknowledged, his model of "knowledge production and consumption" as the fundamental activities of the university also entailed a blurring of the distinction between the university and other institutions in society serving the needs of production and consumption. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, it would begin to be evident that the centrality of the university in American life combined with the multiplicity and complexity of its relationships with the outside world had led to a variety of unintended consequences.

In short, even while gaining enormously in influence and prestige throughout the post-war period, the university suffered a significant loss of autonomy and uniqueness. The new degree of dependence on funding from government and private industry lessened the autonomy of the university vis-à-vis both the public and private, for-profit sectors; while the bureaucracies created to oversee grants and comply with government regulations created a more impersonal institution where conformity to bureaucratic rules trumped individual accountability. They also tended to reduce the role of the faculty in university governance, even as expansion and increased specialization was weakening the ties that had once bound faculty communities. Teaching continued to be subordinated to research, and research was becoming an ever more fragmented enterprise. During this period research centers and institutes that, while perhaps not major new structural innovations, attempted things like multidisciplinary approaches to problems. Most scholars of higher education regard these developments as not central, and thus continue to characterize this as a period of expansion more than of innovation.[16]

Challenges and Opportunities in the Present Era

As this history suggests, the relationship between universities and American society is reciprocal. Society's conditions and demands have shaped the nature of universities. Universities, in turn, have shaped the society within which they are embedded. For the past sixty years, however, it is arguable that universities have been in more of a *re*active than a *pro*active mode. Since the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980, universities, along with other recipients of non-defense-related government funding, have been put on the defensive, and seen dramatic reductions in state and federal funding that continue to this day. It is a shift in the *zeitgeist* that is more easily described than explained.

For publicly funded universities, for example, real appropriations rose by an annual average for about one percent, below the rate of inflation. In both public and private universities, student tuitions rose to cover the growing costs of educating students.[17] The year 1980 also saw the passage of the Bayh-Dole Act, which, in the privatizing spirit of the new political age, revised American patent law to give universities ownership rights in intellectual property developed with the aid of federal funding. Bayh-Dole created new incentives for universities to produce knowledge with commercial applications while government funding of research was cut, with the effect of increasing commercial investment in university research and turning this core university activity into an increasingly profit-driven enterprise serving private rather than public

[15] Jeff Lustig, "The Mixed Legacy of Clark Kerr: A Personal View," *Academe*, January 2004, http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2004/04ja/04jalust.htm.
[16] The one major innovation during this era was the creation of the community-college system, which falls outside the bounds of our subject; or that schools in new fields, like KSG, were built on existing models.
[17] Geiger, *Knowledge and Money : Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*.

ends.[18] Some faculty began to operate more as freelance entrepreneurs than as members of a scholarly community dedicated to the pursuit of truth and the commonweal.[19] Today, with tuition continuing to soar and rising enrollments masking the university's flagging performance as an engine of social mobility, Americans may be forgiven for wondering if universities are fulfilling their side of the social contract between society and the academy originally negotiated a century and a quarter ago.[20]

Meanwhile, at the start of the twenty-first century, the American university once again finds itself on the familiar ground of rapid and radical societal change. Indeed, among the challenges being posed by globalization and the continuing advance of information technology to many of our most important social and economic institutions are questions now being raised about the continued relevance of the university in its by-now traditional form (with, e.g., distance learning challenging the residential model, for-profit "universities" challenging non-profits, etc.).

Yet, just as universities as we have come to know them were one of the primary agents in the process of ordering and civilizing the new industrial society of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, universities today – if they are willing to innovate as boldly as they have in the past – can play a lead role in addressing the most pressing and difficult problems in today's globalized, post-industrial society. Many of the gravest problems confronting society today exemplify H.G. Wells's dictum "History is a race between education and catastrophe." This creates both a compelling imperative and a clear rationale for leadership from universities, which must still ultimately justify their prerogatives and access to resources through service to society.

Columbia University's Lee Bollinger recently acknowledged a loosening of the long-standing bond between the university and society when he said, "We are now at a new period where universities are reentering the world." To the extent that this is true, the reengagement comes at a highly opportune moment for both universities and those whom they exist to serve.

In the past, as we have noted, higher education in America has responded to the challenges and opportunities presented by changes in the external environment by transforming its own structures—proactively in the midst of the Progressive era, and more *re*actively in the post-World War II period. For the university of today, which has not changed in essential ways for a quarter-century or more, the opportunity presented by this historical moment is to again become proactive in the ongoing effort to achieve and maintain alignment between its internal structures and culture and the needs and demands of society.

---

[18] David C. Mowery, *Ivory Tower and Industrial Innovation : University-Industry Technology Transfer before and after the Bayh-Dole Act in the United States*, *Innovation and Technology in the World Economy* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Business Books, 2004), Donald G. Stein, *Buying in or Selling Out? : The Commercialization of the American Research University* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2004).

[19] Derek Curtis Bok, *Universities in the Marketplace : The Commercialization of Higher Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003).

[20] Lawrence H. Summers, "Every child getting ahead: The role of education", Remarks of Harvard University President Lawrence H. Summers College Board Forum, Chicago, Illinois, November 1, 2004

Part Two: Problems of the Global Information Age: The Need for New Knowledge, Skills, and Leadership

Globalization is as old as Greek and Roman conquerors, the Silk Road and the spice trade, and the European colonizers of the Western and Southern hemispheres. But globalization today has a different meaning than empire-building, trade, or land grabs. It is populist as well as elite in character and closely related to the modern revolution in information and communications technology (ICT).

Globalization accelerated in the late twentieth century, with simultaneous events around the world in 1989: the fall of the Berlin Wall, symbolizing the end of the Cold War and the beginning of market economies in Eastern Europe; deregulation of Asian financial markets; liberalization in Latin America and a move from military dictatorships to democracies; and Nelson Mandela's planned release from prison in South Africa in early 1990, which restored foreign investment and perhaps, history might later note, was a major step in helping the African continent move beyond its colonial past.[21] Shortly thereafter, in 1993 the Worldwide Web opened for business, creating an explosion of digital communications and information flow as well as new virtual linkages across borders.

What was once called Post-Industrial Society, which Daniel Bell pioneered in describing,[22] can claim its own name as the Global Information Age. In this era, the "death of distance" produces a "small planet" or a "flat world"[23] characterized by blurring of conventional boundaries (physical or conceptual), spillovers across borders, emergence of international institutions (bi-lateral or multi-lateral), revolutions of rising expectations and even, as Samuel Huntington has it, clashes of civilizations.[24]

New eras bring new challenges. Globalization is associated with occupational upheavals and labor force shifts: a demand for technical skills (network systems, Web design, e-commerce management) or the migration of jobs to places that leapfrog to advanced technology (software and call center outsourcing to India and elsewhere). In terms of technology alone, because the rules are not fully for how to handle emergent issues, there is pressure to define new areas of knowledge, as Debora Spar has shown,[25] such as intellectual property laws, new rules regarding individual privacy, or new ways to police the distribution of publicly-disapproved content. These issues certainly challenge all professions to expand their know-how, but they can generally be handled within occupations, adding to each profession's stock of specialized knowledge.

But a class of problems of another order of magnitude also appears today, which calls for new approaches and new leadership: societal challenges involving well-being and the social

---

[21] Rosabeth Moss Kanter and Euvin Naidoo, "Nelson Mandela: Turnaround Leader," Harvard Business School case
[22] Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*, New York: Basic, 1999 (25th anniversary edition).
[23] For death of distance see Frances Cairncross, *The Death of Distance*, Boston: HBS Press, 1997. The "small planet" concept has been around since E.F. Schumaker. Thomas Friedman added the "flat world" idea to describe a more level playing field across countries as traditional comparative advantages wane, in *The World Is Flat* , New York: Public Affairs, 2005.
[24] Samuel L. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
[25] Debora Spar, *Ruling the Waves,* New York: Harcourt, 2001.

infrastructure. Global institutions concerned with social as well as economic needs, at a micro as well as macro level, are a relatively recent phenomenon, and their effectiveness remains controversial. The United Nations and the World Bank, two of the leading global actors, were created in 1945 and 1947, as products of a world that grew more closely connected through media and increased public awareness, and have continually attempted to evolve in response to broader and more complex problems. Less than a decade ago, the UN set Millennium Development goals, involving over 265 experts on ten task forces; aspirations included cutting world poverty in half by 2015. In Africa, perhaps the last global frontier and poorest region, a variety of trans-national and cross-sector organizations have been formed even more recently: Nepad (New Partnership for African Development), an African-led strategy for renewal initiated by the heads of state of Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal, and South Africa, cooperating on its education program with industrialized countries and international bodies; the Commission for Africa, launched by UK Prime Minister in 2004; and Make Poverty History, a coalition of NGOs, including ActionAid, Christian Aid, Comic Relief, Oxfam, churches, trade unions, and a rock star, Bono.[26]

The problems themselves are not entirely new. But the forces of globalization and ICT tend to exacerbate them, make them more visible, and/or increase the urgency of addressing them. And to address them requires leadership skills that will benefit from development of new areas of integrative knowledge. In short, gaps exist that create an opportunity for a new program of education. Let us take up the arguments one by one:
…that there is an emergent problem set,
…of increasing urgency,
…posing challenges that cross professions,
…for which cross-sector solutions are sought,
…but with a gap in knowledge about how leaders can best address such problems.

In short, we often know *what* to do, but not *how* and *who* to do it.

An Emergent Problem Set

Four major issues in this set tend to be at the top of numerous agendas: **global poverty; global health; basic education;** and **degradation of the environment**. A *Harvard Business Review* global survey of 12,000 managers from 24 countries showed that managers everywhere endorsed the need for action on these issues, with the quality of education the top societal priority.[27] The World Economic Forum, which provides a vehicle to connect leaders across countries and sectors under the banner of "improving the state of the world," has used its profile and network to set an agenda to tackle the issues highlighted above through various initiatives, forums and events. Indeed, the Forum has also found these issues to be amongst the most pressing of our modern age, and the Forum's various initiatives include a Global Health Initiative and Greenhouse Gas Register.[28]

Poverty. While the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are roundly criticized in the press for their *solutions* to global poverty (i.e., structural adjustment programs),

[26] BBC World Service, *BBC World Agenda*: *the BBC's International Journal*, June/July 2005.
[27] Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Transcending Business Boundaries," *Harvard Business Review* (May-June 1991).
[28] http://www.weforum.org/site/homepublic.nsf/Content/Initiatives+subhome

their collective and decided *focus* on the reality of the situation is of note. To underscore the position of poverty in the issues, the United Nations has declared "Goal Number One" of its eight Millennium Development goals to be the eradication of "extreme poverty and hunger."[29] Some 2.8 billion people—more than half the people in developing countries—live on less than $2 a day. Of these, 1.2 billion people earn less than $1 a day.[30] To compound the already sizeable challenge, the World Bank estimates that the global population is expected to increase by an estimated 3 billion people over the next 50 years, with the largest increases coming from underdeveloped and poor regions.[31] At a Harvard Kennedy School conference, Dani Rodrik reported that while the absolute number of poor people worldwide has decreased, the process has been uneven, with Africa now the center of global poverty and Latin America not far behind.[32] Mary Jo Bane has identified how development policies do or do not alleviate poverty.[33]

Health. Global health has received extensive attention from various organizations that cite it as one of the most pressing social concerns. Several of the World Bank's Millennium Development goals focus on health, from reducing child mortality and improving maternal health to combating diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria. The Global Health Council, formerly the National Council of International Health, is a US-based nonprofit created in 1972 to identify priority world health problems and is the largest membership organization of its kind; it reports that issues of global health are inextricably related to poverty. Whether the problem is HIV/AIDS or infectious diseases, the global health crisis is more dire for women than it is for men and more acute for the poor than it is for the rich. For example, one woman dies every minute of every day from highly preventable deaths attributed to maternal causes, 99% of which occur in low-income countries.[34] Other institutions, such as the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization, emphasize that the world's poor, suffering from inadequate basic needs, experience lifetime detrimental developmental setbacks before facing insufficient medical care when faced with disease or illness—the odds are indeed stacked against them. Basic sanitary conditions which could significantly reduce the spread of disease are also lacking; over one billion people do not have safe water to drink.[35]

Basic education. The importance of education, particularly in the early stages of life, is a critical component of a global solutions agenda. Underscoring the interconnected nature of these issues, Global Health Council reports that "with limited access to education or employment in many nations, high illiteracy rates and increasing poverty levels are making health improvements" a significant challenge."[36] UNICEF reports that over 115 million primary school aged children are not receiving any education,[37] and a vast number of countries face a striking gender gap between the education of girls and boys. Education provides children with much more than learning; Carol Bellamy, UNICEF's Executive Director, explained that "in many

[29]http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/EXTARCHIVES/0,,contentMDK:20053333~menuPK:63762~pagePK:36726~piPK:36092~theSitePK:29506,00.html.
[30] http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTABOUTUS/Resources/wbgroupbrochure.pdf
[31] Ibid.
[32] Rob Meyer, "Panelists look at how to tackle global poverty," *Harvard University Gazette*, May 19, 2005.
[33] Mary Jo Bane, *Poverty and Public Policy*, Syllabus, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard, Fall 2005.
[34] http://www.globalhealth.org/view_top.php3?id=225
[35] http://www.globalwater.org/
[36] Ibid.
[37] UNICEF Annual Report 2004, accessed via UNICEF website

countries it's a life-saver, especially where girls are concerned. A girl out of school is more likely to fall prey to HIV/AIDS and less able to raise a healthy family."[38] Girls' education was identified as a priority by Lawrence Summers when he was the World Bank's chief economist.

Environment. The landmark report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, entitled "Our Common Future," warned that unless we change many of our lifestyle patterns, "the world will face unacceptable levels of environmental damage and human suffering."[39] While the well publicized environmental crisis facing the planet is indifferent to borders, environmental decline and destruction is attributed by some analysts to the economic consumption and consumer patterns of developed nations. For example, as much as 70% of the world's consumption of fossil fuel and 85% of chemical products is attributable to 25% of the world's population.[40] Yet, even the poor, in their quests to feed themselves and maximize the value of the land on which they live, sometimes overuse their natural resources, resulting in dangerous cycles of depletion and environmental decline.

Increasing Urgency

Some people suffer the direct consequences of poverty, health crises, inadequate education, or pollution in their own communities, but the poor or deprived are often not in a position to force action. These problems have moved to the top of policy agendas because they are also important to much larger constituencies at several removes. The problems stemming from these issues are seen, variously, as barriers limiting further progress of nations, as problems reducing the desirability of markets and thus inhibiting investment and trade, as gaps that create breeding grounds for conflict and terrorism, or as humanitarian issues calling for the best values and human compassion because that's the right thing to do.

Some of the problems have always been there but are getting more visible. Just as the faces of war are available in real-time on TV screens or over the Net, so are the faces of poverty. NGOs have also become more skillful at making their case to consumers and the public about sweatshops or the plight of small farmers and migrant labor.

Other problems are getting worse, sometimes because of an accumulation of the fallout from neglect. Environmental degradation falls into this category, whether immediate pollution from toxic waste dumps or emissions that change the atmosphere and add to global warming. In some countries, basic education is many children, with a growing gap between the top and bottom, which shows up in high youth unemployment or rates of young male incarceration.

Still other dimensions of the problems are emerging as the result of globalization's successes: for example, increased travel across borders which means that diseases can spread more rapidly; increased use of internal combustion engines in congested areas; increased reliance on ICT which increases the gap between digital have's and have not's; or greater efficiencies in food production and distribution that displace small farmers. And problems stem from globalization's drawbacks. Ready access to information in the digital (and television) age can potentially produce backlash from those left behind – with the potential for revolutions of rising

[38] http://education.guardian.co.uk/schools/story/0,5500,1462511,00.html?gusrc=rss
[39] http://www.ifad.org/events/past/hunger/envir.html
[40] Ibid.

expectations and clashes of civilizations, as people everywhere are aware faster of choices as well as threats to their way of life.

Cross-Profession Challenges

These issues have several characteristics in common that signal the need for new kinds of leadership to address them – leadership that can integrate knowledge across professions.

1. The problem has both a technical and a political component.

Technical knowledge exists that can be used by practitioners to tackle an aspect of this kind of problem and treat its symptoms at an individual level: e.g., medical researchers' latest knowledge about the course of a disease based on individual genetics; environmental engineers' knowledge about removing toxic waste or improving the water supply; business entrepreneurs' knowledge about supply chains that can help poor farmers get more for their crops; educators' knowledge about the best methods for helping children learn to read.

But there are often public controversies surrounding the issue itself, controversies or issues that arise regardless of the latest scientific findings or the technical skills of practitioners. Science does not always speak for itself even in developed countries (as the controversy over evolution versus creationism in high school biology attests). The very nature of this class of problems means that there are alternative or contending perspectives about their root causes, extent, importance, means of resolution, and the public will to support action, including who should bear the costs and consequences. Thus, the political context surrounding the problem must be understood and managed; a variety of institutions across sectors must be mobilized to permit technical solutions to be used.

2. Solutions often exist, but they are mal-distributed.

Scholars in the graduate and professional schools at research universities have provided abundant data on the problems and made excellent policy recommendations – one example is the book by the international health care group at the Harvard School of Public Health working with the World Bank.[41] And many have identified best practices, so-called "positive deviances," that work effectively. There are excellent schools in countries with generally poor educational systems. There are cures for diseases that still plague some areas. In this class of problems, the barrier to change is often not the solution itself – which educators and practitioners may have already identified – but how to get the solutions to the people in need, in the absence of appropriate systemic connections and infrastructure. Consider, for example, the problem of food distribution in poor countries, where international aid packages have sometimes been reported to be held up at points of entry, rotting before reaching those in need. Similarly, drug distribution in poor countries turns out to be difficult for many reasons, including lack of access to hospitals, the inability to monitor drug disposal or use, or supply chain failures. Merck developed a cure for river blindness in Africa but had to create several other innovations in order to get the medication to those who needed it because of gaps in the system that had nothing to do with the technical side of drug development.[42] The system that Merck started, later called the Mectizan Donation Program, resulted not only in the delivery of 200 million treatments over a 14-year period and the documented prevention of over 600,000 cases, but also in the establishment of several other

[41] TK
[42] Merck, HBS case

complementary programs, including the World Bank's African Program for Onchocerciasis Control in 1995, which raised $131 million over 12 years to help it local partners control the disease through aerial spraying in 19 African countries.[43]

The problem of taking effective single projects from the demonstration phase to scale involves resources and skills beyond technical knowledge of the solution itself. In India, there are examples of highly successful health care institutions, such as the Narayana Hrudayalaya Heart Hospital, that struggle with the issue of getting their solution to the masses.[44] Distribution of solutions requires attention to the nature and dynamics of local communities is required, both to customize solutions to particular circumstances and to ensure that solutions developed elsewhere are not rejected out of local pride ("not invented here"), resistance to change, disbelief in the solutions' efficacy, or competing priorities. Furthermore, local capacity-building is often required to sustain the implementation of solutions, however well-intentioned those who appear briefly for "aid" and then leave.

3. The problems themselves are embedded in a complex system.
Thus, there are large challenges, often unresolved, that cannot be dealt with by one professional field acting alone. Effective action to address the scope of this set of problems often occurs at the boundaries across professional fields. Improving educational outcomes for children in public schools, for example, can involve expertise in education (curriculum, teaching methods), administration (budgeting, human resource policies, connections among schools in a district, whether alternative models are permitted), politics (laws, fiscal policies, public officials, unions), life sciences (nutrition, early brain development), etc. Holistic solutions and known to be more effective, yet they can be difficult to implement because of the complex interactions (or failures to interact) among many actors who deal with only once piece of an issue.

4. Solutions require concurrent actions at several system levels or among many stakeholders.
Overall, productive change is not possible through a simple set of actions taken by a single organization at a time, even if they specialize in dealing with a major chunk of the issue. So the change process must influence many interacting actors (individuals or organizations) that have relative autonomy with respect to their own activities), have competing priorities, complicated histories within and among them. Furthermore, effective solutions cannot merely be imposed on people or communities from outside, they must be arise from the grass roots or be compatible with grass roots agendas, and they must appear to increase local capacity, be sustainable over time, and become locally embedded. Social capital[45] as well as financial capital is required, to forge relationships, find opinion leaders and gatekeepers, and ensure cultural appropriateness.

Cross-Sector Solutions

Do global problems require new kinds of action? Tommy Thompson, former U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services, argued for a new role for government in calling for the

[43] http://www.child-survival.org/cs_merck.html
[44] Tarun Khanna, V. Kasturi Rangan, and Merline Manocaran, *Narayana Hrudayalaya Heart Hospital: Cardiac Care for the Poor*, Harvard Business School case in draft, May 2005.
[45] Robert Putnam, *Bowling Along: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001.

transformation of U.S. foreign policy into one that is based on medical diplomacy.[46] Even if governments set new priorities, the global problem set involves challenges that are no longer the exclusive concern of the public sector or of NGOs focused on relief of symptoms. There is growing interest in the involvement of business enterprises as a source of solutions through their own actions, contribution of resources and/or capabilities, or partnerships across all three sectors. Some analysts consider this ironic, since they think capitalism in general and business behavior in particular has contributed to the problems. But regardless of the esteem in which the private for-profit sector is held, it is increasingly called upon to join coalitions focused on solutions.

Some of this reflects a changing view of government. Around the world, governments have been reducing spending and privatizing public enterprises (although the boundaries of public service versus private sector providers are not clear-cut, as evidenced by the U.S. government taking back the function of airport security screening from private vendors). At the beginning of the 1990s, government spending was no longer growing relative to the size of the economy in most developed countries.[47] During that decade, government spending as a percentage of GDP fell in the United States, Canada, the U.K., and Germany.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, euphoria about the triumph of global capitalism (since muted and even reversed in the 2000s), was reflected in a glorification of business enterprises as a force for good and a source of expertise lacking in a "less-professional" public sector, which often did not deserve the criticism but was certainly inhibited by resource reductions. Interest grew in the private sector taking responsibility for problem-solving once in the public realm. A deputy to a U.S. Secretary of Education said that problems of education required business involvement because "business is a neutral convener"[48] (a somewhat startling statement given the legal mandate of corporations to be instruments of shareholders' interests, but a reflection of a ceding of community leadership to CEOs rather than elected officials). President Clinton declared that the "era of big government" was giving way to the "era of big citizens," as he downsized government and rewarded businesses for their community responsibility through the Welfare-to-Work Partnership and the Ron Brown Award, as well as encouraging "social entrepreneurs" founding new hybrid organizations to serve community needs. In the U.K., Prime Minister Blair's New Labor Party has touted social entrepreneurs and public-private partnerships.

If some people in parts of the developed world hold government in low esteem, the view of government is even more cynical in the developing world. Transparency International, the only international non-governmental organization devoted to combating corruption, publishes an annual survey of corruption perceptions of world governments. A total of 106 out of 146 countries score less than 5 against a clean score of 10, according to the survey. Sixty countries score less than 3 out of 10, indicating rampant corruption, and the study reveals a high correlation between economic development and corruption (i.e., corruption is perceived to be most acute in Bangladesh, Haiti, Nigeria, Chad, Myanmar, Azerbaijan and Paraguay, all of

[46] Meyer, "Panelists look at how to tackle global poverty." See also Tommy G. Thompson, "The Cure for Tyranny," *The Boston Globe*, October 24, 2005, page A15.
[47] Richard B. McKenzie and Dwight R. Lee, "Government in Retreat," National Center for Policy Analysis Report No. 97, June 1991.
[48] Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Business as Stakeholder in Public Education: A History of Business Efforts to Improve Public Schools in the United States," Harvard Business School Publishing, 2002.

which have a score of less than 2).[49] Government corruption combined with inefficiency is a drag on development, Bruce Scott has argued.[50] Peter Eigen, Chairman of Transparency International agrees, claiming "across the world, corruption in large-scale public projects is a daunting obstacle to sustainable development, tearing at the social fabric and contributing to civil unrest and conflict. It is a blow to the hopes of millions, one that results in a major loss of public funds needed for education, healthcare and poverty alleviation, both in developed and developing countries."[51] There are exceptions to a declining belief in government's effectiveness to improve well-being—Singapore Inc. or Dubai Inc.—but those tend to be small places with tight borders in which an enlightened authoritarian leader has used state power to raise standards of living dramatically and attract foreign investment. But even the exceptions help make the point that cross-sector partnerships are increasingly viewed as the engine of improvement.

Non-profit organizations, variously defined as NGOs or civil society, increasingly seek partnerships with businesses as an alternative source of funding and connections, stressing common interests.[52] Environmental NGOs once seen as antagonists to large corporations have come inside to work with them on new business practices.[53] Theda Skocpol has shown that many non-profits once membership-driven have become increasingly professionalized and business-like,[54] and therefore, corporations might be seen as more natural allies for professional managers seeking non-profit efficiency. Non-profits recognize the value of their "global brands,"[55] and so do businesses that want to counter challenges to their legitimacy by associating with social causes.

Global institutions and NGOs increasingly seek business partnerships amid louder calls for "corporate social responsibility" in which business enterprises not only do no harm but also actively engage with the public and civil society sectors to solve problems. For examples:

- In the United Kingdom, Prince Charles (HRH the Prince of Wales) launched a Business Leaders Forum to provide a focus for chief executives of international companies to exchange ideas and good practice on how they could successfully be involved in local communities in their overseas markets. The Forum has come to act as "a broker between international companies and pioneering community leaders," he said in 1995.[56]
- In 1992, Business for Social Responsibility began in the U.S. as an association of approximately 50 companies; membership is now close to 2000 companies. BSR is part of a growing global network of national organizations that provide business leaders with opportunities to collaborate and network with innovative managers across all industries, geographies and functions—especially as ICT makes domestic customers and consumers

[49] http://www.transparency.org/cpi/2004/cpi2004.pe_statement_en.html
[50] Bruce Scott, paper for HBS global poverty conference
[51] http://www.transparency.org/cpi/2004/cpi2004.pe_statement_en.html
[52] Shirley Sagawa and Eli Segal, *Common Interest, Common Good: Creating Value through Business-Social Sector Partnerships*, Boston: HBS Press, 1999; James Austin, *The Collaboration Challenge*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
[53] Rosabeth Moss Kanter and Ricardo Reisen, *ABN AMRO REAL: Banking on Sustainability*, Harvard Business School case, 2005.
[54] Theda Skocpol, *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*, University of Oklahoma Press, 2003.
[55] John. A. Quelch and Nathalie Laidler-Kylande, *The New Global Brands: Managing Non-Governmental Organizations in the 21st Century*, South-Western Publishing, 2005.
[56] http://www.iblf.org/iblf/csrwebassist.nsf/content/f1a2d3.html

aware of the condition of suppliers in other countries. BSR partners include Business and the Community in the U.K. the Council for Better Corporate Citizenship in Japan, CSR-Europe, Accion Empresarial in Chile, Instituto Ethos in Brazil, and MAALA in Israel, and EMPRESA, a network of CSR organizations in the Americas.[57]

- At the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, in January 1999, United Nations' Secretary-General Kofi Annan asked business leaders to sign up for the Global Compact, an international initiative that would bring them together with UN agencies, labor, and NGO's to support nine "universal environmental and social principles." The Global Compact began to operate in July 2000.[58]
- In the spring of 2000, the U. K. government created a new Cabinet ministry for CSR, which has been active in getting businesses involved in helping poor communities as well as ensuring compliance with environmental standards. A CSR Academy was established in July 2004 as a public-private partnership to help organizations of any size or sector to develop their social responsibility skills through education in core areas such as understanding society, building external partnerships and networks, questioning traditional practices, building stakeholder relationships, and harnessing diversity. Stephen Timms, the first CSR Minister, claimed that "There is enormous enthusiasm among businesses for the development of responsible practice—to build competitiveness as well as to address social and environmental challenges."[59]

Whether businesses are enthusiastic about CSR or not, a brief historical overview suggests that multi-national corporations have a growing stake in solutions to global problems, even ones that they once might have caused. Over the past centuries of trade and industrialization, business enterprises from First World or developed nations have engaged with the less-developed world in three iconic ways. In an *extractive phase*, "Third World" territories were sources of raw materials based on natural resources, such as forests, minerals, spices, or oil, taken elsewhere for use; the well-being of native populations was often ignored, along with post-extraction environmental problems. In a *production phase*, native populations in underdeveloped areas were a source of cheap labor; companies had little incentive beyond their goodwill to raise standards of living, especially as that might raise costs. (In textiles, contract manufacturing has tended to move across territories as wages rose). In recent decades, a third phase has arisen, a *market phase*, in which developing countries have been redefined as "emerging markets," local nationals are not only workers or landholders, they are also consumers. The latter increases the interest of the private sector in a wide range of social and political issues and in establishing themselves in the public's mind as good local citizens. Multi-nationals increasingly want not just cheap labor but educated labor. And as industrial economies become service economies, "quality of life" services are a business frontier. Businesses are being urged to find new markets among those at the "bottom of the pyramid,"[60] creating for-profit ventures to help the poor in their own economic interest.

[57] http://www.bsr.org/Meta/About/index.cfm
[58] http://www.unglobalcompact.org/Portal/Default.asp?
[59] http://www.societyandbusiness.gov.uk/pdf/jul-release.pdf. See also www.csracademy.org.uk.
[60] C.K. Prahalad, *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*, Philadelphia: Wharton School Publishing, 2004. In December 2005, Harvard Business School will convene a conference on whether and how markets can serve the global poor.

While business involvement in social and environmental issues is growing, and CSR is accompanied by reporting on a "triple bottom line" (financial, social, and environmental performance), especially in Europe, there are also many critics of the ceding of public functions to businesses. Critics come from both the right and the left. *The Economist* has argued that CSR is not good for business, while community advocates often argue that it is not good for society. Moreover, business leaders do not want to be handed sole responsibility for areas outside of their domain, and they rely on partnerships with NGOs to accomplish CSR goals—and sometimes even rely on NGOs in their for-profit efforts, to help with market access or other issues. Thus, business leaders are aware that they cannot take action in areas related to the new class of social and environmental problems without alliances with government and NGO's. Indeed, it is impossible to perform end runs around government when addressing public needs, and eventually, even the most entrepreneurial private sector leaders find that they must work with government to move their projects forward.

Regardless of one's views of the trends we have identified, it is clear that boundaries between sectors are blurring, and solutions to pressing societal issues are seen to require action that cuts across sectors. Finding solutions is a collaborative activity: forming and leading public-private partnerships; hybrid organizations; networks of NGOs, government agencies, and businesses; social entrepreneurs using business methods but through non-profit organizations; and new kinds of intermediaries brokering the alliances for action in local communities.

Knowledge Gaps

There abundant information on economic development, the plight of the poor, the nature of global pandemics, inefficiency or ineffectiveness in K-12 education, and environmental issues. The problems are studied by numerous scholars in numerous professional schools, data about problems and possible solutions are widely-published, and field initiatives are often the subjects of evaluation research. But to date, a large proportion of the intellectual work tends to be oriented toward the technical side, toward specialists' content, and not toward action or system-change processes that draw on knowledge from several disciplines.

As new action models arise that involve cross-sector collaboration based on cross-profession expertise for problems that are controversial and systemic, it is difficult to find concepts, frameworks, research findings, or models that integrate knowledge across fields to guide solution-seeking leaders. New research and curriculum development are necessary.

It is not only the scope and scale of change that makes systemic change highly complex and leadership talent scarce.[61] Societies and institutions, nations and regions, encompass a wide variety of groups, subgroups, organizations, decision-makers, individuals, and cultures that are not controlled by a single entity. Everything from laws to infrastructure to physical capabilities to deeply-held individual beliefs is involved if sustainable change is to be achieved. Greater complexity and system interdependence also increases the difficulty of creating sufficient action in a consistent direction to reshape a whole system, and raises the specter of unanticipated consequences. The Ford Foundation's Corporate Involvement Initiative concluded that effective

[61] Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Even Bigger Change: A Framework for Getting Started at Changing the World," Harvard Business School Publishing, 2005.

methods for transforming markets to better meet social needs requires the long-range use of multiple strategies and competencies in concert.[62]

The competencies we identify include both content and process:

- Examining problems and potential solutions from the perspective of recent best knowledge in a number of fields—developments in the life sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, engineering, economics, etc.
- Diagnosing root causes, intersecting layers of issues, and system dynamics.
- Understanding the legal framework, the legislative process, the enforcement process, electoral dynamics, public resources and their allocation, interest groups and their influence.
- Identifying targets for action, whether public policy, a demonstration program, grass-roots organizing or consciousness-raising, and determining whether to work through an existing organization or create a new one, with awareness of the challenges and tradeoffs
- Determining whether, how, when to convene others, and to influence them so that their actions reinforce rather than cancel each other; stakeholders, interest groups, opinion leaders, resource-holders; when and how to collaborate with competitors
- Understanding the differences among not-for-profit, for-profit, and public sector organizations, and how to work effectively to derive the best from each of them
- Developing standards, governance, accountability, and performance metrics for complex multi-layered partnerships and progress on complex issues
- Enhancing individual/personal skills in pattern recognition and system diagnosis, in influence without sole authority, and in communicating across cultures
- Understanding the drivers of public opinion, including values, history, and culture, and the importance of local embeddedness and community capability-building

There is relatively little guidance in the academic literature about the dynamics of large-scale systemic or social change, and even less about several of these leadership competencies and how they can be developed. In sociology, the study of social movements has focused on opposition or protest rather than on problem-solving efforts, on the disaffected mobilizing to press their cause rather than on the elite attempting to produce widely beneficial change. In political science, the thrust has been on the formal process using the apparatus of the state. The study of social change has tended to focus on sweeping developments such as industrialization and the fate of whole nations, but not on institutional change, although studies such as Paul Starr's history of medicine is an exception in the American context.[63] A literature is just developing on cross-sector collaborations for complex problems, including CSR efforts.[64]

---

[62] http://www.fordfound.org/publications/recent_articles/docs/part_ofthe_solution.pdf

[63] Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*, New York: Basic, 1984.

[64] See, for example, The *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* or the older *Business and Society Review.* Books include: .Steve Waddell, *Societal Learning and Change: How Governments, Business, and Civil Society are Creating Solutions to Complex Multi-Stakeholder Problems*, Sheffield, England: Greenleaf, 2005. Jane Nelson and Ira Jackson, *Profits with Principles*, New York: Doubleday Currency, 2004. David Grayson, *Corporate Social Opportunity: Seven Steps to Make Corporate Social Responsibility Work for Your Business*, Sheffield, England: Greenleaf, 2004. Aron Cramer, Claude Fussler, and Sebastian van der Vegt, *Raising the Bar: Creating Value with the United Nations Global Compact*, Sheffield, England: Greenleaf, 2004.

A consequence of too little theory and research is that the quality of practice is uneven or poor. There is a dearth of leaders equipped to find solutions, despite the high hopes and expectations accompanying the latest press release about the latest global business coalition. It is not enough to be an accomplished leader in one sector and one organization, nor is it enough for top leaders to have resources and a desire to contribute. A different skill-set is required to take effective action on this class of problems. Leaders can declare their interest or even allocate resources (a bold stroke) but still not be well-equipped to effectively diagnose a complex system, find an area for intervention, choose the right partners to forge a coalition, deploy a group for action, and begin the long march toward reshaping institutional patterns.[65]

Sometimes efforts fail despite money and motivation, and when they fail, they can even make the situation worse. Two efforts involving UN agencies and the World Bank illustrate this reverse effect. In 1998, the Roll Back Malaria Global Partnership (RBM) was launched by the World Health Organization, UNICEF, UNDP, and the World Bank, doubling spending on malaria prevention with the goal of halving the burden of malaria by 2010. In 2000, 53 African heads of state signed an agreement in Abuja, Nigeria, to halve the number of deaths by 2010, looking to RBM to "turn advocacy into action." But the loose association was unable to operate effectively, especially with four heads in five years. In the seven years since RBM's inception, malaria rates have increased.[66] The Children's Vaccine Initiative, launched in 1990 at the World Summit for Children in New York, by most of the same players in collaboration with the Rockefeller Foundation, had a similar result. It sought to close gaps in global vaccine development and delivery. By the late 1990s, immunization rates among children were not rising, they were dropping. Lack of funding was not the issue, as the effort received $500 million from Rotary International. One of its principal architects called it "a real mess," citing scarce resources, political infighting, and lack of a shared vision.[67] (This program was picked up by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation in 2001 to turn it around.

Without a firm grounding in this new area of knowledge, even accomplished leaders effective within their own enterprises will fumble the opportunity and fail to meet the challenge. Consider this example:

> *In 2001, the Latin American regional heads of about a dozen multi-national corporations, led by IBM, convened a summit of education ministers, other government officials, education experts, and domestic CEOs to discuss how business could help improve K-12 education in Latin America, a region with the widest income disparity and education gap in the world. This was unique in its convening by businesses to discuss a public policy issue and in the representation of every country in the region.*
>
> *The result was a policy declaration that included a commitment by participating businesses to get more involved, and the formation of a coalition initially called the Latin America Basic Education Initiative (LABEI) which, a year later, included members of an exclusive pan-region organization of chief executives of domestic companies who were the most prominent business leaders in their countries. Most of the companies*

[65] The distinction between bold strokes and long marches accounts for why action to change systemic patterns cannot simply be ordered from the top. See Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Barry Stein, and Todd Jick (eds.), *The Challenge of Organizational Change*, New York: Free Press, 1992.

[66] http://www.guardian.co.uk/medicine/story/0,11381,1466113,00.html; accessed June 16, 2005.

[67] http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/africa/policy23.shtml; accessed June 14, 2005.

represented had projects of their own in particular companies dealing with one school or aspect of education; the collective goal was to make joint progress at raising standards and increasing student achievement everywhere.

The LABEI steering committee came to Harvard Business School in 2003 and interacted with second-year MBA students who provided many suggestions for actions the group could undertake. But when they returned to HBS in the spring of 2004, it was clear that this well-intentioned effort could claim no accomplishments except creating a central office to collect information. The leaders were having difficulty setting an agenda.

The CEOs and senior executives who formed the initiative were successful in their own enterprises and well-intentioned as they tackled bigger change. But these leaders who were successful at running businesses lacked intellectual grounding in the context for public education, did not adequately diagnose the system of intersecting forces, had never attempted a social change project, did not understand how to intervene or create programs outside of a defined hierarchy, and were missing skills fundamental to their task.

Even the most accomplished leaders are often stymied at efforts to work on complex, multi-disciplinary problems through coalitions and hybrid organizations. They need a new kind of knowledge that is not yet common in the academy or world of practice. This knowledge is emerging only now, as efforts such as theirs are created

Summarizing the Knowledge Challenge

In short, we often know more about *what* than *how* and *who* There is an intellectual gap around solving an emergent class of high-profile problems that cut across sectors and require integrative knowledge derived from many professional fields. This is exactly the kind of knowledge-building opportunity universities should embrace, especially to give leaders an enriched portfolio of competencies.

The Ford Foundation, reporting on its Corporate Involvement Initiative, stated one side of our argument: *Building a field of practice helps develop and disseminate new competencies and knowledge*. But the reverse is also true: *Identifying and researching new competencies and knowledge helps build a field of practice*.

Such a new field of practice is particularly well-suited to the capabilities and desires of experienced leaders. These are leaders who have already achieved success in one sector and seek, in their next phase of life, to use their skills to serve society by tackling an even bigger change problem.

Part Three: A Third Stage of Life and the Opportunity for Higher Education

The United States, along with other developed countries, is witnessing a dramatic change in age-related demographics that foreshadows an important social revolution. The changes to come will have three aspects: lengthened life-spans; increased health, vigor, and activity in the later stages of life; and a shift in the overall age-distribution within society (a result of lengthened life-spans) that will have profound consequences for the structure of society itself (due partly to increased levels of activity later in life).

Improvements in medicine and medical technology are increasing both the length and the quality of life in the United States. In 1900, 96 percent of the American population did not live past 65.[68] Today, over 70 percent celebrate their 65th birthday. Researchers speculate that the median lifespan will stabilize at about 85, though many will live longer.[69] As health and vitality improve, the majority of the population will survive to ages previously reached only by a select few.[70] Yet not only will Americans continue to live longer; old age itself will be a different stage of life than it has been in the past. Common ideas about aging involve declining health, senility, frailty, and inactivity. These ideas are metamorphosing as older people defy stereotypes: retiring later, maintaining greater health and mental activity, and proving themselves to be valuable workers. In other words, they are refusing to be "elderly." The combined effect of lengthening life-spans and healthier old age, in turn, will have significant consequences for American society as well as for individuals. The population of citizens between the ages 50 and 64 is expected to grow by 21 percent, and those over 65 by 33 percent, by 2020.[71] During the 20th century, the age distribution of society was shaped like a pyramid, dominated by younger people at the bottom, with progressively fewer adults at increasing ages. Today, the age distribution of society is shaped more like a rectangle, with an even distribution of people across all age groups.

As life expectancy has expanded, a new group of productive workers and citizens has begun to form, forcing society to redraw the lines between various stages of life. Some scholars have argued that there are four stages of human life, each about 25 years long, that divide what used to be considered "old age" into two distinct phases. In this newer scheme, the first stage of life encapsulates maturation and most education. The second stage is devoted to household formation, parenting, and career development. The third stage is defined by an empty nest, strong health, and great work potential. This third stage (our focus) should be thought of as "prime time," a phase in which a person can continue to perform existing work or begin another career focused on giving back to the community. The fourth stage begins around age 75 and is defined by a general decline in activity levels, although some people will remain very active.[72]

---

[68] John W. Rowe and Robert L. Kahn, *Successful Aging*, New York City: Dell Publishing, 1998. p.4
[69] Ibid., pp.4-5.
[70] Ibid., pp.8-9
[71] Andrew Kochera and Thomas Guterbock, "Beyond 50.05: A Report to the Nation on Livable Communities: Creating Environments for Successful Aging", AARP Research Report, May 2005. Accessed at http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/il/beyond_50_communities.pdf, on 28 June 2005, p.4.
[72] Viewing life through a four-stage schematic is a significant improvement over previous conceptualizations, yet it should be noted that it is still problematic. Ideally, the older population should be even more finely differentiated. Unfortunately, research has not progressed far enough to fully understand the variations in this age bracket.

The Challenge and Benefits of an Aging Population

Public discourse about the implications for American society of an aging population frequently centers on the cost of supporting the elderly. Concerns about the ability of Social Security and Medicare to sustain the Baby Boom generation are the stuff of campaign platforms and political debates. The implications are broad and the causes complex. For individuals, retirement raises questions of purpose and meaning in a society like America in which work and identity are co-mingled. For some organizations, like universities, faculty retirement age increasingly seems to be a matter of personal choice, not to mention personal means.[73] For society, there will be social and political tensions caused by older people consuming a share of resources that may disadvantage, or be seen to disadvantage, younger people. A consumer economy and culture long oriented toward youth will need to find different bearings.

Along with these implications for society as a whole, the aging of America may well bring its own set of challenges for universities, whose current educational offerings (with the exception of executive education and a handful of other mid-career offerings) have heretofore been geared primarily towards people in the first or early-second stages of life.[74]

Despite such concerns, the new demographics in general, and re-conception of the third stage of life in particular, also present many potential benefits for both society and universities. For example, concerns about an aging population becoming a drag on the economy and a burden on younger workers overlook the potential productivity older workers could and do provide. If more workers were encouraged to keep their jobs or begin a new career, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) could increase by 9 percent by 2045.[75] In addition, current benefits older workers provide to society are not now adequately measured. The GDP assesses only paid work, and does not take into consideration hours spent volunteering and caring for family members, even as 70 percent of retirees assist family and friends, filling an important need.[76] In addition to providing community service, older Americans are proving themselves physically and mentally capable of remaining in the workforce, as social workers, managers, CEOs, and engineers.[77] Experienced workers, especially those with a proven track record of leadership, provide skills younger workers cannot. Drawing on a rich variety of life events, older workers may be more adept at solving nuanced problems than younger employees.[78]

In short, older workers are a valuable asset to businesses and other organizations, and economic and social gains will be reaped through the increased contributions of older populations. Involving the senior population in socially productive activities will help create a healthier and happier older population, which will reduce the direct costs of expensive programs like Medicare and Social Security. Seniors in leadership will enable the provision of social

---

[73] One possible explanation for the low retirement savings rates of American workers is that the less people value leisure, the later they will want to retire and so the less money they will want to put aside for retirement.

[74] We have previously referred to undergraduate and graduate/professional education, respectively, as "first stage" and "second stage" education, even though graduate or professional study is typically undertaken during what we are calling the "first stage" of life itself.

[75] Peter Coy, "Old. Smart. Productive.," *BusinessWeek*, June 27, 2005. p.81

[76] John W. Rowe and Robert L. Kahn, *Successful Aging*, New York City: Dell Publishing, 1998. p. 187

[77] Peter Coy, "Old. Smart. Productive."

[78] Ibid.

services by mobilizing public-private partnerships, reducing the need for big government spending or direct government involvement in social spending.

Along with the practical benefits it would provide, such a mobilization of seniors could be a source of healing for a divided nation unable to resolve the argument about the role of government in solving social problems, and, as we have noted, subject to inter-generational tensions as the population as a whole ages. Today, the age divide causes political discord as young workers and seniors appear to have competing interests. Social integration would be enhanced by seniors again becoming a vital, contributing part of society, rather than splitting off from the rest of the population.

Americans such as former U.S. Presidents Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, General Norman Schwarzkof, or Senator Elizabeth Dole are all examples of individuals who rose to the tops of their professions and then have chosen to find ways of serving society rather than opting for conventional retirement. This approach to the third stage of life is likely to become the norm among members of the Baby Boom generation who care deeply about having a significant impact in their lives, have risen to the tops of their fields, and aspire to continue making a difference in the world for as long as they are still physically and mentally vigorous. Having succeeded in their careers, many have a passion to give back to society (there is both anecdotal and survey evidence to support this). A recent survey of Americans 50-70 years old found that over half want to spend their time when their primary career ends in national or community service, including paid or part-time positions, and the desire to take on significant leadership is especially pronounced among those 50-60 years old, signifying a major societal shift.[79] Many also feel uncertain about how to do this in ways that will be meaningful for society and fulfilling for themselves.

In the New CEO Workshop chaired by Michael Porter at Harvard Business School, CEOs who have just risen into positions to which they may have aspired throughout their careers confide that they are already struggling with the question of, "What next?" Retiring and playing golf is not the idyllic future to which they look forward. Their current opportunities for involvement with society after their conventional work lives end are typically framed in terms of joining the boards of not-for-profit institutions or participating in some form of volunteerism. But these kinds of activities do not always feel fulfilling, because they are often chosen in an ad-hoc manner and do not fully engage high-achieving people's energies or take full advantage of their skills and capabilities.

If society can find ways to help talented, energetic, high-achieving people in the third stage of life find exciting and meaningful opportunities to continue to make a difference and to achieve what Jerome Groopman calls a feeling of "greater measure in their lives" the issue of changing demographics can be transformed from a problem to an opportunity. It can be an opportunity to unlock and more fully utilize one of society's scarcest resources: productive human capital.[80] Educated people recognize a need to get smart about issues in which they want

[79] Princeton Survey Research Associates International, "New Face of Work," Princeton Survey Research Report, MetLife Foundation/Civic Ventures, June 2005.
[80] Jerome Groopman.

to invest their time and energy and have an impact. Survey evidence suggests that those with higher levels of education continue to seek out educational experiences later in life.[81]

Third-Stage Aspirations: Five Portraits

There is a potentially new market for higher education among people in the third stage of life: The group of potential candidates for university education during the third stage of life includes Baby Boomers who likely already possess advanced degrees and appreciate the impact of education on achievement, having already experienced it in their own lives. Consider the aspirations and educational needs of five accomplished leaders[82] transitioning out of successful careers in the military, government service, large business, small business, and the law.

- From military leadership to leadership models for young people. Colonel "Thomas Green," who has risen through Army ranks and active duty to his current teaching position at West Point, is pondering whether to take the military's generous retirement package while he still has many productive decades ahead. He is particularly interested in enhancing the leadership capabilities of young people by mobilizing them to perform service in disadvantaged communities. He has connected with a non-profit organization dedicated to youth service. He wonders how to most effectively transfer knowledge from the military to this different context, in terms of both the impact on schools and communities and his own effectiveness if he takes a senior position at the non-profit, which has not always known how to take advantage of experienced senior leaders entering at the top.

- From women's health policy in government to non-profit advocacy for global health. Dr. "Barbara Smith," after a distinguished career in government focusing on women's health issues, is ready to move to her next step: her own institute developing a range of projects to improve health outcomes around the world. She holds both an M.D. and a master's degree in public health, and she enjoys occasional teaching at the medical schools where she has a clinical affiliation. But she already sees that mobilization of resources and development of projects outside of government is quite different and that a global scope poses additional challenges.

- From the financial sector to helping an NGO save the environment through sustainable economic development. "Samuel Jackson" recently retired from his post as vice chairman of a large American bank; "Sarah Jackson" is winding down an active career as a partner in a venture capital firm. Both hold MBAs, share a love for the outdoors and a desire to make a difference in the world. They have created a family foundation and are active in environmental causes. Mr. Jackson is on the board of an international environmental NGO; with Ms. Jackson's participation, he has undertaken to chair a committee on sustainable development. They want to find solutions to saving rain forests in South America and central Africa that will be compatible with the interests of poor villagers, finding alternative development pathways that will build local economies and alleviate poverty while preserving the rain forest. They realize that this must be a cross-national effort.

[81] AARP Research Group, "AARP Survey on Lifelong Learning," Washington, D.C.: AARP, 2000. p.25
[82] These are real people whose names and some aspects of their circumstances are disguised to protect privacy.

- From running an international law firm to discovering how to make a difference in global health. "Jean-Francois Monet" and his partners recently sold the distinguished European law firm he founded to a large American firm. Monet, whose law degree is from a U.S. university, remains head of the new conglomerate's European subsidiary, focusing on commercial transactions, but knows that stepping down soon is inevitable. He seeks next steps that would be significant, use his talents, and express his values, especially in global health issues on which his wife, an American, has been particularly active. He wants to contribute to the efforts of one of the international physician partnerships that brings health care to regions lacking it to help eradicate preventable diseases, but he knows there is much he still needs to learn.

- From marketing to women to deepening impact on the lives of children. "Carol Jones" is a self-made leader who founded a company that markets to women and grew it to a substantial size before selling it to a public corporation. Currently a consultant, she also raises money for many children's causes and makes her own contributions through her own foundation. She is intrigued by the question of how to improve the environment for children: from basic education in schools to the community supports surrounding them. But she wishes she could develop a better strategy for her contributions, get involved in agenda-setting, carve out a more activist role as a spokesperson, and increase her impact on helping disadvantaged children gain skills and ways out of poverty.

Experienced leaders such as these could provide a perfect blend of talent, experience, motivation, connections/relationships, and availability to take on difficult problems that require multi-disciplinary solutions. However, in order to best address global and societal issues, senior leaders need access to further education, so they can marry their skills and experience to complex global situations outside their traditional sector and do so effectively . A third-stage education would seek to give leaders the tools to successfully engage in collaborative multi-sector solutions domain, by offering learning opportunities and resources in other professions.

Universities and leaders could form a powerful team to undertake global issues through a third-stage education. Experienced leaders provide the caliber necessary to tackle global issues in that they have already been successful in previous initiatives. In engaging with them, universities can once again address vital social problems using participants who already want to give back to society.

Part Four: A Vision and Call to Action for Higher Education: Third-Stage Schools for Advanced Institutional Leadership (SAIL)

We have described an intersection of forces that provides a timely opportunity for universities to create a new stage of higher education – an *evolving university* concerned with its societal mission; a *global problem agenda* which requires the development of new cross-profession knowledge; and *changing demographics* which make available a population of experienced leaders who are interested in service in their next phase of productive life. This situation calls for a bold new response, a new kind of school that will define third-stage education. This innovation could be one of the greatest opportunities in this century to make higher education an indispensable force for human betterment.

This innovation can be called a School for Advanced Institutional Leadership (SAIL). The name reflects its unique intellectual agenda: to increase leadership to solve the world's most intractable problems through a new kind of advanced education. This kind of school could become the norm for that segment of the adult population seeking opportunities for public and community service, just as an undergraduate college education is increasingly the entry ticket for most skilled jobs. SAIL could define an academic and professional field (institutional leadership) and could develop new forms of engagement and pedagogy appropriate to the life-stage and previous experience of accomplished leaders. The multi-disciplinary, action-focused curriculum created by SAIL could also be used by many other programs at the university.

Some colleges and universities are already addressing either the population or the problems, but dealing with only some elements rather than a comprehensive approach. Consider these examples of existing ventures, from the least comparable to the most comparable to SAIL.

- Education as recreation: leisure learning in retirement. Elderhostel and related organizations offer older adults travel experiences with an educational component—part vacation, part education, with a group of peers. In 30 years, it has had over 200,000 customers and 10,000 programs divided into tracks, and it inspires participants to donate to the programs. One of the tracks is community service. Penn State University is one of several universities with retirement communities located on or near the campus, offering opportunities for residents to interact with students and enroll in selected courses. The Harvard Institute for Learning in Retirement, founded in 1977 and a model for about 500 similar institutes at other colleges and universities, is a membership organization offering courses led by experienced professionals in a range of fields, with limited access to the rest of the University through Extension School courses and public events. It focuses on learning for the sake of learning, requires full-time involvement, does not grant degrees, and is not geared toward specific skills which will be applied to significant activities.
- Retraining and vocational transitions. Pace University is creating a collaborative effort across three schools to help business executives make the transition to non-profit jobs, with an expected start date of March 2006. The preliminary model is a program that combines class instruction with practical experience in the form of internships or volunteer assignments, across two terms (approximately 8 months) to that participants can share workplace experiences with their peers in the program. IBM is collaborating with Schools of Education to pilot its Transition to Teaching program, which aims to help retiring IBM

employees gain the credentials to become science and math teachers, addressing a national shortage. IBM wants to stimulate others to create similar programs.

- Think tanks: integrative research centers on world problems. Columbia University's Earth Institute aims to address global problems by bringing together resources across the university, combining science and technological tools with social policy. It works closely with the UN's Millennium Project, has an external advisory board of stellar leaders, and collaborates with NGOs. The University of Oxford's James G. Martin 21st Century School is a new center (announced in June 2004) integrating intellectual programs and stimulating research across Oxford to foster new thinking that will tackle "the biggest problems facing humanity and identify the key opportunities of the 21st century." It will provide a focus for collaborative efforts among scholars and practitioners from different disciplines, including a group of James Martin Fellows.
- Public service incubators. The Tufts University College of Citizenship and Public Service is a university-wide initiative to connect the values and skills of active citizenship to the education throughout Tufts. It supports students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community partners who develop effective approaches to a social problem. It brings distinguished leaders in public service (designated Senior Fellows) to campus to teach, write, direct projects, or mentor students. The Tufts venture is perhaps the closest to the School for Advanced Institutional Leadership, and indeed, Tufts has reached out to retired leaders to ask how they should be engaged in its mission.

Each of these models finds a receptive audience, several produce new knowledge, and several engage people in their retirement years in exploration of how to make a contribution to their communities and countries. But none yet combines all the elements in a powerful way. Third-stage education, as we envision it, is not just a brief post-graduate experience or executive program but a truly new phase of education. In calling for the development of Schools of Advanced Institutional Leadership, we are seeking a new model: that can stand on its own because of a distinctive mission and intellectual focus and the ability to produce leadership to tackle societal challenges.

We offer a sketch here of what SAIL might look like in practice – and in our own plans to implement it. We are preparing to develop this model at our own institution as a five-year experiment, beginning with a one-year Harvard Advanced Leadership fellowship program, to provide proof of concept and a firm foundation for an entirely new school.

Vision for a School for Advanced Institutional Leadership (SAIL)

This new kind of school would offer a "think tank" environment, as well as an integrative educational program, for already proven leaders to develop their own approach to creating and guiding complex institutional or systemic change. Its mission would be two-fold, to:

- Open new opportunities for leadership for a growing senior population of accomplished professionals and enterprise leaders who are active, energetic, and interested in service well beyond the completion of a career in the traditional sense. Such learner-leaders bring the value of their experience, connections, reputations, resources, and convening power.

- Serve as an incubator for SAIL participants' major projects, programs, enterprises, and foundations with potential to offer significant solutions to global problems such as poverty, health, education, and the environment. SAIL's action-orientation will add great value to the world when the learning it produces is put into practice by experienced leaders.

A multi-disciplinary focus is a basic premise. SAIL could draw on intellectual capital from all parts of a university relevant to the topics of study and build new collaborations to create integrative knowledge. A variety of undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools would benefit from the connections it would make and the resources it would attract. Participants should have access not only to the discipline and learning of the program but also to the intellectual resources of the university as a whole, with the associated opportunities for involving faculty and students in their work, as part of learning teams.

SAIL could be composed of several types of programs: a full-blown degree-granting two-year course of study; a fellowship year in which experienced leaders both take courses and develop their own project plans ready for launch; and short executive-education-type courses on specialized topics, including career transitions to public or community service.

Admissions Criteria: Experience as an Asset

The experienced leaders who would enroll in this school would not be "students" in the traditional sense, nor would they be "going back to school" – with the emphasis on "back." They would be valued for their experience and accomplishments and would be gaining knowledge and connections to assist them in thinking ahead, as well applying what they already know to new situations. They would be joining a dialogue with their peers about solving intractable national and societal problems and would identify their own method for contributing to a solution.

For versions of SAIL that aim high, at the world's most intractable problems, selective criteria can be used; e.g., that participants must be leaders with a demonstrated track record of accomplishment over 25 years, reaching a significant position in their organization or profession. They will have stepped down from their full-time leadership position in their sector (although they may serve on boards or in other capacities), which means that they are not coming as official representatives of an employing organization and do not have daily administrative or professional responsibilities. Some might have identified already a target area to which they are committed to spending significant time developing a new solution, often through a new action vehicle (organization, coalition, or campaign). Others might not have a concrete plan, but they will be clear that they want to make a major contribution to a problem area.

At their discretion, leaders could apply together with spouses, domestic partners, siblings, adult sons or daughters, who would be "accompanying persons" for additional tuition. (Service is often a family enterprise when leaders transition to a new phase of life, and they want to spend more time with partners and adult children.) For those wanting to include partners, there would be flexibility in terms of including them; e.g., in some cases, spouses could attend the program together; in other cases, spouses would be built into important components.

Focus on Action and Solutions

SAIL's equivalent of a "thesis" would be an action plan for what participants plan to do next. Thus, the time participants spend at SAIL (which itself would be flexible, in light of complex lives with other responsibilities, such as board seats) would all be designed to give participants what they need to tackle their next big effort in life – whether that is a "job" in a non-profit, a strategy for a foundation, a cause they intend to advocate, or public service they hope to undertake through running for office or taking a position with a global institution.

As indicated, educational programs of SAIL would be designed around finding solutions to significant societal and global problems. This solutions-focus has a broader meaning than simply applied knowledge. The reason experienced leaders would come to this school would be to create, develop, test, and refine solutions that they want to see put into practice. These solutions would be deeply informed by the best and latest work in relevant fields but also themselves generate new research, knowledge, and frameworks that would be disseminated widely. In short, leaders would be invited to a dialogue with their peers, informed by but not confined by a university's other intellectual resources.

This would be a school for action, not for the passive receipt of knowledge (which might or might not be used later). The learning and its use would be intertwined and simultaneous. The school would create or use theory where relevant but seek to test it in the field. Theories would be enriched or modified as participants, individually or collectively, create implementable steps toward societal improvements. Solutions must be novel, innovative, and involve more than one sector (e.g., how businesses might work with the public sector on a health initiative).

A SAIL would offer education that is highly demanding, challenging, and rigorous. Unlike some programs that bring "seniors" back to universities, this school is not remedial, not retraining for a new career, and not mere time-filling. Instead, it would jump-start the "service" phase of life as well as contribute to meeting societal needs. This focus means that participants would produce a great deal of value for a university, as they interact with undergraduates, graduate students, executive program participants, and faculty.

Life-Stage-Appropriate Requirements, Relationships, Pedagogy

The approach and pedagogy must be appropriate to accomplished leaders, taking into account their experience, stature, and life-stage. It would have features such as these:

- SAIL's think tank flavor, inviting leaders to dialogue with their peers about solutions to intractable problems, means that no one would be expected to have answers yet. Faculty would serve as facilitators as well as subject matter experts, but the leaders joining their peers at SAIL would be looked to as sources of solutions. This would establish a spirit of inquiry in which even the most accomplished leaders could feel comfortable about learning.
- Participants would serve as a resource for each other and for the rest of the university. They would draw on the resources of the university as a whole, to the extent that they could encourage others to join their projects; and they would serve as mentors and guides for undergraduate and graduate students interested in their area of expertise.
- Since the whole group is a resource, there would be a deliberate effort to include a mix of disciplines and professional areas among the participants and to bring additional national and global leaders to SAIL to become a part of the dialogue.

- In the center would be "projects," with traditional courses playing a secondary role. The final requirement or "thesis" would be the detailed plan for influence and impact on the desired target area, with many activities already underway.
- For those wanting to include spouses or family members, there would be flexibility in terms of including them; e.g., in some cases, spouses could attend the program together; in other cases, spouses would be built into important components.

Residency for portions of the program would be essential but flexible. An initial period of residency – perhaps six to eight weeks for three days a week – would be required for immersion in a core curriculum, peer dialogue, and to take regular university courses. The remainder of the year would involve residency in blocks, either portions of the week (to permit enrollment in regularly scheduled courses) or intensive short time periods (for special seminars and consultation with faculty). A residency requirement should not be a problem, especially if housing is available that meets the standards of this group (e.g., two-bedroom apartments). Many affluent leaders with grown children have multiple residences and are mobile among them, and the possibility of involving spouses makes this program particularly attractive. Activities could be clustered in one-half of the week, to make residency even more feasible, providing time for travel to maintain other involvements.

To support the projects undertaken by the participants, as well as to build on their connections, SAIL would also convene major conferences on global problems, open to the rest of the university, but in which SAIL participants would play significant roles.

Core and Customized Curriculum

Our vision for SAIL is that there would be three types of educational activities: a short core curriculum, followed by a customized set of tracks for groups of participants and individualized activities as each leader moves forward on his/her own projects.

The ***core*** of common elements would deal with the systemic issues common to global problems. A core faculty would create an overarching core course, using the tools of many disciplines and covering a spectrum of knowledge areas, from content to process. The core would center on the analytic and action competencies identified in Part Two as those demanded by efforts to address global poverty, pandemics, education deficiencies, or environmental degradation. To recap, these competencies include:

- Examining problems and potential solutions from the perspective of recent best knowledge in a number of fields—developments in the life sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, engineering, economics, etc.
- Diagnosing root causes, intersecting layers of issues, and system dynamics:
- Understanding the legal framework, the legislative process, the enforcement process, electoral dynamics, public resources and their allocation, interest groups and their influence
- Picking targets for action, whether public policy, a demonstration program, grass-roots organizing or consciousness-raising, and determining whether to work through an existing organization or create a new one, with awareness of the challenges and tradeoffs of each choice

- Understanding the differences among not-for-profit, for-profit, and public sector organizations, and how to work effectively to derive the best from each of them
- Determining whether, how, when to convene others, and to influence them so that their actions reinforce rather than cancel each other; stakeholders, interest groups, opinion leaders, resource-holders; when and how to collaborate with competitors
- Developing standards, governance, accountability, and performance metrics for complex multi-layered partnerships and progress on complex issues
- Enhancing individual/personal skills in pattern recognition and system diagnosis, in influence without sole authority, and in communicating across cultures
- Understanding drivers of public opinion, including values, history, culture, and languages, and the importance of local embeddedness and community capability-building

Customized tracks could cover content areas in depth, constituting "***majors***." The majors could include such topics as: **prosperity**: poverty and its root causes, routes to prosperity and economic development; **health**: epidemics, pandemics, prevention and eradication of diseases; **education**: improving educational outcomes and the connection between education and other institutions; **the environment**: global climate change, problems of the physical environment and sustainable development. Faculty from relevant schools and disciplines could be invited to create collaborative seminars in each of these fields as well as identify advanced courses in their own schools. Participants would be encouraged to tap the latest knowledge in associated fields by auditing courses. They would also be encouraged to lead a study group or with peers and students (undergraduate or graduate/professional) to further integrate knowledge on their topic.

Individualized elements would depend on the person and the project and would be designed largely by the end of the initial semester in residence. Faculty members would serve as resources to the project. Undergraduate and graduate students could become members of the project team. Project activities might include field visits to various parts of the world or meetings with heads of government and world leaders—thereby providing significant opportunities for students and faculty who would become involved in projects of the school, while supporting the work of participants as they develop their action plan.

The pedagogy should be fully life-stage-appropriate. Experienced leaders entering third-stage education must be actively engaged, have their curiosity provoked, be valued for their experience, and find opportunities to teach and lead as well as learn.

Standards and Credentials

In its fullest flowering, and when the concept of third stage education is firmly established, a School for Advanced Institutional Leadership can be envisioned as a rigorous course of study and activity over a one-to-two-year period resulting in a degree – perhaps a Doctor of Institutional Leadership that is akin to the J.D. granted by the Law School and similar to honorary doctorates in distinction. This would indicate standards, confer an honor, and recognize achievements. It would reinforce seriousness of purpose and program completion.

A "degree" is not necessarily important to the kinds of leaders the school could attract, but it is an important element of establishing this as a bona fide new form of higher education.

For some participants, a certificate, if not a formal degree, would establish their credentials as they undertake an activity outside of the sector in which they have spent the bulk of their career.

A Bold Innovation at the Right Moment in History

Third-stage education meets the needs of an evolving university, an aging population, and a global society with serious problems to solve. That's why we are committed to creating a model at Harvard University, beginning with a one-year pilot Advanced Leadership Institute and a set of Distinguished Leadership Fellows in the Fall of 2007.

A model such as the School for Advanced Institutional Leadership could be an idea whose time has come. But it will reach its potential only if university leaders are willing to think boldly and imaginatively about an entirely new phase of education. It will prove its value only if allowed to flower as a distinctive academic entity drawing from and integrating other university intellectual resources in collaborative fashion, but taking its own shape unconstrained by structures from the past.

Developing such schools at universities throughout America and the world would give higher education a transformational concept and a catalytic innovation for the twenty-first century. This innovation would usher in an era of integrative knowledge to solve twenty-first century problems while facilitating the social invention of a new life stage. Participants, universities, and societies will benefit. And when accomplished leaders are engaged in service, they will inspire other citizens and students to join with them in dedicating their talents to making a meaningful difference in the world.