



General Principles for Leadership Programs 2021 Concept Paper

Introduction

In 2019, the International Leadership Association (ILA) convened the General Principles Task Force (GPTF) to develop guidelines for academic curricular and co-curricular leadership programs. In this concept paper, the GPTF seeks to establish general principles for continuous quality improvement of leadership learning. The concept paper is intended as a living document which is reviewed regularly, and it is not meant to serve as an instrument for accrediting leadership programs.

The GPTF built on the significant work already done by a similar group that developed the ILA Guiding Questions in 2005-2009 – an evaluative instrument that focused on context, conceptual framework, content, teaching and learning, and assessment (<http://www.ila-net.org/Communities/LC/GuidingQuestionsFinal.pdf>). The concept paper is based on these five categories in the ILA Guiding Questions and incorporated recommendations discerned from member feedback and reported in the 2012 ILA Task Force on Formalized Program Review White Paper. Specifically, the General Principles for Leadership Programs 2021 Concept Paper echoes the 2012 White Paper in advocating that leadership learning should be "grounded in a coherent Conceptual Framework within the Context of the institution," and it acts on the recommendation that ILA should "develop a formalized program review model... thoroughly tested across a variety of program contexts" using the ILA Guiding Questions as the model.

It also takes into consideration feedback obtained from the ILA 2020 conference panel that reported progress of the Task Force and over 100 responses collected over several weeks from the members of the ILA. Finally, the concept paper also includes feedback from a discussion that took place on the HubILA on the ILA Intersections page.

For the development of this concept paper, the GPTF benefitted from the work currently done by the Carnegie Foundation's Elective Classification on Leadership for Public Purpose through Rice University's Doerr Institute for New Leaders. This new elective classification, to be rolled out in

ILA - General Principles for Leadership Programs, Concept Paper 2021

2021, will provide a leadership development framework at the institutional level. The ILA General Principles, in contrast, focus on leadership development and education at the programmatic level (e.g., program, department, center, institute, school).

Other efforts to set expectations for leadership learning in Higher Education informed the development of this concept paper as well. For instance, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) developed standards for student co-curricular leadership programs in the 1980s. CAS issued its most recent revision of the standards for Leadership Education and Development in January 2020. The American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators issued a joint statement in 2004, “Learning Reconsidered,” which argued for a transformative education, a holistic process of learning, that places students “at the center of the learning experience.” (https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/Learning_Reconsidered_Report.pdf). The GPTF shares this holistic perspective when considering principles for leadership learning. We are also mindful of the 2019 edition of the *Collaborative Priorities & Critical Considerations for Leadership Education*, issued by the Inter-Association Leadership Education Collaborative (ILEC), which included three priority areas in leadership learning: (a) building inclusive leadership learning communities; (b) expanding evidence-based practice through assessment & evaluation; and (c) enhancing our community of practice through professional development and resources.

Cultivating leadership capacity has long been an implicit goal of education at the post-secondary level. As the world has become more complex and seamless, the importance of clarifying what is meant by “leading” and “leadership” has become more important. From the mid-20th century to the present, the focus on cultivating leadership in various sectors has increased exponentially, but the impact of this focus has been unclear. ILA has taken on the challenging task of advocating higher expectations in leadership learning due to societal critiques of the effectiveness of these efforts, and the need to define a better future through more effective and inclusive leadership.

The word “leadership” conjures multiple meanings in the Leadership Studies literature. This concept paper considers leadership as a *relational process* in which participants or stakeholders work toward a common goal to find solutions to a complex problem they are inspired to solve. This relationship, however, does not take place in a vacuum. The historical and organizational context influences the leadership process. Further, cultural norms and values shape the expectations of those who participate in this process. The GPTF’s greatest challenge was to draft general principles that could cross cultures and reflect truly universal values that could guide continuous quality improvement on a global scale.

Leadership education, training, and development serve as different elements of Leadership Studies. The body of knowledge developed over the past century through the empirical study of leadership now constitutes the core theories and models that are advocated throughout leadership learning. In addition to passing down this knowledge to learners, leadership-program architects may also seek to

ILA - General Principles for Leadership Programs, Concept Paper 2021

develop competencies through leadership training (skill-building). The combination of leadership education and training provides a foundation for leadership growth – the essence of leadership development. “Leadership learning” serves as the inclusive term used for what leadership educators seek to achieve in total (education, training, and development).

Many people unknowingly contribute to or undermine leadership lessons by the way they talk about, celebrate, and encourage “leading.” The goal of this concept paper is to present ideas for leadership educators to gain an understanding of how they can build leadership capacity of learners. The work of the GPTF is consistent with recent reports that have identified the top skills that global employers will be looking for in higher education graduates. The World Economic Forum, for instance, has identified these top 10 hard and soft leadership skills for 2025 in a recent report (*The Future of Jobs*): analytical thinking and innovation; active learning and learning strategies; complex problem-solving; critical thinking and analysis; creativity, originality and initiative; leadership and social influence; technology use, monitoring and control; technology design and programming; resilience, stress tolerance and flexibility; and reasoning, problem-solving and ideation.

(http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_2020.pdf).

Leadership learning remains an emerging field, and the ILA’s Leadership General Principles are an indication that core theories and concepts have begun to unify and thereby improve the study and practice of leadership. The global conversation regarding common principles is crucial and must be recognized as evolving, which requires openness and a commitment to discerning a workable unity among leadership educators that serves all, rather than a detailed, fine-tuned, and prescriptive view that serves only a sub-set of educators.

A statement of general principles about leadership that will be applicable across sector, culture, and time must provide the opportunity for leadership educators to incorporate various research and theoretical frameworks. It is ILA’s belief that there are certain leadership capacities that can be discerned from the current evidence of research, theory, and practice and that these have been, and continue to be, refined over time. Leadership educators cultivate in their learners these capacities: an understanding of history and experience; an agile and open mind; examination of oneself and systems of leadership through a critical perspective; active and engaged learning; effective dialogue and problem solving with others; adaptability and resilience; purposeful and evolving aspiration to achieve societal good; local and global perspectives; ethics and core values; and optimism while engaging in addressing difficult challenges.

Drawing from previous research and initiatives regarding the evolution of leadership learning across cultures and regions of the world, the ILA offers the following general principles that fall within each of the five topical areas outlined below:

1. **Context:** In a world of rapid change and critical, seemingly intractable local and global problems, leadership programs foster optimism and the desire to bring about positive and

transformative change. They prepare learners to be agile, open-minded, and humble. Learners deal with increasing volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity. The best leadership programs encourage a global, as well as local, perspective, and a respectful, holistic, systems approach to engaging multiple stakeholders.

2. **Conceptual Framework:** Leadership programs recognize that the capacity for effective leading and following resides in each person, and that broader numbers and more diverse leadership are important in resolving the challenges of the modern age. Deeper learning in leadership is demonstrated by critically examining one's own and other's assumptions through active learning and practice and by analyzing the use of power and its impact. Most importantly, leadership learning is guided by a cohesive and coordinated framework that results in repeated and consistent messages across the entities, disciplines, and experiences that learners encounter.
3. **Content:** Truly transformative leadership is shaped by aspirational vision and the pursuit of purpose, approached from both a humanistic and pragmatic perspective that strives to serve the common good and create inclusive and sustainable communities. It is culturally sensitive and relevant, grounded in ethics and core values such as integrity, courage, humility, honesty, fairness, empathy, and transparency.
4. **Learning:** The most effective leadership education programs incorporate highly active and engaging instructional strategies and recognize the appropriate developmental level and maturity of the learner. They create a "trusted space" that integrates theory, practice, and experiential learning to build core competencies such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and teamwork. They promote engagement, dialogue, reflection, and active questioning of learners' experiences as both leaders and followers.
5. **Metrics, Outcomes, and Assessment:** Clearly and concretely described outcomes are required based on the type of leadership program, its context, individual learner goals, and programmatic goals within each individual leadership program. Similarly, assessments need to be directly aligned to the program's goals and outcomes to provide valuable information. Leadership learning and program outcomes are regularly evaluated to assess effectiveness and ensure continuous quality improvement.

These five areas and the general principles within them serve as a foundation upon which an existing leadership program – as well as those designing new programs – can build to promote continuous quality improvement.

We will now dive deeper into the five areas and respective principles and offer key questions that programs are encouraged to examine under each. The questions were drafted in the specific context of higher education with the "Learning" area as the most specific in its focus. Other sector leadership educators will likely need to adapt the questions to their own settings.

Context

How does the context of leadership learning affect the program? Why is it important to consider context for leadership learning?

The context for leadership learning is informed by global, national, local, and organizational factors. It also incorporates history, traditions, culture, and language. Of equal importance is the individual's contribution to this context, in identity, background, values, knowledge, and experience. Leadership learning not only promotes a global and a local outlook in terms of knowledge development and impact, but also responds to the tensions that exist between global and local forces, recognizing how leadership must endeavor to reconcile these. Key to leadership learning are a number of underlying conceptual, epistemological, and design principles.

Contextual Dimensions: Global and Regional

- i. What are the global contexts and environmental drivers for leadership learning?
- ii. What are the regional dimensions and imperatives which relate to a particular area of a country or the world and how is it reflected in leadership learning?
- iii. How does it provide a common language for dynamic contextual learning, within specific settings, events, or circumstances?

Contextual Dimensions: National

- i. How does the national context shape the conceptualization and production of knowledge creation within the leadership learning program?
- ii. How is the program embedded in a given program culture and socio-institutional system (or a set of them, as many learners have a multinational range of experiences)?
- iii. To what extent are the leadership learning programs evaluated on the social and environmental impact that their research and teaching program has on their immediate and not-so-immediate community contexts?

Contextual Dimensions: Organizational

- i. What does the institution say and celebrate about leadership?
- ii. What do stakeholders (e.g. employees, managers, executives, the community) expect of the institution in relation to cultivating leadership capacity?
- iii. How does the program promote collaboration across the institution?
- iv. Does the institution address learners' access to, and proficiency with technology for leadership learning?
- v. How is understanding organizational culture and culture change embedded in the program?

Conceptual Framework

What is the conceptual framework for leadership learning?

The current complex environmental, social, and political conditions of the earth are intimidating but human beings have demonstrated resilience in adapting to these periods of great difficulty. Human organizations thrive because they acclimate to changing circumstances through broad and diverse participation. Including people with diverse perspectives is essential for leadership to develop human capacity and efficacy. Further, leadership educators have a responsibility to conceptualize leadership learning that realistically recognizes these conditions and offers constructive and hopeful processes to respond to them.

Responding to the challenges and opportunities of leadership learning within current world conditions requires a broad conceptual framework that relies on research, knowledge, and insights about organizations in the public, nonprofit, and for-profit sectors. Leadership learning includes ethical implications of power, the need for legitimacy of power, understanding the relevance of leadership and command, and the benefits of moving from power to authority.

The focus on cultivating leadership potential varies across institutions, but almost every organization is more effective when links across entities, disciplines, and experiences are encouraged. Discreet programs, experiences, or courses as well as the comprehensive array of opportunities need to be aligned, repeating core principles, concepts, and rigor of pedagogical methods. The following “Conceptual Framework” questions are proposed as stimuli to increase the priority and integration of leadership learning in participants’ experience. Further, they strengthen institutional will and serve

learners by leveraging the resources of the institutions in which they enroll and communities with which they engage.

- i. How is the program's context considered when developing the conceptual framework (e.g., institutional history, intended impact, fiscal & human resources)?
- ii. Has the conceptual framework been articulated in a way that makes it possible to derive program content, pedagogy, and learning outcomes?
- iii. What theories, research, and wisdom of practice are useful in articulating the program's purpose and goals?
- iv. What evidence exists that the program and its purposes/goals are aligned with the institutional mission, vision, and strategic plan, and adds value to them?

Conceptual Framework: Philosophy, Purpose, and Goals

- i. What is the mission/purpose of the program?
- ii. What is the program's vision for the future?
- iii. How is the relationship among learners' identities, their practical experience, and wisdom informed by research or theory? How is this relationship addressed?
- iv. How are conditions that result in equity, justice, and sustainability across diverse populations and contexts addressed?
- v. In what ways are participants supported by a community of learners that both challenges and supports them?
- vi. Are other statements of standards (e.g., disciplinary, associational, professional, competency frameworks) relevant to the program and the learners' experiences? For instance: Principles of Management Education (unprme.org); the UN Global Compact Principles (unglobalcompact.org); the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); CAS Standards.

Conceptual Framework: Learning Environment

- i. How are the general principles, goals, objectives, and outcomes connected to the program's philosophy and mission?
- ii. Does the conceptual framework incorporate diverse options designed to achieve multiple purposes (i.e., training, education, development, and capacity building) delivered through multiple strategies (e.g., virtual/in-person, credit and non-credit courses, seminars, workshops, conferences) and targeting diverse populations?
- iii. How is building capacity for both individuals and communities of concern incorporated throughout the program?
- iv. How does the program select learning activities and interventions for high likelihood of impact?

Content

What is the content included in leadership learning and how was it derived?

The thought process for developing the program's content needs to be deliberate and inclusive. The program's robustness is a function of balancing well-established theories and evidence-based academic research with relevant effective practices. The content's depth and delivery methods appropriately correspond to the learner's background and experience, educational level and learning needs, and are conducive to achieving the program's learning outcomes. Furthermore, transitioning among the various program components is well planned, creating a seamless learning experience from intellectual rigor and personal reflection to application in real time. The program could also be further enhanced by embedding one or more globally accepted frameworks. Finally, the program needs to be adaptable enough to enable interdisciplinarity. In the end, the content inspires participants and helps them to see leadership as a process whereby its deliberate and thoughtful enactment brings about positive change – transforming themselves, their communities, their organizations, and in the end, the world.

Several building blocks shape the content of leadership learning. First, the foundation of the program sets the tone for other building blocks of content. The design of the content in terms of sequence, interconnectivity, interdisciplinarity, and its relation to outcomes needs to be identified while observing the nature of the target audience. Second, leadership concepts supported by theories and global frameworks are specified while taking into account the geographical and cultural aspects of leadership. Third, a causal association between the program's content and personal development is evident in relation to capacity building and the development of leadership skills. Fourth, the organizational leadership dimension of the content defines the individual – organization interaction through various means such as communication and culture. Fifth, embedding global leadership in the program's content acknowledges the variations and complexities of leadership within the contexts of transnational economies, political spectrums, and environmental ecosystems. Sixth, highlighting ethics in the program brings issues such as morality, legality, integrity and governance to the forefront when setting the content of the program.

Content: Foundations of Program

- i. How do conceptual elements (e.g., theory, research, wisdom in practice) influence the program content?
- ii. How do contextual elements (e.g., diversity, globalization, security, and technology) influence the program content?
- iii. How is the program's course content appropriately designed to address the development level of the learner (e.g., first-year undergraduate students versus graduate students)?
- iv. How is the program's content related to program outcomes?
- v. To what extent is the content of the program sequenced and connected?
- vi. What broad and diverse grounding in theories, philosophical and historical approaches does the program provide?
- vii. What primary disciplines inform the study of leadership in the program?
- viii. How is the content of this program complemented or infused in other fields in an interdisciplinary manner that illuminates historic, social, political, personal, and other perspectives of leadership?

Content: Leadership Concepts

- i. How does the program help learners understand concepts such as leadership (formal and informal), followership, and context at a local, regional, national, international, and global level?
- ii. How does the program help learners master key concepts in strategic leadership such as vision, purpose/mission, needs assessment, planning, change management, problem solving, conflict, decision making, motivation, building cultures, fiscal responsibility, and innovation?
- iii. Does the content contain current/contemporary/developing theories/concepts as well as classic theories or concepts?
- iv. How is bad or toxic leadership recognized and addressed?
- v. How is the continuum of responsibility from followership through full engagement and leadership addressed?

Content: Personal Development

- i. How does the program promote personal development in ways that lead to increased capacities for individual and collective leadership?
- ii. Is there any reference to specific skills and competencies (e.g., critical thinking, growth mindset, systems thinking, stakeholder engagement, collaboration, communication, emotional and gender intelligence)?
- iii. In what ways is self-awareness fostered in participants as a foundation for ongoing and life-long learning in leadership?
- iv. How does the program identify learners' stages of development and maturity levels in the selection phase? How does the program address learners' characteristics (i.e., identity development, culture, life experience, and comfort in learning)?

Content: Organizational Leadership

- i. To what extent does the program advance an understanding of different organizational contexts (e.g., nonprofit, for-profit, public sector, public-private partnerships) and their governance?
- ii. How does the program include aspects of interpersonal skill development, such as collaboration, cooperation and communication, necessary in a team context?
- iii. How does the graduate or undergraduate program help learners to experience and reflect on such concepts as: organizational context and structure for action and results; organizational design and structure; organizational dynamics (formal and informal communication, culture, technology, group dynamics); and law and policy?

Content: Global Leadership

- i. How does the program advance learners' understanding of leadership across physical and cultural boundaries?
- ii. How do the learners apply their leadership learning to a transnational context? This would include dynamics of interconnectivity, global cooperation, global competition, sustainability of economies, politics, and the environment.
- iii. How does the program help learners understand the global dynamics of the 21st century (e.g., globalization) and how to navigate conflicting values and rights?
- iv. How does leadership learning create conditions for people and organizations to thrive by addressing equity, justice, and sustainability across diverse populations and contexts?

Content: Ethical Leadership

- i. Does the program introduce learners to the different philosophical principles related to ethical leadership (e.g., Utilitarianism, Ethical Egoism, Kantianism)?
- ii. How does the program address the ethical complexities (e.g., good vs. bad; morality vs. immorality, moral absolutism vs. moral relativism, character, virtue, social justice, efficiency, moral reasoning, and constitutional rights) of inclusive leadership in action?
- iii. How does the program encourage learners to examine their own values in relation to ethical leadership principles?
- iv. Does the program effectively contrast “good” and “bad” leadership practices through well documented real-world examples?

Learning

What teaching and learning methods are appropriate to maximize leadership learning while being mindful of critical situational factors?

Leadership education focuses on the pedagogical practices of facilitating leadership learning in an effort to build human capacity. The questions below provide a focus for leadership education and how each domain of situational factors influences the decisions made about leadership learning goals, feedback and assessment, and teaching and learning activities. In doing so, program architects allow insights that emerge from questions related to situational factors of the learners, leadership educators, and learning environment, to inform how such learning is facilitated with respect to the questions related to learning goals, feedback and assessment, and teaching and learning activities.

Learning: Situational Factors of the Learners

- i. What are the learners’ developmental levels, that is, how does the leadership program identify learners’ stages of development and maturity levels in the selection phase? How does the program address learners’ characteristics (i.e., identity development, culture, life experience, and comfort in learning)?
- ii. What theories of development (e.g., human, student, adult, identity) inform the programmatic decisions to engage learners?
- iii. How do the situational factors of the learners influence their roles and responsibilities as they develop as learners and leaders?
- iv. What is the program target level of the learners (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, executive education, professional development)?
- v. How might the social and cultural contexts impact the learners’ understanding of the processes of teaching and learning and their possible roles in these processes?

Learning: Situational Factors of Leadership Educators

- i. What methods might be employed to increase instructors' capacities to utilize a wider array of teaching/learning processes?
- ii. How might social and cultural contexts influence the educators' understanding of leadership?
- iii. How do educators connect theory (conceptual framework) to practice (e.g., real-world examples)?

Learning: Situational Factors of the Learning Environment

- i. Which philosophical or theoretical foci would be most appropriate for learners and educators in this teaching environment?
- ii. What are the social and cultural contexts/issues/concerns in which teaching and learning take place?
- iii. How do leadership educators and their programs create learning environments (i.e., physical, virtual, technology-enhanced, or some combination) that maximize the learning experience?

Learning: Learning Goals

- i. How is pedagogy intentionally selected and used to enhance student learning?
- ii. What are the expected learning goals at each stage of learners' development in the program?
- iii. What types of leadership learning (e.g., knowledge, development, training, observation, engagement) are appropriate to attain particular learning goals in the program?

Learning: Feedback and Assessment

- i. What feedback and assessment strategies are developmentally appropriate for the learners in the program?
- ii. What assessment strategies are most appropriate and intentionally aligned with specific content, competencies, and types of leadership learning?
- iii. How is peer feedback used in the program?

Learning: Teaching and Learning Activities

- i. What instructional strategies are developmentally appropriate for the learners in the leadership program?
- ii. What evidence-based practices (e.g., pedagogy, experiential, active-learning, high-impact) do educators use in the program in order to enable learners to demonstrate leadership knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations?
- iii. In what ways are experiential learning, such as critical reflection that supports learners' active questioning of their experiences as leaders and followers in the program/course, institution, and society at large, incorporated throughout the leadership program?

Metrics, Outcomes, and Assessment

What are the program's metrics, outcomes, assessment strategies, and evaluation processes?

The scope of outcomes represented by education programs focused on learning “leadership” is large. Some programs are designed to support the development of their participants into leaders in specific contexts such as women in leadership programs and faith-based programs. Others embrace a broader leadership learning curriculum. Some programs provide more emphasis on the “study” of the concept of leadership, where understanding application goes hand-in-hand with evaluating the current state of the field and adding new knowledge within it. Some programs rely heavily on social science while others provide a stronger foundation in the humanities. The effective assessment and evaluation of leadership programs, therefore, begins with an explicit understanding and listing of goals and outcomes. These goals and outcomes encompass both the level of the individual learner as well as the program itself. In this way, leadership programs strive to illustrate the measurable impact of their interventions. Moreover, program officers need to focus on the program successes and learn from failures.

Effective leadership learning requires explicit, transparent, and concrete outcomes, and these outcomes need to be regularly assessed with the goal of continuous programmatic improvement. In addition, these processes inform all relevant stakeholders – program architects, university administrators, program participants, financial donors, etc. – with information regarding the success of the program's efforts.

The ILA does not endorse any specific outcomes for leadership learning as more preferable than others. This concept paper serves as a compass – ensuring that program assessment officers advance

in a direction that supports the program's specific goals and objectives, and not as a detailed blueprint to follow when building one's assessment efforts.

Outcomes associated with leadership learning may be cognitive, affective, and behavioral. What is most important is that they are transparent. Prospective participants should know what the program intends for them to accomplish through participating. In their stated outcomes, programs need to be explicit about how they define leadership, the environmental contexts for which the program prepares participants; and the specific goals the program intends to achieve.

Program outcomes should be embedded in a similarly transparent process of assessment and evaluation that results in continuous quality improvement. This process needs to be consistently enacted within the program development cycle, in which outcomes are assessed after the activity (e.g., courses, workshops, conferences). Further, these assessments are used to inform improvements to stated outcomes as well as program initiatives designed to achieve those outcomes. Participants themselves are at the heart of contributing to assessment efforts.

Although the method of assessment may vary (e.g., self-assessment, behavioral observation, capstone projects, comprehensive examination), they must provide meaningful information that align with the stated program goals and outcomes.

Using an outcomes and assessment cycle, program officers respond to the following questions for efforts that exist within their programs:

- i. Does the program utilize a cycle of assessment, evaluation, and decision-making for a continual cycle of improvement based on the program's stated outcomes?
- ii. Is the assessment process for data collection clear?
- iii. Do the processes for evaluation and decision-making involve key constituencies?
- iv. Does decision-making inform continued improvement in developing curriculum and outcomes?
- v. Does the program utilize assessment and evaluation cycles for individual learning outcomes, initiatives, as well as the overall program outcomes?
- vi. Does the program also take into consideration campus-level goals and outcomes (e.g., mission, values, and vision)?
- vii. Does the program consider its context within the broader society in its assessment and evaluation efforts?
- viii. How does the program communicate the results of its assessment and evaluation cycles to relevant stakeholders, including participants and the general public?

Next Steps for the Implementation of the ILA Leadership General Principles

The Task Force recognizes that the field of Leadership Studies, like any other discipline in higher education, is always evolving and expanding its knowledge in research, theory, and practice. Leadership learning is not a simple and unidimensional enterprise; it is the product of multiple factors that may be unique to each institution or organization. The word “standards,” therefore, does not connote an immovable bar or one model that fits all. The general principles outlined in this concept paper are designed to serve as a compass to guide new and existing leadership programs toward continuous quality improvement. The principles encourage program designers to aim high through providing rigorous and intentional leadership learning opportunities for their participants.

As a living document, the principles and related guiding questions should be reviewed regularly and periodically. These leadership program principles, therefore, should be adapted to reflect new challenges over time.

As a global initiative, these principles also are intended for new or existing programs within any cultural context. While the implementation will be mindful of local traditions and specific cultural norms and values, the general principles in this concept paper are intended to be broad enough to capture the essence of leadership learning across cultures. The guiding questions within each of the five categories encourage self-reflection and intentional steps in program development and assessment.

Finally, the Task Force invites users of this document to disseminate these standards widely. This concept paper is designed to be shared, discussed, and improved upon. The Leadership Studies community is growing at a rapid pace. It is through these discussions that the field will not only establish its rightful place in leadership learning, but will also make a positive impact on the quality of leadership worldwide.

References

The Task Force recognizes that these suggested references are not exhaustive. This list of references serves as a resource for anyone who would like to delve deeper into using the concept paper to develop or refine their programs. This list also will be available on the ILA website and members will have the opportunity to continually update resources.

- Allen, K. E., & Cherry, C. (2000). *Systemic leadership: Enriching the meaning of our work*. University Press of America.
- Allio, R. J. (2005). Leadership development: Teaching versus learning. *Management Decision*, 43, 1071–1077.
- Alvarez de M3n, S. (2009), *El mito del l3der*. Deusto.
- Andenoro, A. C., Allen, S. J., Haber-Curran, P., Jenkins, D. M., Sowcik, M., Dugan, J. P., & Osteen, L. (2013). National leadership education research agenda 2013-2018: Providing strategic direction for the field of leadership education. Retrieved from Association of Leadership Educators website: <http://leadershipeducators.org/ResearchAgenda>.
- Avolio, B. J., & Hannah, S. T. (2008). Developmental readiness: Accelerating leadership development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 60(4), 331–347.
- Bass, B., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bertrand Jones, T., Guthrie, K. L., & Osteen, L. (2016). Critical domains of culturally relevant leadership learning: A call to transform leadership programs. In K. L. Guthrie, T. Bertrand Jones, & L. Osteen (Eds.), *Developing culturally relevant leadership learning* (pp. 9–22). Jossey-Bass.
- Blasco, M. (2012). Aligning the hidden curriculum of management education with PRME: An inquiry-based framework. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3), 364-388.
- Boyd, B. L., Getz, C. A., & Guthrie, K. L. (2019). Preparing the leadership educator through graduate preparation. In K. L. Priest & D. M. Jenkins (Eds.), *Becoming and being a leadership educator* (pp. 105-121). Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Collinson, D., & Tourish, D. (2015). Teaching leadership critically: New directions for leadership pedagogy. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 14, 576-594.

- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2019). Leadership education and development. Fort Lauderdale, FL.
- Dugan, J.P., Kodama, C., & Correia, C. (2013). *Multi-institutional study of leadership insight report: Leadership program deliver*. National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Edwards, G. P., Elliott, C., Iszatt-White, M., & Schedlitzki, D. (2013). Critical and alternative approaches to leadership learning and development. *Management Learning*, 44, 3-10.
- Edwards, G.P., & Turnbull, S. (2013). Towards a cultural approach to evaluating leadership development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 15(1): 46-60.
- Eich, D. (2008). A grounded theory of high-quality leadership programs: Perspectives from student leadership programs in higher education. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 176–187.
- Endersby, L., Phelps, K., & Jenkins, D. (2017). The virtual table: A framework for online teamwork, collaboration, and communication. In J. Ahlquist, & L. Endersby (Eds.), *Going digital in student learning* (pp. 75-88). Jossey-Bass.
- Fink, L. D. (2013). *Creating significant learning experiences*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Garrett, J. M., & Camper, J. M. (2015). Formative assessment as an effective leadership learning tool. In J. E. Owen (Ed.), *Innovative learning for leadership development* (pp. 97-106). Jossey-Bass.
- Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-technology fit and individual performance. *MIS Quarterly*, 19, 213–236.
- Guthrie, K. L., Bertrand Jones, T., & Osteen, L. (Eds.). (2016). *New directions for student leadership: No. 152. Developing culturally relevant leadership learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Guthrie, K. L., & Jenkins, D. M. (2018). *The role of leadership educators: Transforming learning*. Information Age Publishing.
- Haber-Curran, P., & Tillapaugh, D. W. (2015). Student-centered transformative learning in leadership education: An examination of the teaching and learning process. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 13(1), 65-84.
- Harvey, M., & Riggio, R. (2011). *Leadership studies: the dialogue of disciplines*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hawkins, B., & Edwards, G. (2015). Liminality and threshold concepts and leadership learning: An initial exploration. *Management Learning*, 46, 24-43.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers*

- of leading*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development*. (3rd ed.). University of Los Angeles.
- Iszatt-White, M., Kempster, S., & Carroll, B. (2017). An educator's perspective on reflexive pedagogy: Identity undoing and issues of power. *Management Learning*, 48(5), 582-596
- Janke, K. K., Nelson, M. H., Bzowyckyj, A. S., Fuentes, D. G., Rosenberg, E., & DiCenzo, R. (2016). Deliberate integration of student leadership development in doctor of pharmacy programs. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 80(1), 2.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2020). What the best leadership educators do: A sequential explanatory mixed methods study of instructional and assessment strategy use in leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 19(4), 37-53.
- Jenkins, D. M. (2019). Exploring the lived experiences of becoming and being a leadership educator: A phenomenological inquiry. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 18(3), 141-157.
- Jenkins, D. M., & Allen, S. A. (2017). Aligning instructional strategies with learning outcomes and leadership competencies. In C. Seemiller (Ed.), *A competency-based approach to student leadership development* (pp. 43-58). Jossey-Bass.
- Keating, K., Rosch, D., & Burgoon, L. (2014). Developmental readiness for leadership: The differential effects of leadership courses on creating "Ready, willing, and able" leaders. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(3), 1-16.
- Kegan, R. & Lahey, L.L. (2001). *How the way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kellerman, B. (2018). *Professionalizing leadership*. Oxford University Press.
- Kellerman, B. (2010). *Leadership: essential selections on power, authority, and influence*. McGraw-Hill.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: what it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Khanna, P. (2016). *Connectography: Mapping the future of global civilization*. Random House.
- Komives, S. R. (2011). Advancing leadership education. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, C. Slack, & W. Wagner (Eds.), *The handbook for student leadership development 2nd Ed.* (pp. 1-34). Jossey-Bass.

- Komives, S. R., & Smedick, W. (2012). Using standards to develop student learning outcomes. In K. Guthrie, L. Osteen, & Associates. Developing students' leadership capacity. *New Directions for Student Services* #140 (pp. 77-88). Jossey-Bass.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge*. Jossey-Bass.
- Llano Cifuentes, C. & Polo, L. (1997), *Antropología de la Acción Directiva*. Madrid: Unión.
- Llano Cifuentes, C. (2004), *Humildad y Liderazgo*. México: Ruz.
- Lasley, J., & Jenkins, D. M. (2020). The power of holding environments and facilitation skills to promote psychological safety in leadership education. *Proceedings of the 2020 Association of Leadership Educators Annual Conference*, 151-158.
- London, M. (2003). *Job feedback: Giving, seeking, and using feedback for performance improvement*. Psychology Press.
- Mahoney, A. D. (2016). Culturally responsive integrative learning environments: A critical displacement approach. In K. L. Guthrie, T. Bertrand Jones, & L. Osteen (Eds.), *Developing culturally relevant leadership learning* (pp. 47–60). Jossey-Bass.
- McGrath, J. E., & Berdahl, J. L. (1998). Groups, technology and time: Use of computers for collaborative work. *Social psychological applications to social issues*, 205-228.
- Owen, J. E. (2012). Using student development theories as conceptual frameworks in leadership education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2012(140), 17-35.
- Perruci, G., & Hall, S. (2018). *Teaching leadership: Bridging theory and practice*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Pinker, S. (2018). *Enlightenment now: The case for reason, science, humanism, and progress*. Penguin Random House.
- Priest, K. L., & Jenkins, D. M. (Eds.). (2019). *New Directions for Student Leadership: No. 164. Being and becoming leadership educators*. Jossey-Bass.
- Raymer, S. D., Dobbs, J., Kelley, C. P., & Lindsay, D. R. (2018). Leadership education and development: Theory driven evolutions. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 17(2), 138-148.
- Reichard, R. J., & Walker, D. O. (2016). In pursuit: Mastering leadership through leader developmental readiness. In R. J. Reichard & S. E. Thompson (Eds.), *Leader developmental readiness: Pursuit of leadership excellence* (pp. 15–25). Jossey Bass.
- Riggio, R. (Ed.). (2019). *What's wrong with leadership? Improving leadership research and practice*. Routledge.

IIA - General Principles for Leadership Programs, Concept Paper 2021

- Roberts, D.C. (Ed.). (1981). *Student leadership programs in higher education*. American College Personnel Association.
- Roberts, D. C. (2007). *Deeper learning in leadership: Helping college students find the potential within*. Wiley.
- Roberts, D. C. & Roberts, D. L. (Eds.). (2018). *New directions for student leadership, No. 160. Cultivating students' capacity for international leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Rosch, D. M., Collier, D. A., & Zehr, S. M. (2014). Self-vs.-Teammate Assessment of Leadership Competence: The Effects of Gender, Leadership Self-Efficacy, and Motivation to Lead. *Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(2), 96-124.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the 21st century*. Praeger.
- Seemiller, C., & Whitney, R. (2020) Creating a taxonomy of leadership competency development. *Journal of Leadership Education, 19*(1), 119-132.
- Stover, S., & Seemiller, C. (2017). Moving Students to Deeper Learning in Leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education, 16*(4), 40-59.
- Svinicki, M. D., & McKeachie, W. J. (2014). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers* (14th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Wisniewski, M. A. (2010). Leadership and the Millennials: Transforming today's technological teens in tomorrow's leaders. *Journal of Leadership Education, 9*(1), 53–68.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Becoming a self-regulated learner: which are the key subprocesses? *Contemporary Educational Psychology 11*, 307–313.

Biographies of Task Force Members



Ahmed Abdel-Meguid

Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Administration, Associate Professor of Accounting, The American University in Cairo School of Business, Cairo, Egypt
a_meguid@aucegypt.edu

Extended bio: <https://www.aucegypt.edu/fac/ahmedabdel-meguid>

Bio

Abdel-Meguid is a tenured associate professor of Accounting and the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Administration at the American University in Cairo (AUC) School of Business (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA accredited). He teaches financial accounting and auditing courses. His research focuses on audit quality, corporate governance, and earnings quality.



Prince A. Attah, Ph.D.

Associate Professor and Director, Doctoral Program in Organization Leadership
University of Maryland Eastern Shore, Maryland, United States
paattoh@umes.edu

[No link for extended bio]

Bio

Attah received his Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Adult Education from Nova Southeastern University in Fort Lauderdale, FL. He teaches Research Methods, Organizational/Leadership theories & Cross-Cultural Leadership. His recent work is titled: *A Culture of Organizational Grit: Perspective of U.S. Military Officers: A Qualitative Inquiry*.



Yvette Burton

*Business Learning Solutions Architect, Lead Faculty
New York University, New York, New York, US
ycb2002@nyu.edu*

[No link for extended bio]

Bio

Burton is a people strategist and workforce futurist for innovation-based companies, and Professor of Practice Emeritus for Columbia University. She is also New York University Lead Instructor for the Division of Business' Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Program. Her specializations include: business transformation, organization effectiveness, work-based learning solutions, strategic workforce planning, talent management strategies. Extensive experience in business strategy development, leadership effectiveness, career development, employee engagement, talent acquisition, and workforce analytics. Her professional experience spans multiple industries including health care, travel and transportation, finance, sports, entertainment, global defense.



Gareth Edwards, Ph.D.

*Professor of Leadership and Community Studies
Bristol Business School, University of the West of England,
England
gareth3.edwards@uwe.ac.uk*

*Extended bio:
<https://people.uwe.ac.uk/Person/Gareth3Edwards>*

Bio

Gareth's research focus is on community perspectives and interpretations on leadership. He also has a longstanding interest in researching and developing creative and innovative approaches to leadership learning and development. He is a Fellow of The Leadership Trust and an Associate Fellow of the British Psychological Society (BPS).



Brent Goertzen, Ph.D.

*Professor of Leadership Studies
Fort Hays State University, Kansas, US
bgoertze@fhsu.edu*

Extended bio: <https://www.fhsu.edu/leadership/faculty-and-staff/brent-goertzen/index>

Bio

Goertzen serves as a faculty member and is the director of the Department of Leadership Studies' graduate program. His expertise is in the areas of program development and evaluation, pedagogy such as service-learning, and leadership in team dynamics. Brent teaches classes such as Fieldwork in Leadership Studies, Qualitative Research Methods and Leadership in Team Dynamics. He has facilitated numerous leadership development workshops including the Small Business Development Center, and the civilian workforce at Fort Riley.



Kathy Guthrie, Ph.D.

*Associate Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University, Florida, US
kguthrie@admin.fsu.edu*

Extended bio: <https://education.fsu.edu/faculty-and-staff/dr-kathy-guthrie>

Bio

Guthrie is faculty in higher education and serves as the director of the Leadership Learning Research Center at Florida State University. Guthrie has authored, co-authored, and co-edited over 50 publications on leadership learning and higher education. She serves as the associate editor of the *New Directions in Student Leadership* series.



Sadhana Warty Hall, MPH, MA. Co-Chair Task Force

*Deputy Director, The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center for Public Policy and the Social Sciences, Dartmouth College
New Hampshire, US
sadhana.w.hall@dartmouth.edu*

Extended bio: <https://rockefeller.dartmouth.edu/person/sadhana-hall>

Bio

Hall designs, implements, and oversees leadership programs at the Rockefeller Center for undergraduate students. She is on the senior management team of the Center. She has lived and worked in several countries and in the United States. She has co-authored *Teaching Leadership: Bridging Theory and Practice* and is currently completing *Leadership Blueprints: Adopt, Adapt, Adjust*.



Brigitte Harris, Ph.D.

*Professor and Dean, Faculty of Social and Applied Sciences
Royal Roads University, Victoria, BC Canada
Brigitte.3harris@royalroads.ca*

Extended bio: <https://www.royalroads.ca/people/brigitte-harris>

Bio

Harris is Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Social and Applied Sciences at Royal Roads University. She recently led a large action research project with educators to develop the university's teaching, learning and research framework (<http://ctet.royalroads.ca/learning-teaching-research-model>), which prepares students to lead positive change to address significant challenges.



Mikinari Higano, Ph.D.

*Professor and Leadership Education Curricula Consultant
Waseda University, Japan
mhigano@gmail.com*

[No link for extended bio]

Bio

Higano established the very first academic leadership program in Japan for undergraduate students at Rikkyo University in 2006. In 2016, he moved to Waseda University and set up another program to start from scratch. Now he consults with more than ten colleges on the introduction of leadership education.



Brad Jackson, Ph.D.

*Professor of Leadership and Governance, Associate Dean of
Strategic Engagement
Waikato University, Hamilton, New Zealand
brad.jackson@waikato.ac.nz*

Extended bio: <https://www.waikato.ac.nz/staff-profiles/people/bradj>

Bio

Prior to joining the University of Waikato, Jackson was the Professor of Social Innovation at Griffith University; Professor of Public and Community Leadership at Victoria University of Wellington; and Co-Director of the New Zealand Leadership Institute at the University of Auckland. He is a former Vice-Chair of the International Leadership



Dan Jenkins, Ph. D.

Chair and Associate Professor of Leadership & Organizational Studies

University of Southern Maine, Maine, US
daniel.m.jenkins@maine.edu

Extended bio: <https://usm.maine.edu/lewiston-auburn-college/daniel-jenkins>

Bio

Jenkins is faculty in leadership and organizational studies and has published over 40 articles and book chapters on leadership education. Additionally, Jenkins is a Co-Chair/Founder of the ILA's Leadership Education Academy, Vice-Chair of the Collegiate Leadership Competition, co-host of the [Leadership Educator Podcast](#), and an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Leadership Studies*.



Joanne Lawrence

Professor of Practice

Hult International Business School, Boston, Massachusetts, US
joanne.lawrence@faculty.hult.edu

Extended bio: <https://www.hult.edu/en/faculty/faculty-profile/?cid=0033600000J3voIAAR>

Bio

With more than 35 years of international corporate, consulting and academic experience, Lawrence focuses on developing globally-minded, transformative leaders who can ethically and effectively leverage resources to achieve both social and economic impact. She teaches on all Hult campuses, oversees Hult Case Publishing, is an academic partner of the UN Development Program (UNDP), a Trustee of the Case Centre, and has served as an academic co-advisor to the UN Global Compact, Prior to Hult, she taught at INSEAD.



Carla Ortega, Ph.D.

Postdoctoral Fellow in Leader Development at the Doerr Institute for New Leaders

Rice University, Texas, US

carla.ortega.santori@rice.edu

Extended bio: <https://doerr.rice.edu/people/ricestaff/carla-ortega-santori>

Bio

Ortega manages the Leadership Carnegie Classification in partnership with the Carnegie Foundation and over 80 scholars and practitioners across the nation. At the Doerr Institute, she collaborates with the Leader Development unit to produce evidence-based multi session workshops that aim to develop essential leader skills. Her past experience includes developing learning and development strategies, project management, and employee recruitment.



Gama Perruci, Ph.D. Co-Chair, Task Force

Dean of the McDonough Center for Leadership and Business and McCoy Professor of Leadership Studies

Marietta College, Ohio, US

perruciq@marietta.edu

Extended bio: <https://www.marietta.edu/person/gama-perruci>

Bio

Perruci is the author of *Global Leadership* (Routledge, 2018) and the co-author of *Teaching Leadership: Bridging Theory and Practice* (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018) and *Understanding Leadership* (Second Edition, Routledge, 2019). He is also the Past Chair of the International Leadership Association, Inc., Board of Directors. Perruci has a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Florida.

Dennis C. Roberts, Ph.D.



*Independent Consultant for New Dimensions in Education
Chicago, Illinois, US
dcroberts48@gmail.com*

Extended bio: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/denny-roberts-0b97933/>

Bio

Roberts last served as Assistant Vice President of Education for Qatar Foundation and previously as Associate Vice President of Student Affairs at Miami University. A member of the ILA from its founding, former President of the American College Personnel Association, and has contributed to leadership literature over many years.



David Rosch, Ph.D.

*Director and Associate Professor in the Agricultural Leadership,
Education, and Communications Program
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, US
dmrosch@illinois.edu*

Extended bio: <https://alec.illinois.edu/directory/dmrosch>.

Bio

Rosch serves as the Director and Associate Professor in the Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications Program at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, US. He also currently serves as the Editor of the Journal of Campus Activities Practice and Scholarship.



Adrián Ruíz de Chávez, Ph.D.

*Director, Center for Leadership Research
Anahuac University, Mexico City, Mexico
Adrian.ruizdechavez@anahuac.mx*

*Extended bio in Spanish:
<https://www.anahuac.mx/mexico/EscuelasyFacultades/economia/me/AdrianR>*

Bio

Ruíz de Chávez is a leadership consultant and educator for more than 9,000 top and middle managers in business, government and social organizations. Currently, he serves as director of the Center for Leadership Research at Anahuac University in Mexico City. He holds a PhD in Philosophy and two masters degrees, in Business Management and Sociology. His first degree is in Industrial Engineering.



Oliver Jonathan Jerome Seale, Ph.D.

*Director of the Higher Education Leadership and Management
Programme
Universities South Africa (USAf), South Africa
oliver@usef.ac.za*

[No link for extended bio]

Bio

Seale is a leadership development specialist, lecturer and researcher. He is the Director of the Higher Education Leadership and Management (HELM) program at Universities South Africa (USAf). Seale has extensive experience in strategic planning, change management, business development, program/project management, relationship and stakeholder management in various organizational environments. He holds a PhD in Leadership Development from the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa and has published various academic papers on university leadership, management, deanship and leadership development.



Kerstin Soderlund, Ph.D.

Associate Dean for Student & External Affairs at the Jepson School of Leadership University of Richmond, Virginia, US
ksoderlu@richmond.edu

Extended bio:
<https://jepson.richmond.edu/faculty/bios/ksoderlu/>

Bio

Soderlund oversees the school's admission process, coordinates community based learning, collaborates with community partners, coordinates the internship process and teaches the internship seminar, teaches introductory leadership studies courses and coordinates school assessment initiatives. She has extensive experience in curricular and co-curricular programming. She received her Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, VA, her M.Ed. in Counseling Psychology from Rutgers University in New Brunswick, NJ.



Gayle Spencer

Director of the Illinois Leadership Center University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, US
gspencer@illinois.edu

[No link for extended bio]

Bio

Spencer has over 35 years of experience working in higher education. Spencer is the Director of the Illinois Leadership Center. Spencer served as the Chair of the National Association for Campus Activities She serves on the Council for Advancement of Standards (CAS) for Higher Education and chaired the CAS review of the Student Leadership Programs Standards, released in 2020.