

MAY 15 -17, 2007
HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS



2007 EDUCATION GRANTMAKERS INSTITUTE

The School Leadership Challenge

ROLES *and* STRATEGIES *for* PHILANTHROPY *to* MAKE A DIFFERENCE

A key part of Grantmakers for Education's program portfolio to improve education philanthropy, the biannual Education Grantmakers Institute provides an especially unique and effective venue for strengthening the skills and knowledge of grantmakers. Held at a leading academic institution, the Institute includes noted scholars and researchers directing sessions, attendees using case studies to reflect on their work as funders, and seminars that allow for extensive conversation and debate among participants.

The 2007 Grantmakers Institute took up the question of how philanthropy can best promote effective educational leadership. The program was designed to examine the unique leverage points through which grantmakers can expand and strengthen the pool of educational leaders, as well as the ways that philanthropists can affect the contexts in which leaders work to enhance their effectiveness. Key learning objectives included the following:

- What are the characteristics of effective educational leadership—as well as the supportive policies and systems that nurture it?
- How can funders strengthen the leadership-development pipeline?
- Which kinds of environmental conditions support effective leadership?
- How can grantmakers help to cultivate systems where leaders can succeed?

Faculty members of Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, Business School and the John F. Kennedy School of Government led the 2007 Institute.

Grantmakers for Education thanks the Ewing Marion Kauffman, Prudential and Wallace foundations for their support in underwriting costs for the 2007 Institute and this report summarizing key observations from the meeting. We acknowledge that the conclusions presented here do not necessarily reflect the opinions of these organizations.

Ewing Marion
KAUFFMAN
Foundation



We are also grateful to researcher and writer Anne Mackinnon for authoring this report; to proofreader Meg Storey for reviewing the report; and to Richard Laine, Jessica Schwartz and Susan Wolking, all of whom reviewed and helped us improve drafts of this report. The report's design is by Studio 209.

2007 EDUCATION GRANTMAKERS INSTITUTE

The School Leadership Challenge

ROLES *and* STRATEGIES *for* PHILANTHROPY *to* MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Contents

Introduction	2
<i>Effective Leadership Development: A Conversation with Grantmakers for Effective Organizations</i> Kathleen Enright	5
PART 1.	
The Challenge of Leading Change	6
PART 2.	
Philanthropy and Education Leadership	14
PART 3.	
Reflections on Education Leadership	22
<i>Investing in School Leadership: A Conversation with The Wallace Foundation's Richard Laine</i>	25
PART 4.	
Leadership Priorities for Funders	26
Resources and Further Reading	29
Institute Faculty and Attendees	30

Introduction

Research tells us that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to student learning, especially in high-needs schools. In recent years, dissatisfaction with traditional methods of training school leaders has grown, and efforts have sprung up around the country to better select and train principals who are capable of leading instructional improvement, to support them on the job through mentoring and other forms of professional development and to retain them in their posts.



Grantmakers have been some of the key advocates, researchers and program designers of efforts to improve education leadership. But these initiatives have yielded mixed results.

In May 2007, grantmakers from around the country came to Cambridge, Mass., for an investigation of education leadership and the role of philanthropy that was sponsored by Grantmakers for Education. In a series of discussions with education leaders and a select group of faculty members from Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, Business School and John F. Kennedy School of Government, the Institute participants discussed organizational change, leadership development and school-system management. To inform the discussions, group members analyzed case studies, examined research and shared insights from their own work.

Participants represented a variety of grant-making organizations and brought a wide range of experience with leadership development to the sessions. Many reported that their organizations were not currently funding leadership development but were seriously considering doing so in the near future. Some reported early or limited experience with supporting leadership development and hoped to sharpen their understanding and learn what others were doing to accelerate their work. A

few had significant experience in the area and were grappling with questions of scale, timing and the stubbornness of status quo approaches. "Why can't we get results from all this work faster?" asked a funder whose foundation has emphasized leadership development for close to a decade. "What more do we need to do, and what other agendas do we need to connect to in order to get results that come faster and are broader and more long-lasting?"

What more do we need to do, and what other agendas do we need to connect to in order to get results that come faster and are broader and more long-lasting?

Asked in advance what they most wanted to gain from the Institute, participants posed an array of compelling questions about leaders, leadership and the role of philanthropy. Here are a few examples:

- "What kind of preparation is needed to develop leaders who are well equipped to promote student learning, especially in high-poverty schools?"
- "How can we build a pipeline for both teachers and administrators who are committed to a new paradigm for education?"
- "What are the most effective models for training and supporting effective school leaders? Are there any effective models for building district leadership?"
- "You often have great people all working in a school building, but the efforts aren't coordinated. How do you create the conditions for teams to work together?"
- "How do strong leaders devote time and energy to strategic work while maintaining attention to operational requirements?"
- "How do we build stronger links between schools of education and districts and schools?"

- “How can grantmakers be most effective in systems where hiring practices, expectations and accountability are deeply entrenched?”
- “How have states and communities improved school leadership, and how have they worked successfully with private funders?”

Or, as one funder summarized the challenge: “How can school systems generate the energy and resources needed to make masterful instructional practice a systemwide reality? How can grantmakers be most effective in addressing this immense need?”

The goal of this report is to share answers—even if sometimes tentative—to these and other questions that emerged from a very lively series of sessions.

In particular, the report focuses on two aspects of the discussion:

- **the challenges of leading organizational change, along with a handful of compelling concepts from the management literature that are especially relevant to changing schools and school systems; and**
- **the role of philanthropy in improving education leadership, drawing on published cases and additional examples from the work of grantmakers who attended the Institute.**

Effective leadership development: Lessons for education grantmakers from the nonprofit sector

A CONVERSATION WITH KATHLEEN ENRIGHT,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GRANTMAKERS
FOR EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONS

Across the nonprofit sector—and not just in schools and districts—leadership is recognized as crucial to organizational performance. To help funders more effectively support the leadership capacity of their grantees, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations commissioned a series of reports to help the field better understand what good leadership looks like and how it can be developed and supported.

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations is a coalition of grantmakers committed to building strong and effective nonprofit organizations; understanding that grantmakers are successful only to the extent that their grantees achieve meaningful results, GEO promotes strategies and practices that contribute to grantee success. As GEO Executive Director Kathleen Enright explains, “We see leadership development as the highest order of organizational development activity. Without good leadership, you may misdiagnose what’s actually going on, and you’re unlikely to get the results you expect as a grantmaker.”

Enright identified lessons from GEO’s work on nonprofit leadership development for education grantmakers. “Certain types of leadership-development programs are most valuable for supporting the performance of organizations,” she explained. “The most effective programs have three characteristics: they’re collective, contextual and

continuous.” Enright discussed how those characteristics might apply in the field of education:

- A **collective** approach might support the growth of a principal or superintendent, she said, but it would probably also involve “the school board or the leader’s direct reports. We’ve learned that the people required to make change happen need to have their own ‘Aha!’ moments.” Enright also noted, “It’s easier for a leader to get things done when those they work with are equally committed to the change.”
- To be **contextual**, a leadership-development program should include “action learning” or “learning by doing” that’s relevant to the context where the leader actually works. Coaching for new principals is a good example, Enright suggested, “because the coach is right there in the school, helping the leader solve real problems.”
- A **continuous** approach features “an ongoing commitment to a leader’s growth. Executive coaching, mentorships and job shadowing are continuous programs,” Enright explained. “Short-term courses or workshops are not overly helpful.”

GEO’s *Investing in Leadership* series includes two volumes summarizing the organization’s findings on grantmaking efforts to support leadership development. “In the first volume, we look at how leadership theory has evolved,” said Enright. “In the second volume, we relay the experiences and learning of foundations with deep experience supporting leadership development—not newcomers to the field, but foundations that have supported it for a long time, tried different approaches and learned what is working from their grantees.” The reports are available at www.geofunders.org.

PART 1

The challenge *of* leading change

Schools and school systems are organizations,
and leading school improvement therefore means
leading a process of organizational change.



During the Institute, presenters and participants discussed three concepts regarding organizational change with particular relevance to education and school reform:

- **Leadership vs. Management:**

Leadership and management are interrelated yet demand quite different sets of skills, behaviors and personal characteristics. Both are necessary, but leadership is the rarer quality and the more essential to organizational change.

- **Leading a “Learning Organization”:**

An effective leader focuses on results and organizational improvement—and so places an emphasis on learning across the organization. Fundamental change happens when an organization internalizes the value of data analysis, self-reflection and improvement and becomes a “learning organization.”

- **Adaptive Leadership:** An effective leader recognizes the difference between a problem that requires a straightforward “technical” solution and one that requires an “adaptive” solution—a situation where the challenge is complex and the answers are not clearly known and therefore. Strong leaders are skilled at handling adaptive challenges and mobilizing their organizations to do the same.

LEADERSHIP VS. MANAGEMENT

In a session led by Christine Letts of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, participants dug into a case study about the Harlem Children’s Zone, formerly known as the Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families. The case tells the story of Harlem Children’s Zone’s adoption of a quantitative performance measurement system—part of a larger drive by CEO Geoffrey Canada to unify the organization’s program model behind one overarching objective: improving the life chances of children growing up in the Central Harlem neighborhood of New York City.

As the case study explains, Canada “dreamed of building the agency based on its potential impact rather than creating new programs and adapting existing ones to accommodate externally perceived needs and available funding.” He believed that establishing a single performance assessment system dedicated to measuring outcomes aligned with the core mission of Harlem Children’s Zone would unify the organization and strengthen the alignment between its activities and its objectives.

The opportunity to reshape the organization grew out of Canada’s relationship with a long-time funder, the New York-based Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Under the leadership of a new president, the foundation was actively rethinking its grantmaking approach: rather than make many grants in several program areas, the foundation intended to develop strong relationships with a smaller number of effective youth-serving organizations, support business planning to enable those organizations to grow and provide each with a large core support grant over a longer period. The foundation invited Canada’s organization to participate.

During the business-planning process, Canada and his top managers probed their assumptions about how the organization’s programming would improve the circumstances of children living in the target neighborhood: a 24-block area of Central Harlem with a poverty

rate of roughly 50 percent. The theory of change they created helped them to determine where to focus and intensify their work, which programs to drop and what measures to use to track their progress.

Canada dreamed of building the agency based on its potential impact rather than creating new programs to accommodate externally perceived needs.

By 2000 the business plan was complete, and the Clark Foundation awarded Harlem Children’s Zone \$5.75 million over three years, with an additional \$7 million provided by the Robin Hood and Picower foundations, to implement the plan. The case study details Canada’s efforts to transform the organization while also managing the “occasional disconnect between the measurement demands of his organization and the program passions of his directors” and the pressing requests for quantitative data from funders.

In discussing the case, Institute participants attempted to differentiate leadership from management functions in Canada’s handling of the situation—while also noting the line was often difficult to discern. The implementation of the new performance measurement system, for example, looked at first glance like a management issue, but Canada’s leadership came into play when the agency’s directors and staff balked at collecting the necessary performance data. “Was gathering data at the heart of the Harlem Children’s Zone mission?” one participant asked. “If it’s central, and not a distraction, then staff need to hear that clearly.”

Referring to the resistance Canada initially encountered, another participant asked, “Did the staff not understand the value of data, or did they not see it, or did they disagree? Getting to the bottom of that is a leadership challenge.” Another person drew a connection

to school principals and the role of data in school improvement: “The program directors are like principals.” Once they understand that information can help them align the activities of their programs with the organization’s underlying mission, “the data can help them know what they need to be doing.”

The group also considered the role of funders in the transformation of Harlem Children’s Zone. Prior to receiving the offer from the Clark Foundation, Canada had felt “frustrated by the whims of foundations that dictated program design through their various initiatives,” according to the case. The business-planning process was supposed to help the organization clarify its core mission, which in turn would make it less susceptible to distracting offers from funders. Ironically, to Canada’s top managers the organization’s new focus on performance measurement often felt like a distraction from “the real work.”

Moreover, at least at the beginning of the change process, foundations’ interest in Harlem Children’s Zone’s work continued to be perceived as part of the problem. Recalling the

Leadership vs. management: A few examples

LEADERSHIP	MANAGEMENT
Establishes the vision and direction	Sets the agenda
Seeks alignment in the work	Develops job descriptions; supervises the work
Inspires motivation and effort	Emphasizes the need for predictable output
Proves the value of change	Reinforces the value of measurable results

early days of the performance measurement system, one of the nonprofit's executives is quoted in the case study as saying, "We were in a difficult place because our funders were making frequent demands for data: 'How many seven-year-olds in all of your programs? How many four-year-olds in Harlem Gems came from two-parent families?' We became a lab for all of our funders' research. And we could not say 'no.'"

Over time, Canada led his organization through a process of change that helped staff see themselves as contributors to a "conveyor belt" of services that lifts all children residing in Central Harlem from infancy through childhood and adolescence to adulthood.

Institute participants were especially intrigued by the organization's eventual decision to use standardized reading test scores as the ultimate measure of their work. Some argued that reading scores were not a good indicator for assessing the work of Harlem Children's Zone: "There's simply not enough evidence that really good youth development will affect reading," said one. Others argued that reading scores were a reasonable proxy for the "real objectives" of the organization's work: "Why not reading?" asked one. "Can we name a better measure?" The use of reading scores may also have forced Canada, productively, to strengthen his agency's connection with the school system.

Letts concluded the session by posing a compelling question: "What about the consultants who came in to help develop the business plan? Given the problems Harlem Children's Zone encountered, did they miss something?" Perhaps so, the group concluded. Harlem Children's Zone had a strong leader, a vision and an idea of what its first steps might be toward organizational transformation. What was missing, at least at the start, was an ingredient Letts said is often essential to organizational change: dissatisfaction. The program

Harlem Children's Zone: The process of change

FROM	TO
Autonomy of program output	Integrated performance measurement
Wraparound services for each child	Services oriented toward desired impact
Services delivered one by one to individuals	"Conveyor belt" of services, at scale
Disparate programs	System of programs

Participants attempted to differentiate leadership from management functions—while also noting the line was often difficult to discern.

directors did not enter the process dissatisfied with the results of their work, and the business-planning activities did not convince them that they should be.

Only when they embraced Canada's vision did they see the gap between what the organization was and what it could become for the Harlem community. It took Canada's leadership to inspire the other leaders in his organization to see the need for change; only then did the directors embrace the consultants' recommendations and challenge themselves to become more effective managers.

LEADING A “LEARNING ORGANIZATION”

A case study discussion led by Susan Moore Johnson of the Graduate School of Education focused on the recent history of Boston’s Samuel Mason Elementary School and the steps taken by its principal, Janet Palmer Owens, to instill a culture of organizational learning. Located in Roxbury, a largely African-American neighborhood of Boston, the school (known as “the Mason”) was low-performing for many years before experiencing a turnaround in the 1990s under the leadership of Owens’s predecessor. Owens became principal in 1998.

The case study explains that Owens, as a new principal, realized that continuing and expanding on the school’s history of success would demand hard work and inspired leadership. A key to the school’s success, she believed, was teachers’ ability to meet during the school day for common planning time. Unfortunately, the school’s regular budget did not pay for that component; instead, the previous principal had raised private funds for art and other enrichment classes and made strategic use of interns to relieve teachers for common planning time. Owens would need to do the same, and several of the grants were up for renewal.

Looking back over nearly 10 years as principal, Owens credits the rise of culture of teacher leadership as a prime reason for the school’s continuing success.

Owens invested her time in seeking outside funding, but she also took advantage of new initiatives being implemented by Boston Public Schools superintendent Thomas Payzant. Under Payzant’s leadership, the district ramped up and refined a new student-data system, accountability measures that responded to state and federal demands, and new curriculum and professional development initiatives, and expanded opportunities for school-level autonomy.

At each step, Owens brought teachers into the process, encouraging them in particular to learn about data analysis and draw connections between their own instruction and student learning. This inquiry was strengthened substantially by an initiative of the Boston Plan for Excellence (the local public education fund), through which Boston educators can enroll in an intensive course in data analysis at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Owens and a key teacher-leader at the Mason took the class together and strategized carefully about how to distribute their new expertise across the faculty.

Looking back over nearly 10 years as principal, Owens credits the rise of a culture of teacher leadership as a prime reason for the school’s continuing success.

“Every single teacher has a leadership role,” she told the writers of the case study. “When I first came, we would talk about teacher leadership, but the only teacher-leaders in that building in 1998 were the two literacy coordinators and myself.... Now every single teacher is a teacher-leader.” Teachers, said Owens and members of her staff, manage the agenda of the school’s Instructional Leadership Team, coach other teachers on the implementation of new instructional programs and meet individually with colleagues who need “support or questions answered.” Teachers have assumed those extra responsibilities while continuing to work under the provisions of the Boston Teachers Union collective bargaining agreement—a decision they made, with Owens’s endorsement, in 2003, when they voted to become a “pilot” school under Boston’s within-district charter program.

As the Institute participants discussed the case, they noted that the Mason had been forced to contend with frequently changing demands: new state tests and testing requirements, data systems that seemed promising but turned out to deliver information too late to be of use to teachers, and others. Johnson pointed out that,

under those circumstances, Owens's greatest contribution may have been shielding her staff from a "compliance orientation"—a common response to external accountability demands. "Rather than organizing the school to execute," Johnson explained, Owens appears to have "organized the school to learn."

In their discussion of learning organizations, Institute participants found many additional lessons in the case, including advice for grant-makers. "Teachers need to be in a collaborative environment to study the data," observed one, "and that demands a lot of flexibility." Several participants focused on the role of the Boston Plan for Excellence, which not only sponsored the Harvard data course but also provided many of the interns who covered teachers' classes so they could attend common planning sessions. "How many public education funds are as good as this?" asked one participant. "School systems need more organizations like this, and philanthropy ought to be supporting them."

"This is not a rollout model," Johnson concluded, explaining that the story of the Mason is too dependent on the skill of an unusually effective school leader to allow for easy replication. But participants found other potential uses for the model. Teams from other schools could learn a lot from visiting the Mason, they suggested, and seeing teacher leadership in action. One participant wondered if it might be possible to "identify some specific instructional practices" that could be shared with schools that didn't have the same "critical mass" of innovative educators.

The school's effective use of data analysis to improve instruction struck one participant as a hopeful sign for "the next generation of educational leaders" and an example from which aspiring principals might learn.

ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP

A session led by Ronald Heifetz of the John F. Kennedy School of Government explored a third key idea from the management literature with relevance for education and school reform: adaptive leadership and its role in organizational change. Adaptation, Heifetz explained, is a concept borrowed from biology that describes a process that happens because of "pressure to adapt or perish." Applied to leadership theory, Heifetz argued, adaptation is the ability to thrive in complex, competitive and challenging environments and accomplish deep change.

Education leaders need to create environments in which people can experiment and learn—not an easy thing, since trying new things places an organization in a state of disequilibrium.

Often, he noted, leaders respond to such pressure by looking for "technical" solutions, when in fact a more flexible or "adaptive" approach is what's really needed. Complex social problems, like improving the public schools, are fundamentally different from technical problems. Heifetz explained that technical problems are well defined, while adaptive problems are entirely different: they are not so well defined, the answers are not known in advance, and many different stakeholders are involved, each with their own perspectives.

Adaptive problems—which require adaptive leadership—call for innovation and learning among the interested parties and, even when a solution is discovered, the stakeholders themselves must create and put the solution into effect since the problem is rooted in their attitudes, priorities or behavior. Until the stakeholders change their outlook, a solution cannot emerge.

Change is difficult, Heifetz explained, because it usually involves loss. The effective leader goes “face-forward” into change in order to help people “understand and meet the challenge of loss.”

Heifetz’s work with the Center for Public Leadership at the School of Government has brought him into close contact with school district leaders and the dilemmas they face. One of the most important dilemmas, he said, was figuring out “how to mobilize people to tackle new, hard problems.” Education leaders need to create environments in which people can experiment and learn—not an easy thing, since trying new things places an organization in a state of disequilibrium. “There’s almost always a gap between aspiration and reality,” he explained, “and the gap is a hard place to be.”

Grantmakers encounter similar problems when they attempt to promote experimentation and end up generating disequilibrium that’s felt by their own board of directors. “It’s hard to get your board to understand the value of being in a place where you’re always falling short and always looking for the next challenge,” Heifetz noted. Participants agreed—especially, said one, when “your only opportunity to explain [a complex school reform agenda] is two three-hour meetings a year.”

The group was intrigued with Heifetz’s notion of adaptive leadership and its value in enabling transformative change. It’s tempting, the group agreed, to search for technical solutions to the problems that beset schools.

Dorothy Jacobson, vice president of the Rodell Foundation of Delaware, illustrated the point by describing her foundation’s experience with the “disequilibrium” of trying to advance fundamental change. The foundation convened a leadership coalition from across Delaware and engaged Heifetz’s consulting firm, Cambridge Associates, to help it design an ambitious, statewide school-reform initiative: “We’ve been living in productive distress for a year,” she

said, “and it has been very hard. The decisions we need to make do involve loss. We’re going to need to lose some things that people value. But we think it’s going to be worth it.”

Whether the unit of change is a state, a school district, a school or a classroom, the group agreed, a leadership style that focuses narrowly on accountability can close people’s hearts and minds to experimentation. Disequilibrium is a difficult but necessary part of genuine, adaptive educational change.

A note on case study learning

Case studies typically depict actual organizations and situations; often, they name real people and describe their handling of real problems. A case study discussion is a privileged opportunity to probe a situation, hear the candid reactions of others, and develop analytic, decision-making and planning skills. Yet every case study is of necessity a partial picture. As cases published by Harvard Business School note, “Cases are not intended to serve as endorsements, sources of primary data, or illustrations of effective or ineffective management.”

In a successful case study discussion, participants often disagree sharply—with one another and with decisions made by case study subjects. This report describes moments when Institute participants learned together by debating the cases before them. Neither the discussions nor this report are intended as critiques of the case study subjects. Rather, Grantmakers for Education and the Institute participants are grateful to them for allowing their stories to be used as tools for professional learning.

Citations for and information about ordering the case studies used during the 2007 Institute are found in the “Resources” section on page 29.

Adaptive leadership & education philanthropy

In a 2004 article in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Ronald Heifetz and coauthors John Kania and Mark Kramer challenge philanthropy to “create social change” more boldly and intentionally—by exercising adaptive leadership. The article includes a schematic comparison of the technical problems and adaptive challenges that grantmakers typically encounter in their change efforts.

The article also includes an analysis of the 2002 decision by three Pittsburgh foundations—the Heinz Endowments, the Grable Foundation, and the Pittsburgh Foundation—to suspend funding to local public schools; Heifetz, Kania and Kramer cite it as an excellent example of adaptive leadership by philanthropy—and one that is especially relevant for education grantmakers.

CHALLENGES CONFRONTED BY LEADERSHIP

Technical Problems

- Problem is well-defined
- Answer is known
- Implementation is clear
- Solution can be imposed by a single organization

Examples

- Funding scholarships
- Building hospitals
- Installing inventory controls for a food bank
- Developing a malaria vaccine within a malaria-infected region

Adaptive Challenges

- Challenge is complex
- Answers are not known
- Implementation requires learning
- No single entity has authority to impose a single organization solution on the other stakeholders

Examples

- Reforming public education
- Providing affordable health care
- Increasing organizational effectiveness
- Achieving 80 percent vaccination rates within a malaria-infected region

From Ronald Heifetz, John Kania and Mark Kramer, “Leading Boldly: Foundations Can Move Past Traditional Approaches to Create Social Change through Imaginative—and Even Controversial—Leadership,” *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2004.

PART 2

Philanthropy *and* educational leadership

Education leadership is a question of people—people who need to be attracted to the field, trained effectively, supported professionally, retained in large numbers and held to high standards. How can philanthropy support the development of effective education leaders? What can funders do to help create the conditions under which strong leadership can get the job done?



Over the course of the program, the discussions yielded no single best approach to supporting leadership development, in part because there are so many possible points of entry. Grantmakers have been involved in programs to train or certify aspiring school leaders, offer rigorous learning opportunities for existing leaders, reshape professional compensation and incentives and encourage new roles in “distributed” leadership configurations. Each has its place, depending on local (or state or national) conditions or needs.

What did emerge was a healthy respect for the challenges involved in supporting leadership development. Through case study analysis, presentations and anecdotes, a picture developed of a field where grantmakers need a sophisticated understanding of the core work of schools, an appreciation for adult learning processes, a working knowledge of the dynamics of systems change, and a taste for the hardball politics of school districts, professional unions and higher education.

Reflecting on several specific philanthropic efforts, the group’s discussions coalesced into three lessons about what grantmakers can do to be effective in supporting education leaders and leadership development:

1. Be mindful of deeply embedded

institutional agendas. Even when people say they want change, incentives within their institutions will assert themselves and, in many cases, cause inertia that’s very difficult to overcome.

2. Focus on leaders, but remember the

system in which they work. A grantmaker who wants to help people be more effective leaders may need to work on changing the larger environment as well.

3. Give good leaders extra flexibility.

BE MINDFUL OF DEEPLY EMBEDDED INSTITUTIONAL AGENDAS.

Richard Elmore of the Graduate School of Education led an intense discussion that examined the Principal Development Partnership, a project supported by the Girard Foundation of La Jolla, Calif. The conversation drew on a working-draft case study of the project prepared specifically for the Education Grantmakers Institute. Susan Wolking, executive director of the Girard Foundation and a key protagonist in the case study, participated in the discussion.

Grantmakers need a taste for the hardball politics of school districts, professional unions and higher education.

The Principal Development Partnership was a five-year initiative that began in 2000, during Wolking’s first year with the foundation. Charged with pursuing the foundation’s mission to “improve K-12 education in San Diego County” but with relatively little direct experience in school reform, Wolking diligently sought out the advice of educators throughout the county. What they told her, as the case study recounts, was that “the key to improving K-12 education was having highly effective principals in every school.”

Wolking took that finding to a wider group of county and state officials, university administrators at four local schools of education, business leaders, and area principals, superintendents and professional developers. They confirmed that there was a significant need to “improve the preparation of aspiring school leaders.” In summary, as Wolking later recalled, the group concluded that “administrative credentialing programs were very theoretical, were focused on administration as opposed to leadership for learning and weren’t very practical. Even the deans of the schools of education said that our programs ‘aren’t doing a good job of preparing school principals for the job.’”

In meetings convened by the foundation, the stakeholders agreed to create an independent, nonprofit organization—the Principal Development Partnership—whose purpose would be to “create dramatic and systemic changes in the way principals are recruited, prepared and supported in San Diego County.” The Girard Foundation contributed an initial \$250,000 and found another funder to match its investment.

Over the next five years, the partnership carried out two strands of work. The first was an effort to revamp the curricula of the administrative credentialing programs in the region. The second was the creation of a two-week field experience, during which credential candidates shadowed “model mentor principals.”

When the elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers.

Although the deans of the local education schools had originally been enthusiastic about having their institutions work collaboratively to create a new approach to principal preparation, the Principal Development Partnership had difficulty engaging the colleges’ faculties. Significant changes to curricula didn’t take place until the latter part of the initiative, and then only after the state announced changes

in its standards for accrediting administrative credential programs.

The partnership’s field experience, on the other hand, was initially very successful, with over 70 aspiring principals participating in the process during its first three years. “Everyone—the candidates, the mentor principals, the districts, even the universities—loved the program,” said Wolking. Having assumed that the field experience would be institutionalized as part of the credentialing process, she was disappointed to find that the program had essentially disappeared a year after the foundation’s grant ended. She was even more surprised to read in a follow-up study of the program that only 17 percent of the original participants had moved into positions as school principals.

What had happened? The Principal Development Partnership’s goals and strategies had been developed jointly with all the major stakeholders, including the universities. Why had it fallen short of Wolking’s and her initial collaborators’ expectations?

Elmore launched the discussion by quoting an African proverb: “When the elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers.” The elephants, in this case, were the schools of education, institutions with “deeply embedded incentive structures,” according to Elmore. The failure of local universities to turn out a sufficient supply of qualified principals is a classic “institutionalized problem,” he explained. “How,” Elmore asked the group, “should a grantmaker ‘play’ in such a heavily institutionalized arena?”

Citing evidence from the case study suggesting the universities’ avowed eagerness to collaborate but unwillingness to change their own programming, he argued that the problem facing a grantmaker in an institutionalized environment is “not to find an opening but to create an opening in the existing institutional structure. Most systems don’t think they’re dysfunctional.”

According to Elmore, Wolking had plenty of evidence that education leadership was a good place to focus: local advice and a large research base suggested that leadership development was an arena where the Girard Foundation could have a big impact. Moreover, it seemed manageable—more manageable, he noted, than “a focus on, say, teacher quality.” And yet the universities’ early energy for change “flattened out” and made the strategy unmanageable because of their strong preference for routinized solutions: “Institutions want you to put in the quarter and pull the lever,” he argued. “They don’t want you to change how the machine works.”

In the ensuing discussion, participants elaborated on Elmore’s argument and noted additional incentives that made real change difficult to effect.

Within universities, one participant argued, “schools of education are cash cows. They specialize in revenue streams that subsidize parts of the university that don’t raise money. The job of university leaders is to make it come out even.” Maybe it didn’t make sense to put resources into collaboration and try to get everyone to agree, suggested another, since there was “no way the university representatives were going to be able to translate back to their organizations consistently.”

One grantmaker asked if the foundation’s investment could have “bought more impact at the policy level,” since a change in state requirements would have had an unambiguous impact on the incentive structure. Regarding the apparent failure of the field experience to yield new principals, one participant asked about the incentives that draw—or fail to draw—qualified candidates into school leadership: “How do you attract and train people to lead in a system where there’s little clarity about what it means to succeed?” Many teachers who enroll in leadership-development programs do so to increase their salaries, said

another, not necessarily because they intend to become school leaders: “They want convenient credits, and they don’t necessarily care about quality.”

How do you attract and train people to lead in a system where there’s little clarity about what it means to succeed?

Wolking added an interesting reflection on her own early thinking about incentives. “At the beginning,” she said, “my business training led me to go for a technical solution. People, including people at universities, told me that there was a problem, and so I assumed they would want to develop a better product. I thought they had an incentive to do so.” She also noted that once the project was underway no one had an incentive to call problems or disappointments to her attention.

In conclusion, Elmore offered three key observations:

- **The power of institutional incentives:** When attempting to drive change in an environment with powerful institutional incentives, Elmore argued that “the best predictor of what’s going to happen at point two is the incentive structure at point one.” As a process of change unfolds, “the system will try to bring itself back to point one.”
- **Influencing the agenda:** The message, he said, is not “You can’t change incentives, so give up.” It’s possible to change incentives, but doing so requires becoming deeply immersed in institutional politics, understanding the flow of resources and building constituencies. “Players with limited resources usually exercise influence by changing the policy agenda,” he explained, “not by changing the institutions themselves.”

- **Confronting the credentialing cartel:**

The supply of school leaders is controlled by a “cartel,” he said, “made up of the state certification apparatus, institutions of higher learning and school systems. If you want to break in, you need to break the cartel.” That’s beginning to happen, he noted, through a few new alternative credentialing pathways that have opened up through school districts and private organizations.

FOCUS ON LEADERS, BUT REMEMBER THE SYSTEM IN WHICH THEY WORK.

As part of a roundtable discussion moderated by GFE Deputy Director Chris Tebben, Richard Laine, director of education for The Wallace Foundation, described his foundation’s commitment to leadership development as a centerpiece of its education grantmaking. “We made a big bet in leadership seven years ago,” he explained, as a result of an overall assessment of the foundation’s effectiveness. “We were investing in a lot of things, and we realized that we were being too diffuse. We asked ourselves, ‘What are the high potential areas for making dramatic, lasting impact?’ We chose leadership.”

Players with limited resources usually exercise influence by changing the policy agenda, not by changing institutions themselves.

Yet the foundation’s focus on leadership has been anything but narrow. “We realized,” Laine continued, that “if you change people and put them back into a bad system, you can bet on the system to prevail every time.” As an example, he cited a foundation-supported effort to help school leaders learn to use student-performance data to drive school improvement. Principals learned the skill, but they “got the data at the wrong time and so couldn’t really act on it.” Both elements needed to change: school lead-

ers’ capacity to use data and the system’s capacity to provide data to them at a time when analysis would make a difference.

This recognition taught the foundation that it had to look at wider influences on the work of school leaders. Or, put another way, it needed to look at school reform through the lens of education leadership at all levels of the system: state, district and school. To plan its work, the foundation began to ask a sequence of related questions:

- How will school leaders need to change?
- What actions will bring about that change?
- Who or what else will influence those actions?
- What changes will be needed at the state or district level?

This more integrated approach to grantmaking meant that the foundation had to integrate its own activities and supports as well. The foundation’s programs, communications and research are now more tightly linked and coordinated.

To allow for measurement of the components of a “cohesive leadership system,” Laine explained, the foundation is seeking to develop indicators in the following three areas, including how these three areas are connected and mutually supportive:

- **Statewide leader standards:** The foundation is supporting work to develop and Institute effective statewide leader standards that will be used as the basis for leader training and development programs and hiring and evaluation criteria in districts across the state.
- **Leadership training:** Foundation-commissioned research, conducted by Linda Darling-Hammond and a team at Stanford University, identified the elements of exemplary leader-training programs, including a rigorous selection process, university-district residency programs for aspiring leaders and principal mentor-

ing by trained mentors. The Education Development Center has developed quality indicators for leadership-training programs based on the Stanford findings and has identified model programs and best practices in Wallace-funded states and districts.

- **Conditions that support leader effectiveness:** The foundation and its grantees have identified high-leverage conditions, including a leader-performance assessment system based on state standards, clearly differentiated roles and responsibilities, a statewide system to provide timely and useful data, effective incentive and governance structures, and authority for leaders to allocate resources (money, people, time) to meet the needs of schools and students.

Leadership-development policy “isn’t an either/or question,” Laine continued. “You can’t focus on leadership at the state level or the district level. You need to try to move levers at the state level and do a few things to move school practice at the level of the district.”

As evidence, Laine cited a study that looked at how principals spent their time and found that they were dedicating only about a third of their time to instruction. The district responded by changing the roles and authority of principals and providing professional development to support principals in shifting more of their time to active instructional leadership. “Principals *still* spend only a third of their time on instructional leadership,” he reported. “If we want principals to focus on instructional leadership, we need to make their job more doable. We need to look at how state policies can support that shift through incentives and accountability.”

Tebben concluded by asking Laine what advice he would offer to funders “who don’t have the resources to work so consistently at every level.” Laine responded first by cautioning against the impression that The Wallace Foundation has been pursuing a perfectly laid

out, fully integrated strategy: “We’ve been stumbling through it,” he admitted. For an example of a strong, cost-effective approach, he said, grantmakers should study the work of the Rodel Foundation in Delaware, whose deliberate, strategic efforts have attracted attention and resources from The Wallace Foundation and other cofunders.

If you change people and put them back into a bad system, you can bet on the system to prevail every time.

“It’s a credit to Delaware’s leaders,” Laine said, “that, rather than chase foundation dollars, they developed an agenda that fit within the resources they had. It’s the quality of their strategy that counts.”

As a second piece of advice, Laine urged grantmakers to try to bring “small grain size to the level of state policy. If they say, ‘Let’s have standards,’ we need to say, ‘What standards?’ When we talk about teacher contracts, we need to say ‘Here are four things that belong in every contract.’ We need to get to that level of granularity.”

Commenting on Laine’s description of The Wallace Foundation’s experience with funding leadership development, Richard Elmore noted the foundation’s tendency to adhere to the “principle of reciprocity”—which, he argued, should be embraced more widely as part of a “culture of accountability.” If a grantmaker makes a demand of a school or district, he contended, it only makes sense to invest in increasing its capacity, as The Wallace Foundation has attempted to do.

Robert Schwartz, Institute program director, concurred, noting that capacity building is crucial if a funder wants its work to “carry on beyond its own investment.” He also seconded Laine’s emphasis on looking for connections between leadership practices and student per-

formance: “If we want to know if our investments in capacity are changing the bottom line,” he said, we need better methods for looking at “the quality of assignments, day-to-day student work, student engagement” and other indicators of student performance.

GIVE GOOD LEADERS EXTRA FLEXIBILITY

Presented at the Institute as a third example of philanthropic support for leadership development, the Boston Teacher Residency Program differed from the others in its focus on preparing teachers, not principals or other school system “leaders,” the term conventionally used. Even so, it offered potent lessons regarding the role of philanthropy in supporting effective leaders and developing future leadership.

The Boston Teacher Residency Program began with a conversation between Thomas Payzant, superintendent of the Boston Public Schools from 1995 to 2006, and Joanna Jacobson, founder of a then-new coalition of 14 Boston-based family foundations known as Strategic Grant Partners. Formed in 2002, Strategic Grant Partners tried from the start to be intentional about identifying leverage points—“small, good things” that, as Jacobson explained, could make a major difference.

If we want principals to focus on instructional leadership, we need to look at how state policies can support that shift through incentives and accountability.

As Jacobson recalled, she was looking for just such a leverage point one day in 2002 when she called Payzant and asked him to name “one crucial thing that you can’t fix.” His response was immediate: “the revolving door of new teachers” who enter the system underprepared, struggle to succeed, fail and leave.

The “revolving door” was hard on teachers, hard on kids and hard on principals, who needed to achieve some degree of stability among their faculty in order to achieve their goals for school improvement.

In further conversations, Jacobson, Payzant and Ellen Guiney, executive director of the Boston Plan for Excellence, studied the problem and came up with some ideas. Payzant remembers being “impressed and intrigued” by Strategic Grant Partners and its style. “They were different from the usual funders,” he recalled, “and they included an interesting cross-section of people. It was refreshing. And so I thought, let’s listen.”

Jacobson’s due diligence identified additional leverage points that eventually informed the model: the need for a stronger “clinical practice piece,” for example, and the desire among experienced teachers for an alternative to administration as a career path to advancement.

The three local leaders also discussed what would happen if they introduced competition to local institutions of higher education: Would those institutions respond by improving their own programs? What about the racial and ethnic composition of Boston teachers, which had remained predominantly white even as the student population had grown more diverse? Could the program somehow help to change the composition of the teaching workforce—and therefore, over time, the composition of the school-leadership pipeline?

They then crafted the framework for a new approach, one that offers aspiring teachers a full year of classroom experience under a skilled mentor along with training in instructional approaches. Participants earn a license and a master’s degree from the University of Massachusetts. A stipend and a loan (forgiven after three years of service as a teacher) cover tuition and basic living expenses and make the program a financially attractive alternative to conventional teacher training.

The Boston Teacher Residency Program is based within the Boston Plan for Excellence, a local education intermediary that works in collaboration with Boston Public Schools. According to Payzant, “The Boston Plan for Excellence is a great partner and prod. It pushes things the superintendent can’t do inside the system.” Today, Strategic Grant Partners continues to provide some funding for the program, although the district is gradually assuming responsibility for program costs—a feature of the plan that was built in from the start.

The field needs to adopt a more collaborative style of practice, as in other professions.

In further discussion, the program’s relevance to education leadership became even more apparent. Perhaps most important, the program supported leadership by helping a strong leader, Payzant, solve a problem that had plagued the school system and diminished his own ability to lead it effectively. Principal leadership also grew, as the “revolving door” slowed down and became a less pressing problem. Giving effective leaders an added measure of flexibility is a goal of Strategic Grant Partners, and the program seems to have accomplished it.

Moreover, as Payzant explained, the program model implicitly builds future leadership by making teaching more attractive to highly qualified candidates. Payzant believes that “the field needs to adopt a more collaborative style of practice, as in other professions. By building a teacher-leadership model in Boston, the program is moving us in that direction.”

PART 3

Reflections *on* education leadership

In a lively exchange at the close of the Institute, participants answered questions about what they'd learned and found most compelling in the sessions.



Grantmakers cannot control every factor that contributes to the success of their grants, especially in a system as complex and political as education. However, institute participants identified key lessons from the program to sharpen their work and better help ensure its impact.

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

- Leadership means building the capacity of others and building the capacity of the system.
- Leadership is identifying what to keep and what to discard. It's about focus.
- Leaders need to work the tension between capacity building and innovation. They need to continue to move forward even when they're not sure how.
- Leadership is both adaptive and technical; in education, the line between the two is especially difficult to determine.

WHAT CONCEPTS AND IDEAS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR GRANTMAKING?

- Changing the status quo sometimes means taking on a "cartel" of entrenched interests—a group that may include state regulators, school districts, unions, schools of education and others. For those institu-

tions, the power of inertia often outweighs even a sincere willingness to change.

- It's important to understand people's incentives, values and attachments in promoting change.
- Don't enable continuing failure. As grantmakers, we're in a good position to see the actual capacity of school leaders clearly. We should be asking questions and encouraging critical reflection.
- If a school system can generate some capacity, build on that. Getting an initial foothold is often the toughest part.
- Measuring well is a function of leadership, not just a function of accountability. We need to help leaders learn to do it well.
- School leaders need ongoing access to learning and reflection. Grantmakers can help them connect with and learn from each other.
- School leadership needs to help people (including school leaders) let go of complaining and address instructional improvement.
- To support the development of leaders and leadership, we may need to take more risks and be a lot bolder than we've been.

WHAT OPPORTUNITIES HAVE BECOME CLEARER TO YOU?

- We're in the infancy of working collaboratively on this issue. Grantmakers need to put aside the "team jacket" in order to spread the risk, sustain work for longer periods and take on larger initiatives. Can we bring this message of collaboration back to our foundations? Grantmaking organizations are too idiosyncratic.
- We need to do more to rate our successes and failures with our colleagues and boards. We should also analyze missed opportunities with colleagues inside and outside our foundations.

- How do we open up dialogue and change culture within our own organizations? We're not involved in supporting transformational leadership. Could we change?
- Recognizing the need to improve is necessary, but it makes you vulnerable. This is true of both school leaders and grantmakers.

CONCLUSION

Robert Schwartz wrapped up the Institute with four closing observations on the role of philanthropy in developing education leadership:

First, many people have said that grantmakers have reason to be tired of the challenges of systemic school reform; they say it's simply too difficult for grantmakers to take on. I don't believe it. Education leadership is a systemic issue, and our discussions this week have shown that you and your organizations are either working on it or very interested in trying. The truth is, there's very little risk capital in K-12 education. Most of what's there is private money, from organizations like yours. It's therefore possible to invest in this area and have a disproportionate impact.

Second, for urban districts, it helps to have a permanent public-education fund like the Boston Plan for Excellence. An intermediary like that can be a crucial bridge between donors and the district. Intermediaries are also equipped to get things done that are very difficult to do from inside a school system or institution of higher education. We need more of them.

Third, as grantmakers, you have authority. You love to talk about partnerships with educators, but you need to be disciplined about acknowledging the power differential. School reform is the work of educators; your work is different. You need to pick good people to get things done. Your job is to look carefully, make large invest-

ments, stay in and get involved when they need you.

Fourth, remember the conditions under which education leaders operate. Use your power to address some of those conditions. It's hard to be a good superintendent when you need to deal with competing political agendas and cope with endless problems. Those things make it hard to address the real work of instructional improvement. If you can relieve some of those problems and don't bring your own political baggage into the fray, you can be very helpful.

Investing in school leadership: Entry points and other lessons

A CONVERSATION WITH RICHARD LAINE, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, THE WALLACE FOUNDATION

The Wallace Foundation has been focusing intently on educational leadership for nearly a decade. What has the foundation learned from its investments? Where do foundation staff see the greatest opportunities for progress over the next few years? And what advice about possible “entry points” would it offer to other funders? The foundation’s Richard Laine offered five observations for funders interested in bringing a focus on school leadership to their grantmaking:

- **Embed the concept of leadership within whatever approach you’re taking toward school reform.** “Stay true to your working hypothesis,” said Laine, “but think about how leadership matters. There’s a leadership angle to anything you’re doing. If you’re focusing on early literacy, for example, and supporting professional development for teachers, think about what the principal can do to make the teachers more effective. We need to get better at building bridges between educational leadership and school reform.”
- **Focus on the environment in which leaders work and the conditions that enable them to act.** “Too often, principals are forced to be cheerleaders rather than leaders. They urge people on, but they don’t have the authority over things that would actually let them lead, like budget and staffing.” As a larger foundation, he explained, The Wallace Foundation can “work at the state and district levels, and we’re able to push for policies that give principals the scope to be leaders.” A smaller foundation might be working in a single school, but it can still use its authority to improve the environment for leadership—for example, by “opening up a conversation with the district about what would help the principal get things done.”
- **Pull what’s known about the essentials of leadership together and simplify.** “We know that leadership is second only to teacher quality in turning around a failing school,” said Laine. “Stanford University’s Linda Darling-Hammond and others have done research about the knowledge, skills and personal qualities of effective leaders and how those things translate into actual behaviors that change schools. It’s an important new research base, with implications for who gets recruited to become a school leader, how they’re trained and how the system supports them so they can be effective. Being able to lead change is essential to the job, but for the most part school leaders don’t have those skills.” Grantmakers can make a difference, he believes, by investing in strategies that build and reward those skills among school leaders.
- **Remember that education is a human business.** “As grantmakers,” Laine reflected, “we’ve given a lot of attention to teacher quality and to principal quality. Now, we’re more likely to talk in terms of ‘human capacity.’ Some people resist that term because it sounds so corporate, but it’s really about seeing connections and figuring out how change is enacted.” As an example of the approach The Wallace Foundation is taking, Laine cited its support for a new assessment tool for school leaders, the Vanderbilt Assessment for Leadership in Education, or Val-Ed, designed to “rate principals on things they do that actually have an impact on student learning.” A funder concerned about school leadership “could go to a district and say, ‘Let’s adopt this tool,’ rather than ‘Let’s do something about these particular principals.’ We’ll never get the politics out of education entirely, but at least we can begin to depersonalize important decisions about school leadership and emphasize what really matters.”
- **Recognize that leadership is an asset that can be leveraged.** “In recent years,” said Laine, “this foundation and others have put a lot of emphasis on ‘universal success,’ by which we mean closing the achievement gap and improving the quality of instruction for all kids, especially poor kids in historically low-performing schools. It’s going to take dramatic change to make that happen. If that’s the objective, and if we believe that leadership is crucial to making that happen, then we need to put our best leadership where it’s going to make the most difference: in underperforming, hard-to-staff schools. A good principal gives good teachers a big incentive to come to a difficult school and stay there. Right now, all the incentives work in the opposite direction; that’s something funders can help change.”

The foundation’s online knowledge center—accessed at www.wallacefoundation.org—includes an extensive collection of research reports and analyses about education leadership.

Leadership priorities for funders: *feedback from participants*

While the experience was still fresh in their minds, several people who participated in the 2007 Institute agreed to complete a follow-up questionnaire on their current leadership-oriented grantmaking and future priorities.



Funders attending the Institute told GFE they were supporting a wide range of leverage points to advance leadership quality. Their feedback helped tremendously in developing this report, and we thank them for it. Below is a summary of their responses.

SCOPE

- **Local focus:** Funders large and small are supporting leadership development at the level of the locality or district. The programs they support tend to fall into three broad types:
 - academies for aspiring principals, sometimes associated with a national program such as New Leaders for New Schools;
 - professional development to improve the performance of existing leaders, especially in instructional leadership; and
 - help for districts that want to support school leaders more effectively.
- **State policy:** Some larger foundations are working at the state level, mainly in support of better-aligned policies regarding leadership development, retention and performance assessment. This sort of work does not appear to have attracted many smaller funders.

STRATEGY

- **Leadership and district performance:** Support for local leadership development is often part of a grantmaker's larger commitment to improving the performance of a school district and aligns with other efforts.
- **Beyond the principal:** Funders that are deeply immersed in improving a particular district often support leadership development for school boards, parents and community leaders too—not just principals and superintendents.
- **Research on leadership:** Some funders are supporting research on the components of effective school leadership, the characteristics of leaders and how effective leadership can be developed.
- **Funder collaboration:** Based on the very limited sample of responses received, it appears that larger foundations find it relatively easy to collaborate with other funders on leadership-development initiatives. Smaller foundations say they are interested but find it harder to identify the right project and relationship, perhaps because their areas of focus are narrower. Some said they were interested in collaboration with funders that share their geographic focus.

FUTURE PRIORITIES

As priorities for future support of educational leadership, the respondents suggested the following topics and problems:

- more effective spending of professional development money by districts;
- better policies and practices to retain teachers and school leaders;
- improved university-based and alternative training programs, with a stronger focus on leading change and instructional leadership in key content areas;

- governance changes, including those that would promote greater collaboration among district administrators, school boards and union leadership;
- continuous, job-embedded leadership development;
- developing community college leaders; and
- CEO coaching and other strategies that mitigate the effects of rapid turnover of superintendents in many districts.

Resources and further reading

CASE STUDIES ON EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

(all available for purchase from
Harvard Business School Publishing at
www.hbsp.harvard.edu)

James Austin, Allen Grossman, Robert Schwartz and Jennifer Seusse, "Long Beach Unified School District (A): Change That Leads to Improvement (1992-2002)," Public Education Leadership Project at Harvard University, 2006.

Allen Grossman and Daniel Curran, "The Harlem Children's Zone: Driving Performance with Measurement and Evaluation," Harvard Business School, 2003.

Susan Moore Johnson and Tiffany K. Cheng, "Using Data to Improve Instruction at the Mason School," Public Education Leadership Project at Harvard University, 2007.

LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND PHILANTHROPY

Kathleen Enright, "Investing in Leadership (volume 2): Inspiration and Ideas from Philanthropy's Latest Frontier," Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, 2006. (available for download at www.geofunders.org)

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, "Investing in Leadership: Discussion Guide for Grantmakers," 2008. (available for free download at www.geofunders.org)

Ronald A. Heifetz, John V. Kania and Mark R. Kramer, "Leading Boldly: Foundations Can Move Past Traditional Approaches to Create Social Change through Imaginative—and Even Controversial—Leadership," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2004. (available for free download at www.ssir.org)

Betsy Hubbard, "Investing in Leadership (volume 1): A Grantmaker's Framework for Understanding Nonprofit Leadership Development," Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, 2007. (available for free download at www.geofunders.org)

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

Edgar H. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992.

IMPROVING EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

Steven Adamowski, Susan Bowles Therriault and Anthony P. Cavanna, "The Autonomy Gap: Barriers to Effective School Leadership," American Institutes for Research and Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2007. (available for free download at www.edexcellence.net)

Linda Darling-Hammond, Michelle LaPointe, Debra Meyerson and Margaret Orr, "Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs," Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, 2007. (available for free download at www.wallacefoundation.org)

Keith Leithwood, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson and Kyla Wahlstrom, "How Leadership Influences Student Learning," The Wallace Foundation, 2004. (available for free download at www.wallacefoundation.org)

Institute Attendees

FACULTY & DISCUSSANTS

RICHARD ELMORE
Professor of Educational Leadership, Harvard Graduate School of Education

ALLEN GROSSMAN
Professor of Management Practice, Harvard Business School

ELLEN GUINEY
Executive Director, Boston Plan for Excellence

RONALD HEIFETZ
Lecturer in Public Leadership and Founder, Center for Public Leadership at Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government

JAMES HONAN
Senior Lecturer on Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education

JOANNA JACOBSON
Managing Director, Strategic Grant Partners Needham, Mass.

SUSAN MOORE JOHNSON
Professor of Teaching and Learning, Harvard Graduate School of Education

RICHARD LAINE
Director of Education, The Wallace Foundation, New York, NY

CHRISTINE LETTS
Associate Dean for Executive Education and Lecturer in the Practice of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership, Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government

THOMAS PAYZANT
Former Superintendent, Boston Public Schools, and Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education

ROBERT SCHWARTZ
Institute Program Director, Academic Dean and Director, Education Policy and Management Program, Harvard Graduate School of Education

PARTICIPANTS

(titles and affiliations in May 2007)

ADRIENNE BAILEY
Program Manager of District Alliances, Stupski Foundation, Mill Valley, Calif.

CANDACE BELL
Program Officer for Children, Youth & Families, William Penn Foundation, Philadelphia, Penn.

JUDY BIGELOW
Director, Fordham Street Foundation, Medina, Wash.

AYEOLA BOOTHE-KINLAW
Program Officer, The Wallace Foundation, New York, N.Y.

JACQUELINE BRAYMAN
Program Director, The Ball Foundation, Glen Ellyn, Ill.

DAVIS CAMPBELL
Senior Advisor, Stuart Foundation, Davis, Calif.

JOHN CARWELL
Vice President, Rodel Foundation of Delaware Wilmington, Del.

JASON CASCARINO
Manager, The Chicago Public Education Fund, Chicago, Ill.

MARISA CASTUERA
Program Officer, Harold K.L. Castle Foundation, Kailua, Hawaii

ROSS DANIS
Education Program Director, Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Morristown, N.J.

NICHOLAS DONOHUE
President & CEO, Nellie Mae Education Foundation, Quincy, Mass.

HENRY FERNANDEZ
Executive Director of Philanthropy, USA Funds Indianapolis, Ind.

DAVID FUKUZAWA
Program Officer, The Kresge Foundation, Troy, Mich.

ANU GREENLEE CAIRO
Program Officer, Walter and Elise Haas Fund, San Francisco, Calif.

SHANÉ HARRIS
Program Officer, The Prudential Foundation, Newark, NJ

ELLEN HERSHEY
Senior Program Officer, Stuart Foundation, San Francisco, Calif.

ROBERT HILL
Director of Education Initiatives, The Ball Foundation, Glen Ellyn, Ill.

JENNIFER HOLLAHAN
Director of Executive Education, Council on Foundations, Washington, D.C.

JOSEPH IGNAT
Trustee, The Nord Family Foundation, Amherst, Ohio

DOROTHY JACOBSON
Vice President of National & State Partnerships, The Rodel Foundation of Delaware, Wilmington, Del.

DEANNA LEE
Senior Vice President, Wachovia Corporation, Charlotte, N.C.

GUDELIA LOPEZ
Senior Program Officer for Education, The Chicago Community Trust, Chicago, Ill.

ALYSON MALONE
President, The Malone Family Foundation, Dothan, Ala.

DEANE MARIOTTI
Senior Associate, The Chicago Public Education Fund, Chicago, Ill.

MARY MATTIS
Senior Officer for Research & Evaluation, The Wallace Foundation, New York, N.Y.

CHRISTINE MCCABE
Executive Director, College Spark Washington, Seattle, Wash.

RICHARD MCKEON
Senior Philanthropic Advisor, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, New York, N.Y.

PETER MICH
Executive Director, McDougal Family Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

ADRIENNE O'NEILL
President, Stark Education Partnership, Canton, Ohio

MICHAEL PALMISANO
Senior Fellow, The Ball Foundation, Glen Ellyn, Ill.

JEANNE PEARLMAN
Senior Program Officer, The Pittsburgh Foundation, Pittsburgh, Penn.

RICHARD PUFFER
Executive Director, The Byerly Foundation, Hartsville, S.C.

CHARLES PUTNEY
President & Director, James F. & Marion L. Miller Foundation, Portland, Ore.

LATA REDDY
Vice President, The Prudential Foundation, Newark, N.J.

TERESA RIVERO
Senior Program Officer, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Washington, D.C.

HELEN ROSEN
Director of Education Programs, Arizona Community Foundation, Phoenix, Ariz.

WYNN ROSSER
Executive Director, The Greater Texas Foundation, Bryan, Tex.

WENDY SAMET
Vice President, Goldsmith Family Foundation, Baltimore, Md.

JESSICA SCHWARTZ
Senior Communications Officer, The Wallace Foundation, New York, N.Y.

DANIEL SHOY
Program Officer,
Arthur M. Blank Family
Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.

VEENAY SINGLA
Senior Associate, The
Chicago Public Education
Fund, Chicago, Ill.

CHRIS STECKLEIN
Program Officer, Care
Foundation, Springdale, Ark.

RUBY TAKANISHI
President, Foundation
for Child Development,
New York, N.Y.

SCOTT THOMPSON
Assistant Executive Director,
The Panasonic Foundation,
Secaucus, N.J.

ADAM TUCKER
Senior Program Officer, Bill
& Melinda Gates Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

MARGARET DANIELS TYLER
Senior Program Officer, Bill
& Melinda Gates Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

SUSAN WALLY
Executive Director,
PREP-KC, Kansas City, Mo.

CATHERINE WILSON
Vice President,
The Malone Family
Foundation, Dothan, Ala.

REBECCA WOLFE
Director of the Education
Fund, Fairfield County
Community Foundation,
Wilton, Conn.

SUSAN WOLKING
Executive Director, Girard
Foundation, La Jolla, Calif.

grantmakers^{for}education

Grantmakers for Education's mission is to strengthen philanthropy's capacity to improve educational outcomes for all students. We achieve this mission by:

1. Sharing successful strategies, effective practices and lessons that exemplify responsive and responsible grantmaking in education.
2. Creating venues for funders to build and share knowledge, debate strategies, develop leadership, collaborate and advocate for change.
3. Gathering and interpreting data to illustrate trends, highlight innovative or proven educational approaches and support informed grantmaking.

grantmakers^{for} education 

720 SW Washington St., Suite 605

Portland, OR 97205

tel 503.595.2100 fax 503.595.2102

www.edfunders.org