W.K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

Evaluating Outcomes and Impacts:

A Scan of 55 Leadership Development Programs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

_____

Please feel free to contact us at:

Development Guild/DDI, Inc.
233 Harvard Street, Suite 107
Brookline, MA 02446
617-277-2112
creinelt@developmentguild.com
www.developmentguild.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

The Kellogg Foundation asked the Development Guild/DDI to undertake this scan with the hope that it would shine some light on how various leadership development programs are evaluating the impact. We hope you will find the scan informative whether you run or fund a leadership development program, are a participant in this kind of training or just have a general interest in the topic.

From the scan, Development Guild/DDI identified several topics for future research and action. We offer them here to encourage others to think about how the leadership development field can work collaboratively to improve its ability to learn about program impact and share that learning with others.

Sharing and Disseminating Tools and Learning From Evaluations

Funders, program staff, and evaluators should consider ways in which they can share their learning with the broader field, particularly their outcomes and indicators; their approaches; their methods and sources of information; their evaluation tools; their reflections and lessons learned about leadership and leadership development; and their thoughts about the evaluation process and how evaluation was or was not useful to them.

Sharing survey tools might be a good place to start. Designing a survey tool can be quite time consuming. Having other surveys to use as a model would be an asset for programs and evaluators. Sharing surveys also would enable programs to begin to understand the ways in which their intended outcomes are similar to those of other programs, and in what ways they may be different.

A data bank of knowledge would be one way to create a place that everyone in the field can draw on to improve their capacity to evaluate the effectiveness and the impact of their programs. The Leadership Learning Community has created a website that invites people to upload their learning and information to the site.

Developing a Shared Learning Agenda

Those who fund, run, evaluate, and study leadership programs might consider developing a shared learning agenda. Currently, learning is driven by questions that each program decides. Programs have many more questions about their programs and their impact than they can possibly afford to evaluate. Some programs are exploring some of the same questions and coming up with many of the same answers. Figuring out what we already know about developing leadership and its impact, and where the gaps in our knowledge are, might enable the field to better allocate its evaluation resources to learning that will advance our collective knowledge.

For instance, there is a lot of knowledge about how leadership programs impact individuals; we have far less knowledge about impact on organizations, communities, fields, and systems. Regarding individual outcomes, we know more about the skills, capacities and knowledge that individuals have learned, and the changes in attitudes and perceptions that have occurred, more than we know about the mastery of leadership over time and the process of developing as a leader.

Developing Shared Assessment Tools

One future task might be the development of assessment tools that could be used across leadership programs. There are significant areas of overlapping interest among programs, and the data generated from this scan can serve to begin experimenting with shared survey tools. If these assessment tools were available on-line they would be easily accessible to programs and their participants, and could be adapted to meet the needs of each program. A further benefit of an on-line assessment tool would be a shared database of information and learning about leadership and leadership development across programs.

It is our hope that those who fund, run, and evaluate leadership program will work together to better leverage the knowledge that now exists and focus our mutual learning in ways that will benefit all of us and those we serve.

Rick Foster
Vice-President for Programs
W.K. Kellogg Foundation
August, 2002

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has had a long history of investing in leadership development and in learning from its leadership programming.[1] In recent years the Foundation has moved from investing in leadership as a distinct and separate endeavor to integrating leadership into the programming of all its strategic initiatives. Along with this shift came a change in thinking about leadership as primarily an individual capacity to leadership as a process in community with others. These changes have been accompanied by questions from the Foundation's leadership team about how to evaluate the impact of leadership programs and convincingly demonstrate their impact. Challenged by its own evaluation efforts, the Foundation had a desire to learn from others in the field about how they were learning to evaluate program impact.

Another important context for this project was the formation of the Leadership Learning Community (LLC). The Leadership Learning Community brings together people who fund, run, study and provide services to leadership programs in order to promote mutual learning and the development of leadership that has a capacity to achieve positive social impact. One of the primary issues that drew LLC together was the question of how to design, implement and effectively use evaluation (1) to make the case for the impact that leadership programs are having, and (2) to support programs to make improvements that increase their effectiveness. Since its formal launch in 2001, LLC has convened diverse groups of participants to discuss the outcomes that programs are trying to achieve, indicators and measures of success, evaluation strategies, methods, accomplishments, and challenges. Founded by a Kellogg Fellow and supported by WKKF and other foundations, LLC has been an important advocate for collective learning, and for evaluation as a valuable learning vehicle.

Development Guild/DDI, a consulting firm with a commitment to supporting nonprofits and foundations to build their capacity and learn from their efforts, has been actively supporting both WKKF and LLC to capture and document knowledge about leadership programming. We have a particular interest in how programs are capturing, documenting, and evaluating impact. We believe that by enhancing this knowledge programs will be more effective, more knowledgeable about how to catalyze change, and more capable of sustaining that change over time.

In the last four years, more foundations have been investing in developing leadership capable of catalyzing and sustaining change. A wealth of leadership programs exist, supporting individuals, organizations, and communities to promote changes that will move us towards a more inclusive and just society and world.

Leadership programs have many theories about how their programs lead to change. Broadly speaking these programs include fellowship programs, individual skill-building programs, social entrepreneurial programs, community service programs, pipeline programs, organizational development programs, community-based, grassroots leadership programs, and issue and/or field-based programs. There have been several efforts to categorize leadership programs by approach.[2]

Leadership programs articulate and pursue a wide diversity of outcomes depending on the focus of change the program has and the types of activities the program implements. Appendices D-H provide an overview of these outcomes. Despite the diversity of desired outcomes, programs tended to evaluate and report on outcomes related primarily to individual and group leadership development. Increased competencies such as collaboration, cultural competence, and communication; personal transformation including increased self-awareness, confidence, and broader thinking; relationship building, such as enhanced professional networks, communities of practice, and collaborations are widely demonstrated outcomes of leadership programs.

This scan intends to map the outcome terrain for change-oriented leadership programs. Funders and those who run programs will benefit from understanding the range of outcomes that programs are seeking and where particular programs are focusing their efforts and fit within the larger context.

---

[1]Some of those programs include the Kellogg National Fellowship Program, the Kellogg International Leadership Program, Agricultural Leadership Development Programs, Community Health Scholars Program, the Flemming Fellows Program, and Grassroots leadership Development Programs.
[2]"A Conceptual Map of Leadership Models" available at www.leadershiplearning.org and "Briefing Paper: The Potential for Leadership Programming" available at www.calendow.org.

The scan provides an overview of evaluation approaches that programs are using to capture, document, and evaluate leadership outcomes. Some people interviewed were uncomfortable using the term "evaluation" to describe what they did, and instead preferred to use the term "learning." "Evaluation" in this context is broadly defined to include any coordinated set of learning activities that is intended to provide information and knowledge about experiences and effects related to a particular program.

Programs have different purposes for learning that influence the evaluation approach they will choose. Some programs make reflection, evaluation and learning deeply integral to the program itself. Program participants may be actively engaged in keeping journals, developing portfolios, taking self-assessments and learning from the assessments that others make of them. Programs also may promote participatory evaluation in which participants contribute to the design, implementation, and interpretation of data from the evaluation. At other times, programs may engage in learning by hiring a consultant to conduct an evaluation or learning project. All of these learning approaches yield valuable knowledge, and when used in combination, have multiple benefits for participants, programs, and funders. The report highlights these different evaluation approaches.

An overview of the methods of learning that were most commonly used is discussed. Methods are the means of gathering information or data. Different methods yield different information. For instance, surveys are particularly useful for gathering similar data from across participants in a program. This data is easily quantifiable and provides statistics about the program's impact and effectiveness. Nearly every program used more than one method for learning, and often three or four methods were used in order to get a fuller picture of program impact.

The sources of information that programs and evaluators are relying upon were examined. By far the most common source of information are the participants themselves; however, we found many other sources of information that programs are using to validate what they learn from participants and to provide another perspective on the impact programs are having for organizations, communities, and fields. Using multiple sources is also common practice for leadership program evaluations. Programs that over-rely on any single source of information have a more difficult time making a case for impact. This is particularly true when that source is the participant.

It is the Foundation's hope that this scan will encourage the leadership development field to enhance its knowledge and practice of evaluations focused on impact. This baseline information may serve as a catalyst for the field to explore and develop innovative models and approaches for evaluating leadership development that will yield invaluable information for those who are supporting leaders to be change agents.

METHODOLOGY

With the help of the WKKF Leadership Team and the Leadership Learning Community, over 80 programs were identified and contacted to participate in this scan. The criteria used to identify programs are described in Appendix A. Of those 80 programs, substantive contact was made with 55 programs. (A complete list of these programs and the people we interviewed may be found in Appendix B.) For each of these programs materials were reviewed and/or held conversations with program staff, evaluators, and, in some cases, with foundation staff that oversee the running or evaluation of leadership programs. In a number of cases, more than one person involved in the program (e.g., program director and evaluator) was interviewed to gain a fuller understanding of the evaluation process.

The focus of this study was impact evaluation. Not included in the review of materials or discussions with stakeholders, were issues related to process evaluation, for example the effectiveness of the program's design and implementation.[3] The purpose of the interviews were to explore how programs were assessing their impact, the outcomes they hoped to achieve, indicators of success they had identified, approaches they used for evaluation and learning, and methods and sources of information they relied on. Additionally, questions were asked about the evaluation challenges that were being encountered, and what learning needs were not being met. A full description of the methodology and a sample of the questions explored may be found in Appendix C.

---

[3] Future studies may want to consider more fully how program activities do or do not produce the desired outcomes, and what constitutes a successful program design. For some emerging thoughts on this topic see "Emerging Wisdom in Program Design, 'Successful Designs, Innovations, Cautions, and Challenges,'" www.leadershiplearning.org.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

The Kellogg Foundation recently published a *Logic Model Development Guide* that defines outcomes and impact. Outcomes are the specific changes in attitudes, behavior, knowledge, skills, status, or level of functioning expected to result from program activities.[4] Outcomes may be short-term (1-3 years) or long-term (4-6 years). Impact refers to the results expected 7-10 years after an activity is underway – the future social change a program is working to create.[5]

Program directors are frequently being asked to provide outcome and impact data for their programs, and in many cases, feel frustrated with the lack of resources they have to invest in collecting this data, their knowledge about how to conduct impact evaluations, and the multiple demands on their time which too often make focusing on evaluation a low priority. Almost all interviewees reported an interest in pursuing, or have already undertaken, some type of outcome evaluation. Typically the focus is on short-term outcomes, for example outcomes that occur in the course of the program or by its conclusion. Few programs have developed logic models that link short-term outcomes, long-term outcomes and impact, although some are beginning to think through these relationships. There is increasing interest among programs to conduct retrospective evaluations that look at outcomes that persist or evolve over time. Still, there are no known well-developed theories of leadership development that are grounded in what is being learned through program evaluation.

Programs articulate a set of outcomes depending on the changes they hope to achieve. Despite the uniqueness of each program, a wide similarity exists in the types of outcomes that are being evaluated. This section highlights some of the key outcomes that programs are documenting about their leadership programs. Outcomes were organized according to the focus of desired change. A program may seek individual, organizational, community, field or systems change. The choice to focus on these domains of impact emerged from the review of evaluations, from work with LLC, and from frameworks developed by colleagues at the Center for Creative Leadership and the Population Leadership Program.[6]

KEY FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES

- *Increased demand for and focus on evaluating outcomes and impact*. Leadership programs reported being frequently asked to document the outcomes and impacts of their programs. While many programs are capturing some outcome data, there are widespread feelings that more focus on evaluating outcomes and impact is needed in order to demonstrate effectively the impact that programs are having.

- *Systematically linking program activities and intended outcomes and impact*. Few leadership programs have developed a theory of change that explicitly links program activities to short-term and long-term outcomes and impact. While a theory of change is only one approach to program planning and evaluation, complex initiatives with multiple desired impacts have found this approach valuable, as have leadership programs that have used it.[7]

- *Aligning outcomes with program activities*. Most leadership programs have a primary focus on developing the capacities of individuals. While programs desire to have impacts on organizations, communities, fields, and/or systems, these are much less frequently documented because the links between individual changes and changes in organizations, communities, fields, and/or systems are not well established.

- *Focusing on short-term outcomes*. Short-term outcomes are much more frequently evaluated than long-term impacts because they may be captured at the conclusion of the program when most evaluations are conducted.

- *Barriers to conducting impact evaluations*. Lack of resources for evaluating outcomes and impact was the most frequently reported reason that programs did not undertake this learning. Other reasons included that evaluation did not rise to the top of the list of program priorities, and people lacked knowledge about how to evaluate impact effectively.

---

[4] See *WKKF Logic Model Development Guide*. Similar definitions may be found in *United Way's Measuring Outcomes: A Practical Approach for Definitions of Outcomes and Impact*.
[5] IBID. *Logic Model Development Guide*
[6] While no widely used framework exists for evaluating leadership program impacts, several groups are beginning to explore and articulate frameworks. See the Population Leadership Program's EvaluLead Framework, CCL's *Handbook of Leadership Development*, and the Leadership Learning Community's LAMPS model.
[7] See Aspen Institute, New *Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, and the Center for Assessment and Policy Development's evaluation of Eureka Communities.

Individuals are the primary focus of change for nearly every leadership program. The development of skills and knowledge; changes in attitudes, perspectives and behavior; and clarification of values and beliefs are all possible outcomes for individuals who participate in leadership programs. Longer-term outcomes are the leadership paths that individuals pursue and the relationships that support them in their work. Appendix D identifies the most common individual outcome categories in the study and some of the indicators that programs track. The report offers some observations about how programs are evaluating individual outcomes.

Changes in Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, and Perceptions

Individual outcomes, especially the acquisition of new knowledge and skills, and changes in attitudes and perceptions, are widely captured by leadership program evaluations, especially those that have occurred in the course of the program. These outcomes can be documented through surveys and interviews.

What is more difficult to assess is how new knowledge, skills, attitudes and perceptions are deepened and applied over time. This requires longitudinal evaluations and an evaluation framework that articulates stages of competency or mastery. No leadership program in this scan evaluated leadership development as a process of increasing mastery.

Changes in Behavior

Few evaluations capture changes in leadership behavior. Behavior change is often not an immediate outcome because it takes time to be recognized and valued by others. Retrospective stories that are captured some time after the program is completed are often an effective way of documenting changes in behavior. An example might be the story of leader who had a tendency to do everything alone, and who now recognizes and values working with others.

Important sources of information about changes in leadership behavior are the people with whom a leader interacts on a regular basis, for example, peers, supervisors, direct reports. Three hundred sixty-degree assessments explicitly seek input from co-workers and others who have knowledge of the leader in a particular context to share their perceptions about the leader's behavior. Three hundred sixty-degree assessments are used extensively by the Center for Creative Leadership and Public Allies.

Changes in Values and Beliefs

An impact of leadership programs that is difficult to fully appreciate during the course of the program, but which is frequently reported anecdotally post-program, is the transformation people experience in how they feel "called" to lead. Particularly for those programs that build in a spiritual or reflective component, the process of self-awareness and self-discovery changes how people think about what work they want to do. Programs like the Women's Health Leadership Program, Fetzer Fellows, Flemming Fellows, Healing the Heart of Diversity, and more recent classes of the Kellogg National Fellowship Program all have a strong reflective component that moves people to deeply consider their values and beliefs. The most common approaches for capturing and documenting these changes are "deep interviewing," storytelling, journaling, or case studies.

Leadership Paths
The leadership path that program participants take in their lives upon leaving the program and how their program experiences affect the choices they make, is a key learning from many retrospective evaluations. Often these stories are only captured anecdotally; however several programs have been more systematic in documenting these stories such as KNLP and the Women's Health Leadership Institute. Sometimes leadership paths are defined as movement up a career ladder; other times as sustained commitment to social justice work or to a field; and at still other times, as a commitment to living one's calling or being an authentic leader. Different methods can capture different aspects of a leadership journey. Surveys can identify changes in leadership positions, and whether a person has remained in a field. Deeper changes require methods like interviewing or reflective writing to fully capture their meaning.

Relationships
Some of the most powerful and enduring outcomes of leadership programs are the relationships that are formed between participants in the program. Programs often use surveys to track the frequency and importance of these relationships. Programs ask not only about contact, but also whether they have engaged in collaborative projects with one another. The explosion of alumni programs is another testament to the value that these relationships have. Future leadership program evaluations may want to look at the impact of alumni networks.

Leadership program evaluators may want to consider some of the learning from the field of social network analysis for understanding the power of relationships that develop through leadership programs. In an introduction to an edited collection entitled *Networks in the Global Village*, Barry Wellman discusses what he calls "personal community studies." These studies focus on understanding the composition, patterns and contents of people's networks. Much of this research becomes very technical but may offer concepts and some methods that are applicable to leadership studies.

Organizational Outcomes

Organizational effects are frequently mentioned as desired outcomes for leadership programs, whether the program explicitly structures activities to produce these outcomes, or not. It is not uncommon for individually focused leadership programs to ask participants what impact their learning has had for the organization where they work. The scan results offer a caution to programs about claiming that positive answers to such questions demonstrate organizational impact. A valid assessment of organizational outcomes requires, at a minimum, that there be some additional assessments with people in organizations to learn about effects on the organization that may be correlated with a leader's participation in the program; and more substantively, a longitudinal study that tracks impact over time.

Very few leadership programs in the scan group evaluated organizational capacity as a measure of leadership effectiveness. For most programs, organizational outcomes are secondary. Similarly, organizational capacity-building programs do not often focus on leadership.[8]

In this section, the focus is on leadership programs that have explicit organizational leadership outcomes that can reasonably be expected from their activities. These programs may offer an opportunity for generating knowledge about the role of leadership in building and sustaining organizations. Examples of programs that are building organizational leadership capacity are the New Voices Fellowship Program, Eureka Communities, Michigan Community Foundations Youth Action Project, Echoing Green Foundation Fellows Program, Leadership for Institutional Change, Americorps Leaders Program, Rhode Island Foundation's Leadership Program, and Institute for Education Leadership. A list of organizational outcomes is attached in Appendix E.

Enhancing Organizational Leadership Capacity and Providing Opportunities for Youth

Leadership programs that have an organizational focus are often seeking to create leadership opportunities for young people while at the same time expanding leadership capacity for organizations. The New Voices program is an example of a leadership program that is committed to supporting youth leaders and organizations in the field of human rights by creating opportunities for the organizations to hire a young leader. The evaluation of the program is seeking to document both the contribution that the fellow is making to the organization and the ways in which the organization is supporting the professional development of the fellow. Information is gathered through site visits, and interviews with fellows, mentors and other key staff members of the organization.

Another example of a youth leadership program with organizational effects is the Michigan Community Foundations Youth Action Program. One outcome of this program is bringing more awareness and resources to youth issues within community foundations, transforming how adults think about the leadership capacity of youth, and in some instances, changing organizational priorities and decision-making. Another organizational outcome is the development of young leaders who become a resource for the community. The evaluation tracked to what extent young leaders were asked to sit on boards, make presentations, or provide advice to a community-based organization.

---

[8] Conversation with Kim Hsieh, program director, Packard Foundation

Program Innovation and Expansion

Several leadership programs have identified the development and implementation of new programs as an important outcome, including Echoing Green, Eureka Communities, the California Wellness Foundation's Violence Prevention Initiative Leadership Program, and the Center for Health Leadership and Practice. Evaluations ask fellows whether they have developed and implemented a new program as a result of their participation in the program. A further assessment of the longer-term impact of these programs is not often conducted. An exception is the Echoing Green Foundation, which sought to learn about the social and community impact that organizations founded by fellows had had. In a focus group of Echoing Green fellows, community leaders, and funders, participants were asked to identify indicators of social and community impact. In follow-up surveys and interviews, evaluators documented organizational capacities to have a social impact by exploring their use of various change strategies, and the effectiveness with which they were able to apply those strategies.

Changes in Organizational Functioning

Eureka Communities has evaluated program outcomes along several organizational dimensions, including whether the fellow's organization has refocused its priorities, become more efficient, or changed some organizational process. Other issues that were explored were changes in capacity for strategic planning, human resource development and financial management. The evaluators conducted surveys of fellows; and interviewed fellows, selected organizational staff, community directors, mentors and program observers in each community. The multifaceted approach contributed to the reliability of data that was collected.

Community leadership outcomes are among the most difficult to evaluate. There are several reasons for this. Programs do not benchmark the community's leadership capacity at the outset so it is difficult to determine what impact the program has had. Community leadership programs have tended to focus on bringing together diverse individuals not on addressing particular issues of concern. Shared action agendas often emerge but they take time to implement and evaluate, often well beyond the completion of the program. Community leadership programs often do not have well-articulated theories of change so it is difficult to know what outcomes to look for in the short-term. Some of the more common short-term outcomes that are tracked are: collaborative projects and resources leveraged. Tracking long-term impact requires considerable time and investment in learning.[9]

Programs that have a strong community leadership component are the American Leadership Forum, Blandin Community Leadership Program, CORO, Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative, a collaborative Community Leadership Project (between the Kettering Foundation, National Association for Community Leadership, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation), the Michigan Community Foundations Youth Project, and the Mary Reynolds Babcock Grassroots Leadership Program. A summary of selected community outcomes is attached as Appendix F.

Broadening Leadership Participation

One of the measurable outcomes of community leadership programs is its success in identifying and recruiting leaders who are not "members of the 'leadership elite' or what Sorenson and Hickman have termed 'invisible leaders.'"[10] While these programs do not actively define what constitutes inclusive leadership, they do try to cast a wide net for participants that goes beyond the visible positional leaders in the community. An underlying assumption for some of these programs is that everyone is a leader and citizens from all walks of life need to accept responsibility for problem solving.[11] Implicitly this goal is achieved when the composition of the participants in the program looks differently from the existing leadership in the community. A more in-depth evaluation might look at how inclusive leadership groups solve problems differently.

Collaboration

Enhanced collaborative leadership is a key desired outcome of community-based leadership programs. These programs are characterized by bringing diverse people together to solve community problems. Developing a shared vision and plan of action and working together to implement this plan are often intended program outcomes.

The American Leadership Forum initiated a Collaborative Leadership in Action program. Community teams documented the outcomes of their team efforts in reports. Measures that structured team reports included: changes in community life, such as new policies, concrete environmental improvements, attitude changes, behavior changes, and greater awareness of community issues being addressed; and changes in team capacities such as new resources, more diverse membership, greater recognition and more confident/experienced/skilled leadership.

---

[9] Resources from the United Way and Aspen Roundtable for Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives, while not focused specifically on community leadership capacity, may be valuable in supporting programs to articulate community outcomes and develope tools for capturing or measuring these outcomes. United Way of America, *Achieving and Measuring Community Outcomes: Challenges, Issues, Some Approaches*, April 1999, and Aspen Institute Roundtable on Evaluating Community Initiatives, *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives* have a measures for community research database on their website.

[10] Description of leaders recruited for the Pew Civic Partnership Initiative, see *Crafting a New Design for civic Leadership;* Georgia Sorenson and Gill Hickman, "Invisible Leadership: Acting on Behalf of a Common Purpose," paper presented at the 2001 International Leadership Association meetings.

[11] Janice Lucas, "Developing Leaderful Communities" in *Community Leadership: Community Change Through Public Action*. National Association for community Leadership, 1999.

Another approach used to evaluate collaborative leadership is the case study approach. David Chrislip and Carl Larson used this approach in their book *Collaborative Leadership*.[12] They developed case selection criteria and identified six cases to study in depth. They conducted 15-20 interviews for each case that included people who were involved in and responsible for the collaborative effort, and "observers" – people knowledgeable about the community and the case but not directly involved. After developing a series of hypotheses, they tested these with 46 additional cases. Chrislip and Larson developed an instrument for assessing collaboration that is published in their book *Collaborative Leadership*. It develops indicators for assessing the context of the collaboration, the structure of the collaboration, collaboration members, the collaboration process, and the results of collaboration.

The Pew Partnership Initiative identified skills, competencies and attributes that facilitate effective collaboration. These are outlined in a document available on-line. These were not used to evaluate the collaboration among leaders in the communities selected in the Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative.[13]

The Blandin Community Leadership program retrospective evaluation used collaborative projects that were initiated during or after the program as a measure of impact. Five communities were selected for the evaluation. The evaluators convened group meetings with alumni that included a discussion of the main projects or group activities undertaken since the training. These sessions were followed by face-to-face interviews with alumni and with key informants to explore in-depth these projects and activities.

Collaboration between organizations may be another program outcome. The Michigan Community Foundations Youth Project, for instance, tracks collaborations among community foundations, nonprofits, and Youth Advisory Committees.

---

[12] David Chrislip and Carl Larson, *Collaborative Leadership*
[13] Pew Partnerships, "Collaborative Leadership"
http://www.pew-partnership.org/collableadership/collableadership.html

Fields, or what might also call "communities of practice," has a common focus of shared interest. A shared knowledge base, institutional structures, and associations of practitioners characterize established fields. Emergent fields may not have these features; yet they do have some forums for bringing together like-minded people with a set of shared interests who feel that they can benefit from interacting with one another. The role of leadership in shaping the knowledge base and policy directions of a field is only beginning to emerge as a focus of attention for leadership programs, and hence for evaluation learning.[14]

A number of leadership programs in this study focused on enhancing field leadership capacity. These included Annie E. Casey Foundation's Children and Family Fellowship Program, Zero to Three Leadership Program, Minority Scholars in Health Disparities Program, Robert Wood Johnson's Health Policy Fellowships Program, the California Wellness Foundation's Violence Prevention Leadership Program, Institute for Educational Leadership, and Center for Health Leadership and Practice. Field outcomes are summarized in Appendix G.

Developing Future Leaders in a Field
A number of leadership programs are intentionally broadening and strengthening the capacity of future leaders in their fields (such as public health, children and family, service learning, and the nonprofit sector). Measures of success include increased connection with current leaders in the field, publications and presentations, assuming leadership positions within professional organizations, and speaking out on policy issues. Program participants, mentors/advisers, site staff, and key leaders in the field are frequently sources of information for assessing the capacity of emerging leaders in the field.

Replication of Leadership Programs
One measure of success for programs that have an interest in developing their field's leadership capacity is the replication of leadership programs in other sites. Both the Center for Health Leadership and Practice's Public Health Leadership Institute and the AmeriCorps Leaders Program identified replication as a significant program outcome that builds the leadership capacity of the field. Program replication is not a short-term outcome measure and thus requires time to demonstrate.

Connections and Networking
An important outcome of leadership programs that are building the leadership capacity of those in a field, are the relationships that are developed with others in the program and with experts in the field. The networks that are developed open doors for emerging leaders. The full impact of these relationships and networks has not been well documented, but there is considerable anecdotal evidence about their importance.

Policy Knowledge
There is a particular interest on the part of leadership programs in this arena to develop policy knowledge and expertise in emerging scholars and practitioners. In addition to asking program participants what they have learned, programs often rely on experts in the field as a source of information about the enhanced knowledge and skills that participants have developed that enable them to more effectively address policy issues in their field. Outcomes may include presentations at meetings, hearings and other venues where policy issues are addressed, publications, and media coverage.

---

[14] WKKF has taken a leadership role in catalyzing and transforming fields through leadership development and other activities with its Service Learning and Middle Start initiatives.

Systemic Impacts

Some leadership programs are beginning to articulate systemic impacts, for example, changed public discourse on a topic, public policies that benefit families and communities, institutional cultures and practices that focus on maximizing people's assets and capacities.[15]

Often leadership programs that articulate a systems change impact are part of a strategic initiative that has other component parts. For instance the California Wellness Foundation's Violence Prevention Initiative Leadership Program was part of a larger initiative that had a research program, a policy program, and a community action program. The goal of this initiative was to have a major impact on preventing violence against youth. There is currently an evaluation project underway to capture the outcomes of each of these program components, and to synthesize lessons learned from the initiative. Foundation leaders have struggled to find an evaluation approach that could effectively capture the impact of the program. After investing significant resources in a quantitative study with disappointing results, they are hoping that "telling the story" of the program using case studies and deep interviewing will yield a more meaningful understanding of the program.

Other programs that have a systemic change component that they have articulated but have not yet evaluated are Leadership for a Changing World, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Leadership for Institutional Change, and the Center for Policy Alternative's Flemming Fellows Program. Systemic impacts are summarized in Appendix H.

---

[15] For an interesting discussion of community-based systems change see Beverly Parson's paper Using a Systems Change Approach to Building Communities, available on line at
http://www.muohio.edu/forumscp/policymakers/pdffiles/v2fp.pdf

APPROACHES

Evaluation approaches vary widely and are informed by deeply held assumptions about who should or does produce knowledge, what constitutes valid knowledge, what makes knowledge useful, and so forth. The field of evaluation has some well-defined approaches that are commonly used by leadership programs.[16] In repeated conversations with people who run and evaluate leadership programs there was a desire to expand the range of approaches that are available for evaluating leadership programs. One person noted that we need more holistic and appreciative approaches that open up learning possibilities by enabling us to see what is there and make meaning from what we see. What follows will describe some of the most common evaluation approaches now being implemented.

KEY FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES:

- *Different approaches yield different learning*. The evaluation approach that one chooses to use has an effect on what can be learned. For instance, a critical reflection approach emphasizes the learning process and values highly the ability of participants to articulate what they have learned to themselves and others. A theory of change approach focuses on capturing outcomes that demonstrate or disprove the validity of the program theory. Such an approach would be less interested in capturing, for instance, the nuances of leadership journeys. Each of these approaches yields valuable information. The choice about which approach to choose depends on the audience for the evaluation and what they value as useful and valid knowledge.

- *Mixed methods studies are a widely used approach for evaluating leadership programs*. Mixed methods approaches enable leadership program evaluators to take advantage of the diverse learning that different methods make possible.

- *Experimental methods are difficult for leadership programs to design and implement*. Leadership programs are designed to be responsive to the learning needs of the participants. Participants therefore do not all experience the same program. Likewise programs change and evolve over the course of their implementation. Both of these factors make it unlikely that experimental studies will be a feasible learning approach for many leadership programs.

- *Qualitative approaches to learning*. Case studies and leadership stories that capture the complexities and nuances of change appear to be growing in popularity. One of the challenges with using qualitative approaches is the difficulty of lifting up common themes that might enable the field to better articulate theories of leadership development that are rooted in leadership practice.

- *Participatory and critical reflection approaches transform the purpose and power of learning*. Participatory and critical reflection approaches empower program participants in their own learning and bring new voices into the process of knowledge creation. These approaches are more time-consuming and demanding of all those involved, but they may have the potential to radically alter what constitutes useful and valid knowledge.

---

[16] Daniel Stufflebeam, *Foundational Models for 21st Century Program Evaluation*, December 1999.

Mixed Methods Approaches

To evaluate their outcomes, leadership programs commonly use mixed methods approaches. Mixed methods studies use both quantitative and qualitative methods (such as surveys and interviews) and usually have both a formative and a summative component. As Daniel Stufflebeam notes, "the basic purposes of the mixed method approach are to provide direction for improving programs as they are evolving and to assess their effectiveness after they have had time to produce results."[17]

Many programs use mixed methods to collect information about outcomes. Using a variety of methods improves the validity of the data collected by enabling the evaluator to substantiate information it receives from one source with information received from another. In addition, mixed methods enable evaluators to collect different kinds of information. As John Grove has noted, different methods yield different kinds of information about outcomes. He concludes that changes in values, vision, and self-awareness are best captured with interviews, text analysis, ethnographies, and narratives/stories; while changes in skills, strategies, and policies can be assessed with 360 Feedback surveys, pre/post interventions, static retrospective reviews, and experimental designs.[18]

Theory of Change Approach

Every program has an implicit theory of change. However, few programs have engaged in developing a consensus among key stakeholders about the program's theory of change and/or have used that theory to guide program decisions and evaluation. Theories of change and logic models enable programs to articulate the relationship between the inputs (resources and activities), outcomes, and long-term impact. The process of thinking systematically about the program in this way enhances a program's likelihood of success.[19] The Kellogg Foundation's *Logic Model Development Guide* notes four benefits of program logic models.

- It finds "gaps" in the theory or logic of a program and works to resolve them;
- It builds a shared understanding of what the program is all about and how the parts work together;
- It focuses attention of management on the most important connections between action and results, and;
- It provides a way to involve and engage stakeholders in the design, processes, and use of evaluation.

Theories of change are not widely used as a framework for evaluating leadership programs. One example of a program that has used a theory of change approach is Eureka Communities. Program stakeholders developed a logic model with the evaluation team that was then assessed during the evaluation process. This led to an extensive re-examination of the model. A new model was developed and documented in the evaluation report.[20]

---

[17] Ibid. page 28.

[18] John Grove et al., "The EvaluLead Framework: Examining Success and Meaning: A Framework for Evaluating Leadership Development Interventions," March 2002.

[19] W.K. Kellogg Foundation, *Logic Model Development Guide*, October 2000.

[20] Susan Batten and Peter York, Evaluation of the Eureka Communities: Third Year Findings, May 1999.

Qualitative Approaches

Case studies are frequently used to document or evaluate the impact of leadership programs that have a focus on communities and organizations. The complexity of these programs, and the multiple stakeholders involved, require evaluators to talk to many different individuals in order to put together a picture of the outcomes and impacts of the program. The American Leadership Forum, the Blandin Community Leadership Program, and the Michigan Community Foundations Youth Project have all used case studies to evaluate and document their programs.

Case studies or in-depth stories also are an important approach for capturing the leadership journeys of individuals who participate in leadership programs. Several programs including the Kellogg National Fellowship Program, Partners of the Americas, LEAD International, the Women's Health Leadership Program, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Community Health Leaders Program, Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program, and CCL have documented the stories of their participants.

The Ford Foundation's Leadership Development Program trained grassroots leaders in rural America between 1966-1977. In an account that chronicles the stories of some of those leaders, David Nevin wrote *Left-Handed Fastballers: Scouting and Training America's Grass-Roots Leaders 1966-1977*. Nevin's ability to capture the struggles and achievements of fellows in those years remains a model for the field about how to effectively use case studies to tell the story of a leadership program.

The Women's Health Leadership Peer Leader Case Study Project developed an interesting approach to ranking peer leaders in order to determine objectively whom they wanted to include in the project. The categories they selected for rating were designed to assess personal, professional, organizational and community change. The report, "Tilling the Soil: Reflections and Stories of Change and Transformation" includes "short stories" of each participant and six transcribed interviews.

The Partners of the Americas program put together a volume entitled "Portraits, Snapshots, and Voices: A Collection of Vignettes about Fellows."
- *Portraits* are comprehensive vignettes about selected fellows and what the Fellowship has helped them achieve in their personal, professional, and community lives.
- *Snapshots* are brief descriptions of an important project, incident or achievement that came about as a result of the Fellowship.
- *Voices* represent quotes about involvement in the Fellowship and what some fellows are doing as a result of their experience.

This unique evaluation approach captures the meaning of the fellowship experience in the words of participants and those in their communities. It is rich in context and thick description of projects and their impact.

CCL's CEO Leadership Development Program used case studies to develop an understanding of the complex dynamics of individual learning and change that occur with a developmental intervention and to capture the contexts of participants' lives during the year-long program experience.[21]

Programs that capture leadership stories often do not try to lift out common themes about leadership and leadership development. An exception is a forthcoming book by Richard Couto and Stephanie Eken entitled *To Give Their Gifts: Leadership, Community, and Health Care* that profiles 12 community health leaders from Robert Wood Johnson's Community Health Leadership Program.

---

[21] See CCL, *An Evaluation of the Outcomes of a Leadership Development Program*, 1994.

Experimental Studies

Experimental studies are not a common approach for evaluating the impact of leadership programs. We found only four programs that had used this approach. Among the challenges in conducting an experimental study are finding an appropriate control group, delivering programs that provide everyone with the same intervention, and quantifying every desired change. One program considered an experimental approach but rejected it as unsuitable, impractical, unethical and counterproductive.[22] Despite these difficulties some programs have designed modified experimental studies. These projects do not claim scientific validity for their results but they do assist programs in pointing to potential program effects.

Education Resources Group is conducting a study of the New Voices Fellowship Program in which they are following both fellows who were selected to participate in the program and a group of "non-fellows" who were hired by their organizations but did not receive the fellowship.

CCL's LeaderLab program administered its Impact Questionnaire to a matched sample control group of individuals who had been accepted into their program but who had not yet attended. They then compared the scores of the two groups to see if those in the program had made significantly more change than the control group.

Robert Wood Johnson's Health Policy Fellowships evaluation compared quantity of publications by those who were participants in the program and those who were finalists but did not enter the program.

The Michigan Community Foundations Youth Project used data collected by the Independent Sector on youth involvement, volunteerism, and philanthropy to compare with how Youth Action Committee participants scored.

Participatory Approaches

Participatory approaches actively involve program stakeholders in designing, implementing, and/or interpreting data. Participatory approaches are used in evaluation and with other learning approaches. Participatory approaches build the capacity of participants to assess their own learning or to create new knowledge. They are often preferred because program participants become the subjects of learning – not its objects. Some examples of participatory evaluation and other participatory learning approaches are described below.

The Michigan Community Foundations Youth Project actively involved youth in the evaluation. They participated on the design team to determine what questions were important to investigate and how to research those questions. They were also trained to do interviews and interpret the data from the interviews.

The Kellogg International Leadership Program evaluation actively engaged stakeholders in the design of the evaluation, including program staff and fellows. Stakeholders were asked to give the evaluation team input on the skills and attitudes required of leaders who have the capacity to build sustainable, healthy communities; to reflect on the contribution of program activities in developing leadership competencies; and to assist in the interpretation of survey results.

The Ford Foundation's Leadership for a Changing World program has developed an approach to learning and knowledge development that engages academics and practitioners in co-producing knowledge to better understand leadership. They define "co-production" as "the joint inquiry work of practitioners and scholars, which requires the mutual acceptance of each other's points of reference and appreciation of what each party brings to the inquiry." There are many challenges to collaboration among academics and practitioners, but this approach may yield important advances in practice-grounded research in which data comes directly from practice and yields findings that can inform practice.[23]

---

[22] See "Building Leadership: Findings from a Longitudinal Evaluation of the Kellogg National Fellowship Program," pp. 24-26
[23] Sonia Ospina, Bethany Godsoe, and Ellen Schall, "Co-producing Knowledge: Practitioners and Scholars Working Together to Understand Leadership," January 2002.

Critical Reflection

Critical reflection is an approach to learning that is systematically integrated into the everyday activities of the program and organization. Organizations that use critical reflection generally include all individuals involved in the program (e.g., participants, staff, mentors, etc.) in identifying learning and impact. Public Allies and The Center for Third World Organizing are two programs that implement this approach.

Public Allies uses a "continuous learning process" at all levels of the organization – they examine how the community views them, how their staff does their work, and, how the Allies (program participants) do their work and the impact of that work throughout the program. Each Ally reports on the impact of his/her work both weekly, through required reports; and monthly, during structured "critical reflections." In culmination, at the end of the program each Ally does a "Presentation of Learning" – a 15-minute presentation in front of peers and alliance members on the learning impact on themselves, and their community.

The Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO) also integrates its evaluation efforts throughout the organization. At the beginning of each program year CTWO and its Movement Activist Apprenticeship Program participants set outcome-oriented goals to be accomplished. Participants report on their progress towards these goals daily. Participants also participate in mid-term and final evaluations with CTWO and their host supervisor at which time progress towards goals are evaluated.

The critical reflection approach supports organizations to make learning and documenting outcomes a priority. It also yields a plethora of information. The challenge for those who practice critical reflection is to synthesize the information learned and to document it in such a way that others can benefit from it. The process also can be difficult for program participants, who may have difficulty seeing impact in "the here and now," as opposed to reflecting on their experience following the program.

METHODS

Methods are the means that are used to collect data and information. Like the approach one chooses, methods shape what data and information is collected. Surveys, for instance, are useful for collecting quantitative data, whereas journals collect the reflections of participants and the meaning they make of their experiences. The choice of methods should be determined by what one wants to learn. Most programs use multiple methods because they are interested in both qualitative and quantitative learning. Below we describe the most common methods that programs use.

KEY FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES:

- *The choice of methods needs to be aligned with the type of information wanted*. Clear communication between funders, program staff, and evaluators about the type of information and knowledge that will be valued and valuable needs to precede the decision about which methods to use. In several conversations, interviewees told stories about funders who were disappointed in the evaluations they received because the methods that were being used did not yield the information they wanted. For example, statistical findings did not "tell the story of the program." Clarifying what the audiences for the evaluation want to know before choosing methods might avoid some sources of disappointment.

- *Using multiple methods yields a fuller picture of the program's impact*. Nearly every program reviewed used multiple evaluation methods.

- *Methods vary widely in how much they cost to use*. Cost is a factor in determining whether a particular method is used. Surveys, for instance, tend to enable programs to reach a large number of participants at relatively little cost compared with interviews and site visits. Cost, therefore, has consequences for the type of information that programs are able to collect.

- *There is a desire by programs and evaluators to use more in-depth methods for learning*. Site visits, in particular, were cited by several people as a method that they wished they could have employed but did not have the resources to do so.

Surveys

Surveys are commonly used to evaluate the outcomes of leadership programs. They are a popular method because they enable evaluators to learn a lot from many people at relatively less cost than other methods, such as interviewing. Most frequently programs survey their program participants, although mentors, advisers, supervisors, or colleagues may also be asked to complete a survey. Surveys typically ask participants to rate the effect of the program on a set of indicators. Sometimes surveys are administered at the beginning and at the end of the program to assess change that may have resulted from the program.

A survey strategy that is used by the Center for Creative Leadership is a "post-then assessment." Participants are asked to make two ratings on each indicator. One assessment asks the participants to circle the number that best describes their knowledge, skill, etc. today, and a second assessment asks them to circle the number that best describes their knowledge, skill, etc. at some earlier point in time. The difference between the two ratings is the impact of the change on the person's effectiveness. CCL prefers this approach to assessments that are taken at different points in time and then compared because they feel that the changes that people go through change how they perceive their own knowledge, skills, and capacities resulting in an unreliable relationship between assessments that are taken at two different times. For instance, someone may come into the program feeling that they are quite competent at interacting with people who are different from them, but may learn in the program about subtle ways in which power and privilege are communicated to others that radically changes their own self-perception and thus causes them to rate themselves lower than they did at the beginning of the program.

One other survey strategy was found in a retrospective evaluation by the Center for Health Leadership and Practice, and asked about whether a skill was improved as a result of the program (yes/no) and then had participants rate the impact of the improved skill on leadership effectiveness (or some other variable) over time.

One of the challenges in surveying the impact of programs on some set of indicators is that often there is no benchmark to know where an individual was when they came into the program. As a result a low score on an item may have two meanings: on the one hand it may mean that they came into the program with strong competency in an area and the program did not change them much, or it may mean that the program did not have much effect. Some surveys, such as the California Wellness Foundation (TCWF) Violence Prevention Leadership Program sought to distinguish between these two possibilities for "no effect."

Surveys are a valuable method of data collection, although programs need to be careful about relying solely on this method for drawing conclusions about the impact of the program, particularly when they are asking about organizational and community impact.

360-Degree Assessment

Some programs, including the Center for Creative Leadership and Public Allies, actively use 360-degree evaluations in order to gather information about individual leadership growth from not only program participants but also from their peers, colleagues, supervisors and others. Three hundred sixty-degree assessments are particularly valuable when they are integrated as a learning component of the program that both CCL and Public Allies do. Some programs, such as KNLP, explicitly considered and rejected using 360-degree assessments because they felt that it would compromise the integrity of the learning space they wanted to create which was one based on trust, curiosity, and shared responsibility. The value of a 360-degree assessment and the conditions under which this tool may be used appropriately and effectively have not been fully explored.

Interviews

Along with surveys, interviews are a frequently used method of data collection. They are more time and cost-intensive but they are more likely to capture the nuances and meanings of the program experience for participants. Participants often report that interviews provide them with a valuable opportunity to reflect on their experience and what it meant. Answering open-ended survey questions may not achieve this same impact.

Often interviews are used as a follow-up to a survey to deepen knowledge that may only have been hinted at in a survey. Interviews provide the evaluator with an opportunity to "press for specific examples and corroborating evidence" rather than rely on generalities.[24] Standard interviews seem to be about an hour, although some programs report more lengthy conversations.

The California Wellness Foundation Violence Prevention Leadership Program has designed a second level of interviews that are called "deep interviews" in which participants will engage with the interviewer for several hours. The desire is to more fully capture the leadership journey.

Journals

Journals are not widely used as an evaluation method because they are so demanding for participants to maintain, and because confidentiality may be a concern. Often programs encourage their participants to keep private journals as a tool for reflection but evaluators do not use these. The LEAD International Training Program undertook an extensive use of journaling as an evaluation tool. Participants were asked to write weekly entries in their journals. Topics were provided for each week. They included writing about a challenge, problem, or obstacle the fellow faced recently; writing about a success, resolution, or change you achieved recently; about your personal and professional developments; about a person you have met through LEAD whom you admire; and about a specific aspect of your leadership skills.

Public Allies asks its allies to complete weekly Personal Impact Service Documentation. This tool identifies hours worked, movement towards meeting their goals, stories, impact, challenges, and successes. A continuous learning officer whom we interviewed indicated that this tool is hard for many people to use because it is so demanding in terms of time and because it is often difficult for people to reflect when they are in the midst of the experience. When it works well for people she described it as "exceptional." The data from Personal Impact Service Documentation has not been analyzed across participants for lessons learned about leadership and leadership development.

---

[24] See "Building Leadership: Findings From a Longitudinal Evaluation of the Kellogg National Fellowship Program," p27 and John F. Jones,
"Training for Rural Development: A Community Impact Study."

Site Visits

Site visits are particularly valuable for assessing the organizational and community impact that a leadership program is having. These visits enable evaluators to talk with multiple people within an organization or community about the changes they observe. For example, in the New Voices Program evaluation, site visits are used to interview fellows, their mentors and key staff members with whom they work. They observe the fellows in action, and generally try to assess how the fellow is fitting into the organization. Examples of other programs that have used site visits are the Partners of the Americas Leadership Program, and Blandin Community Leadership Program.

Site visits are costly so many programs do not conduct them unless they are an integral part of the program intervention. Several people, however, wished that they had the resources for evaluators to do site visits because they would enable a first-hand experience of the leader, organization, or community in action, and provide opportunities for the evaluator to talk with multiple stakeholders and acquire a fuller picture about the program's impact.

Participant Observation

To gain an experiential understanding of the program evaluators commonly use participant observation. In and of itself, it cannot stand alone as a method for evaluating impact. Participant-observation does; however, give evaluators an opportunity to listen to participants speak about their experiences and a chance to observe behavior. In a conversation with the program director of Healing the Heart of Diversity, the point was made that she wanted the evaluators to participate in the program in order to fully understand its impact. The evaluators' own experiences became a source of information for the evaluation, not just their observations and conversations with others. This approach challenges the canon of objectivity and raises questions about the role of the evaluator and what information is used to inform one's understanding of the program and its impact. At the same time there is a depth of experience that can contribute significantly to the evaluator's ability to describe the experience of the program and what is being achieved.

Focus Groups

Focus groups are used in two primary ways: to generate new knowledge through the exchange among participants and to capture shared knowledge. The Echoing Green Foundation used a focus group to generate knowledge about community impact indicators that were then used to inform the evaluation. Partners of the Americas used focus groups to pose questions that were then the subject of intense discussion among fellows. Through this exchange the evaluators learned data that they would not have had access to through surveys and one-on-one interviews. The Blandin Community Leadership Program (BCLP) used focus groups with alumni in selected communities to develop a group analysis of each town as a healthy community following the BCLP training themes, an inventory of the individual activities for each alum, and a discussion of the main projects or group activities undertaken since the training. Focus groups may be a particularly valuable method for community leadership programs since shared leadership is an important outcome of the program.

Tracking Accomplishments

One measure of program impact is the accomplishments of individuals who participate in the program. This is particularly true for programs that want to have an impact on a field such as the Minority Scholars in Health Disparities; the Center for Health Leadership and Practice, the Robert Wood Johnson Health Policy Fellowships, Leadership for a Changing World; the Zero to Three Leadership Program, and the California Wellness Foundation's Violence Prevention Initiative Leadership Program. These programs often track publications, presentations, and media coverage.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

There are many potential sources of information that programs and evaluators may tap to learn about program impact. What follows identifies and describes some of the most common sources of information found in the study.

KEY FINDINGS AND CHALLENGES:

- *There is an over-reliance on collecting data from program participants*. Program participants are a valuable source of information for understanding the outcomes of leadership programs; however, the validity of the claims made by participants is more valid when other sources of information corroborate the findings. For instance, a participant might report an outcome about increased visibility of their work or their organization. If this outcome is corroborated by media coverage and documented speaking engagements then the impact of the finding is significantly strengthened. Programs that rely solely or primarily on program participants risk having their evaluations criticized.

- *Proxy sources of information are being used to indicate impact*. Dollars leveraged, publications, presentations and media coverage are among the common sources of information that are being used to indicate long-term impact.

- *Program-generated data is a valuable resource for evaluators*. Participants create program-generated data in the context of the program. This may be a rich source of information about program outcomes. Participant-observation is one way to gather this information; written sources are another. Sometimes program-generated data is underutilized because it is time-consuming and costly to analyze.

Participants in Leadership Programs

Self-reporting by participants in the leadership program is by far the most frequent source of information used to assess the outcomes of leadership programs. There are several reasons for this. First, most leadership programs focus on developing the leadership of individuals, and as such they become the primary focus of the evaluation. Second, and perhaps even more importantly, the over-reliance on self-reporting is driven by the cost of collecting information from other sources, particularly from others who have not had any direct affiliation with the program.

Mentors/Advisers

Programs that have a mentoring component almost always collect information about the participants' leadership development from the mentors or advisors. Among the programs that have collected data from mentors/advisers are the Kellogg International Leadership Program, Eureka Communities Fellowship Program, New Voices Fellowship Program, and Community Health Scholars Program.

Supervisors/Colleagues

Another source of information that is occasionally used to assess the leadership development of program participants is people with whom they work. This source of information is particularly valuable for programs that hope to catalyze change within organizations. Supervisors and colleagues also are valuable sources of information because they experience the program participant's leadership on a regular basis and can observe and note changes. Those programs that build in a 360-degree assessment will ask supervisors and colleagues to participate in assessing the participant's leadership. Examples are the Center for Creative Leadership and Public Allies.

Community Leaders

Community leaders were less frequently used as a source of information. One reason is the difficulty of identifying appropriate people who have enough knowledge about the program and its participants to offer valuable insights. One program that did seek input from community leaders was the Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership. They interviewed school principals in order to assess the impact of parent leadership development on their schools. The Blandin Community Leadership Program sought to verify information collected about alumni from the program with "city officials, school administrators, librarians, and the like."

Organizations/Institutions

Programs that have a site-based component to their program may assess the impact the program has had on the organization or institution where the leader or leadership program is located. This may involve interviewing or surveying organizational or institutional leaders, or visiting the site to learn from multiple conversations what impact the program has had. Some programs that are evaluating the impact of their program on organizations and institutions are the Community Health Scholars Program, the Minority Scholars in Health Disparities Program, the Leadership for Institutional Change Program, the Michigan Community Foundations Youth Project, the New Voices Fellowship Program, and the AmeriCorps Leaders Program.

The Echoing Green Foundation Fellowship Program selects and funds individuals to create non-profit organizations. In one sense tracking the survival rate of organizations in the post-fellowship period can easily assess the impact of the program. This quantitative assessment does not provide, however, any indication about whether the organization is actively engaged in social or systemic change – a goal of the program. In a recent study, the foundation sought to better understand what social impact a selected number of organizations were having. Through a survey and follow-up interviews, the evaluators looked at the extent to which organizations were engaged in advocating for changes in policy, building social movements, leveraging collaborations and partnerships, and replicating their programs, among other strategies.

Leaders in the Field

For programs that are developing leaders to have an impact on their fields, existing leaders in the field are a good source of information. These individuals are able to provide a perspective on the leadership impact or potential for impact of program participants. Two programs that have relied on collecting data from leaders in the field are the Center for Health Leadership and Practice and the Zero to Three Leadership Program.

Program-Generated Data

Program-generated data may include meetings or other program activities, as well as written reports, journals, or other writing that participants provide the program as part of their learning and assessment. Sometimes these may be used for assessing program impact, although they are more typically used to keep program staff informed about the progress of participants or for participants themselves to have an opportunity to reflect in writing about their experiences.

Another valuable source of program-generated data that is sometimes used for evaluation is the program application. The Center for Reflective Community Practice had fellows reflect on statements in their application at the conclusion of the program to learn how their leadership had changed.

Finding ways to take full advantage of information that programs are already collecting can lessen the burden of evaluation for participants, and provide evaluators with a valuable information resource. Some programs, such as Public Allies collect an enormous amount of program-generated data but they do not have the resources to analyze this data and look for common themes and lessons learned about leadership development.

Publications/Presentations

A number of programs that are interested in assessing the productivity and visibility of leaders in their programs will use publications and presentations as an outcome marker. The value of this source of information is that it is relatively easy for participants to provide and it can be objectively verified.

Media Coverage

Several programs are tracking coverage in the media as another measure of success and impact. Participants may be asked to provide copies of coverage. Examples of programs that are interested in media coverage are Ford Foundation's Leadership for a Changing World, and the California Wellness Foundation's Violence Prevention Initiative Leadership Program.

Leveraged Dollars

One measure of impact that several programs are tracking is the dollars that individuals, collaborations of program participants, organizations, and communities have been able to leverage as a result of the program. This again stands as a proxy measure for impact. The implication is that if dollars have been attracted then this testifies to improved leadership capacity.

During the course of this project over 50 conversations were held with people who fund, run, and evaluate leadership programs. Evaluation reports were also reviewed. What follows describes some of the themes and insights that emerged from the conversations and the review of documents.

Aligning Learning Expectations With Evaluation Funding

One of the most prevalent frustrations heard in interviews was the lack of funding available to do the evaluations and data collection that would yield answers to the questions that funders have about the impact of leadership programs. In particular funders want to know what the impacts of programs are beyond the individual. Few leadership programs have had the resources to systematically document impact on organizations, communities, fields, or systems change. What exists is a plentiful amount of anecdotal information that, while compelling, does not stand alone as evidence of impact. While there appears to be growing interest among foundations to fund leadership programming, there is still considerable skepticism about how to measure the impact of these programs.[25] Funders and program staff need to work closely together to identify questions that they would like answered and make sure that appropriate resources are allocated to answer those questions.

Conducting Longitudinal Evaluations

There are an increasing number of programs that are conducting retrospective evaluations.[26] These evaluations survey and interview multiple cohorts of program participants to learn what long-term benefits the program has had. They document such elements as activities that program participants have undertaken, career development, the creation and sustainability of professional networks and collaborative relationships, and the ability of participants to leverage resources for their work. These evaluations take a snapshot in time at the legacy of leadership programs.

Longitudinal evaluations do not appear in the data collected. Longitudinal evaluations differ from retrospective evaluations in that they intentionally track people over time at regular intervals. Ideally these evaluations would start from the beginning and chart changes in leadership competencies, skills, and mastery at whatever levels the program had an intended impact. The Kellogg Foundation has done the most extensive evaluation of this type with its national leadership fellows. Through biannual interviews with several groups of fellows over a six-year period, evaluators tracked the policy relevance of fellows' work over time, collaboration among fellows, collaboration across disciplinary boundaries, career paths, and other paths to leadership. Other longitudinal evaluations that are under way are the California Agricultural Leadership Program, and Michigan Community Foundations Youth Action Project.

Everyone asked acknowledged that leadership is a process that happens over time. Changes that may be seeded by a leadership program grow and develop through leadership experiences. The learning that is available at the end of a program is not the same as the learning that is available one, two, or five years later. Longitudinal studies would give the field the opportunity to learn about and document the leadership journeys of individuals, organizations, communities, and fields. Using a mixed methods approach, these studies could yield quantitative and qualitative measures of change.

Learning Across Programs

There have been very few efforts to begin to capture and document learning across programs.[27] The Population Leadership Program is seeking to validate a leadership framework by developing cross-program indicators for the field of global health leadership. Similar efforts might be initiated for other types of leadership programs, such as social entrepreneurial programs, grassroots community programs, or community service programs. Cross-program evaluation might examine common lessons learned, or develop evaluation questions that are explored by multiple programs.

---

[25] California Endowment, *Briefing Paper: The Potential for Leadership Programming* and the Pew Charitable Trusts, *Returning Results: Ready, Fire, Aim*, October 1998.

[26] Among those tht have published the results of their retrospective evaluations are the California Public Health Leadership Institute, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's National Leadership Program, and the Blandin Foundation Community Leadership Program.

[27] The Leadership Learning Community has convened leadership programs in the Bay Area to share outcomes and impacts that they are intending to achieve with their programs, and those outcomes that they feel they have been able to demonstrate through their evaluations (see www.leadershiplearning.org). The Population Leadership Program has initiated a project to develop case studies by global health leadership programs using a common framework. The intent is to develop a compendium of indicators for leadership development that emerge from very specific leadership situations and interventions.

Learning From The Private Sector

While there are important differences in context, and in the purpose of leadership development, there is also much that private sector and nonprofit sector programs have in common and can share with one another. The Center for Creative Leadership has designed and implemented leadership programs for both the for-profit and non-profit sectors. They have collected their learning in several publications that may be of interest to those who develop leadership in the nonprofit sector.[28] In an interview with the Center's evaluation director, she noted, somewhat surprisingly, that the desire for impact assessment has been driven more by nonprofit sector leadership programs than by corporate programs. She speculated that this might be explained by the fact that nonprofit programs need to make the case for impact to funders, while corporate programs do not have this same compelling need. This has recently begun to shift, she said, as for-profit organizations have started using leadership development programs to catalyze and support organizational change, rather than as a "perk" for rising executives.

Another important learning resource from the private sector is Peter Senge's book *The Dance of Change: The Challenges to Sustaining Momentum in Learning Organizations.* This book focuses on the challenges of sustaining change initiatives within organizations. Assessment is one of the key challenges he identifies because often "the new practices contradict the thinking behind the traditional measures." Senge and his colleagues suggest that in order to meet the challenge of assessment and measurement organizations need to: 1) appreciate that profound change takes time; 2) build partnerships with key stakeholders/leaders to change "traditional metrics" so information can be gathered, interpreted and used in new ways; 3) learn to recognize and appreciate change as it occurs; and 4) make assessment and developing new abilities to assess a priority among advocates of change. These lessons are compelling and have much to teach the field of leadership development programming.

Encouraging more sharing and communication between the for-profit and non-profit sectors on what is working in leadership programming and how we measure effectiveness and change would benefit both sectors.

Evaluating The Evaluations

The Pew Charitable Trusts has shared what they learned about structuring an effective evaluation process in a piece that was written by the foundation's evaluation officers, the evaluators, and the Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership program staff.[29] The Center for Health Leadership and Practice has published an article about their evaluation planning, design, and implementation as well as lessons learned. Among the lessons that they share are: the need to have a true partnership between program staff and evaluation consultants; the need to start with a theoretically based conceptual framework in order to make good decisions about what to ask in the evaluation; the importance of testing the evaluation instruments with real participants.[30] The Center for Assessment and Policy Development's evaluation of the Eureka Communities Fellowship Program included lessons on evaluating the program and the use of data to strengthen programming. Among what they concluded is that "it is possible to assess the benefits of place-based leadership and community-building programs beyond the specific outcomes for participating individuals to further explore broader organizational and community effects and that a "theory of change" approach can be applied to evaluations of leadership development and support programs."[31]

The field may want to pay more attention to systematically reflecting and documenting the evaluation process to learn what is working and what is not working in the various approaches. An important outcome may be a set of guidelines about how to engage in evaluation, and how to promote effective use of evaluation findings. Evaluation standards currently exist that can help program staff, funders, and evaluators as they design and implement evaluations. These standards provide the evaluation field with guidelines for good practice that help ensure that all stakeholders are working from a common ground of understanding.[32]

---

[28] See CCL, *Handbook of Leadership Development.*
[29] Setting the Stage for Success: Bringing Parents into Education Reform as Advocates for Higher Student Achievement, by Janet Kroll, Rober F. Sexton, Beverly N. Raimondo, H. Dickson Corbett, and Bruce Wilson.
[30] Carol Span Woltring, Wendy Constantine, and Liz Schwarte, "Development of the CDC/UC Public Health Leadership Institute Retrospective Evaluation Questionnaire," in *Public Health Leadership: Putting Principles into Practice*, Lous Rowitz, Ed., Aspen Publishers: Gaithersburg, Maryland, 2001.
[31] Center for Assessment and Policy Development, *Eureka Communities: Lessons Learned from a New Leadership Development Model*, May 1999.
[32] The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards.*

CONCLUSION

The field of leadership development programming is at a unique moment in its developmental history. More and more foundations are recognizing that leadership is core to catalyzing and sustaining change; there has been an explosion of leadership programs in communities and fields, and within academic institutions; and all of us who are engaged in leadership programming recognize that we have much to learn from each other. At the same time it is a perilous moment because with our current approaches we cannot possibly train, support, or nurture leaders fast enough to meet the needs we have as a community, a nation, or the world.[33]

One response to the challenge before us is to accelerate our learning by working more closely together to develop a shared learning agenda, finding ways to build upon each other's learning, and collaborating on evaluations of our programs. The Foundation hopes this paper demonstrates that we have a great deal of knowledge among us that can help all of us do a better job of preparing, supporting, and nurturing the leaders we need for the future.

---

[33] Remarks by Meg Wheatley at the LLC Creating Space Conference, April 2002.

Criteria for Program Selection

Working closely with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Leadership Team, we created the following criteria for program inclusion in the scan. These criteria were seen as guidelines, and as such we did connect with some programs that did not fully fit the criteria. Our overriding concern was to include all programs from which we thought that we could learn important, relevant lessons.

Criteria for Inclusion in the Scan
Programs to include:
- Programs that focus on positive social change
- Programs that target civic and community leadership
- Programs that use multiple approaches to learning leadership
- Programs that convene participants periodically over a period of at least 3 months
- Programs that have a collective or cohort experience
- Programs that we know have done innovative evaluation work
- Programs that target youth and others who have been traditionally excluded from leadership
- Programs that build the leadership of individuals, organizations, and/or communities

Programs to typically exclude:
- Awards programs
- Programs that are predominantly classroom/instructionally-based
- Private sector/corporate programs
- Fellowship programs that fund academic study
- Training programs of short duration with no follow-up
- Programs that provide capacity-building primarily through technical assistance

Programs Reviewed and List of People Interviewed

Program	Individuals interviewed and/or contacted
American Leadership Forum	
Americans for Indian Opportunity - American Indian Ambassadors Program	Laura Harris
Americorps	Tracy Stone
Annie E. Casey Foundation - Children and Family Fellowship	John Sullivan/Donna Stark
Ashoka: Innovators for the Public	Leslie Crutchfield
Asian Pacific American Women's Leadership Institute	
Aspen Institute - Henry Crown Fellowship Program	Keith Berwick
Blandin Foundation - Blandin Community Leadership Program	Jim Krile
California Agricultural Leadership Program	Tim LaSalle
The California Wellness Foundation Violence Prevention Initiative Leadership Program	*
Center for Creative Leadership	Jennifer Martineau
Center for Health Leadership and Practice	Liz Schwarte
Center for Policy Alternatives - Flemming Fellows	Renee Bianco, Jane Gruenebaum
Center for Reflective Community Practice	Joy Amulya
Center for Third World Organizing - MAAP	Mark Toney
Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership	Beverly Raimundo
Coro - Fellows Program in Public Affairs	Andrew Haupt
Echoing Green Foundation	Lynn Rothstein *
Environmental Leadership Program	Mary Huston
Eureka Communities	Peter York; Sally Leidermann
Fannie Mae Foundation - Maxwell Awards of Excellence	Staci Alexander
Fetzer Institute - Fellows and Scholars	Carol Schwinn
Ford Foundation - The Leadership Development Program	
Ford Foundation - Leadership for a Changing World	Tom Burns, Marian Krauskopf, Bonita Stowell
Ford Foundation - New Voices	Ken Williams; Jane Chon
Ford Foundation - Public Policy and International Affairs Fellowship Program	Patrick Hesser
Great Valley Center	Douglas Jackson
Healing the Heart of Diversity	Patricia Harbour
Institute for Educational Leadership - Education Policy Fellowship Program	Hunter Moorman
Kauffman Foundation - Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership	Carol Cobb
Kellogg Foundation - Community Health Scholars	Toby Citrin
Kellogg Foundation - Kellogg International Leadership Program	*
Kellogg Foundation - Kellogg National Fellowship Program	
Kellogg Foundation - Leadership for Institutional Change	Byron Burnham
Kellogg Foundation - MCFYP	Karen Tice
Kellogg Foundation - Minority Scholars in Health Disparities	Barbara Krimgold
Kettering Foundation - Community Leadership Program	Maxine Thomas
Leadership for Environment and Development	Gillian Martin-Mehres

Program	Individuas Interviewed and/or contacted
Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation - Grassroots Leadership Development Learning Initiative	Gladys Washington
National Youth Employment Coalition - New Leaders Academy	Adrienne Smith
Open Society Institute - Community Fellowship Program	Pamela King
Open Society Institute - Criminal Justice Fellows	Miriam Porter, Kate Black
Partners of the Americas	Jan Elster
Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative	Suzanne Morse, Page Snow, Janet Kroll
Plan to Lead – California Partnership for Children	Beth Sauerhaft
Population Leadership Program	John Grove
Public Allies	Patricia Griffin
Rhode Island Foundation Leadership Program	David Karoff; Laurisa Sellars
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation - Health Policy Fellowships	Laura Leviton
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation - Community Health Leadership Program	Richard Couto
Rockefeller Foundation - Next Generation Leadership Program	Surita Sandosham, Paul Aaron
Women's Health Leadership Program	Connie Chan Robison ; Martha Campbell
Youth Service America - Fund for Social Entrepreneurs	Silvia Golombek
Zero to Three Leadership Program	Laurisa Sellars; Victoria Youcha

Others Interviewed List

Other individuals contacted	Organization
Deborah Meehan	Leadership Learning Community
Gene Honn	National Community Leadership Association
Alfred Ramirez	National Community for Latino Leadership

*Claire Reinelt, of Development Guild/DDI, was the evaluator for these projects.

Overview of Project Methodology

Using the criteria outlined in Appendix A, Development Guild/DDI began a process of identifying appropriate programs to include in the scan. We worked closely with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's Leadership Team and with the Leadership Learning Community. Together we identified over sixty programs that we wanted to include in the scan. As the project progressed we learned of approximately 20 additional programs, bringing the total number of programs to over 80.

It was our original intent to have brief conversations with as many of these programs as possible, (we hoped to connect with approximately 60) and then to identify five or six programs that we would spend significantly more time with, analyzing their evaluation efforts. As our work on the project progressed, we revised our original approach for two primary reasons. First, making initial meaningful contact with individuals at foundations and leadership development programs had been more difficult than we originally anticipated. Second, and more importantly, once we had made meaningful contact, we found individuals more willing to share their evaluation leanings with us than we had anticipated. We therefore expanded our approach in order to take fuller advantage of all the information that programs were willing to share with us, especially their evaluation and learning documentation, such as reports, articles, tools, and indicators.

The overriding question we were curious about was whether leadership programs had been able to demonstrate whether their leadership programs were having the intended impact. In addressing this issue, during our interviews we asked programs what their intended impact was and what methods and approaches they had used to assess whether their program achieved this impact. We then explored whether the programs were confident that the information that they captured represented the full impact of their program, and if they were not, why not.

Some of the specific questions that we asked included:
- *Do you have a theory of change for your program – in other words have you articulated short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes for your program with some theory about how the activities you provide in your program will assist in achieving those outcomes?*

- *What are the outcomes and impacts of your program that you have tried to evaluate and/or document? Which outcomes and impacts have you had the most success learning about? Have you developed indicators or measures of success for these outcomes and impacts?*

- *What were the strengths and weaknesses of the methods you chose to use?*

- *What were several learning highlights from your evaluation/documentation of outcomes and impacts? How have you used your evaluation findings to improve your program?*

- *What are the major challenges you have encountered when attempting to design and/or implement a outcomes and impact evaluation?*

- *Are their tools, information, etc. that you would like to have to help you in current and future evaluation work? What would you like to learn about your program that you haven't yet been able to capture, document, or evaluate?*

In addition to the interview process, our review of evaluation documentation from these organizations provided valuable information. The documentation was particularly helpful in deepening our understanding about promising evaluation approaches and tools for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the programs, identifying common challenges and concerns, and understanding what findings, if any, had been learned from these evaluations.

Individual Outcome Indicators

Collaboration/Partnership
- Are individuals more able to collaborate across societal boundaries such as race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, gender, etc.?
- Do individuals have improved or new, professional networks?
- Have individuals remained in contact with those they met through the program?
- Are individuals effectively engaging interdisciplinary groups?
- Are individuals engaging in collaborative projects?
- Are individuals building relationships across sectors?

Communication
- Do individuals have the ability to express or hear divergent opinions and really listen?
- Are individuals able to mobilize political will for change?
- Have individuals improved their oral and written communication skills and their ability to explain complicated information to others?
- Are individuals able to gain the support of influential people?
- Are individuals able to effectively utilize the media?

Courage and Confidence
- Have individuals' confidence and self-image improved?
- Are individuals taking greater risks?

Cultural Competence
- Are individuals able to work effectively across cultures?
- Have individuals had broader exposure to cultural differences and similarities?
- Have individuals gained a greater recognition of their own biases and prejudices?
- Do individuals have a deeper appreciation of their own culture and community and the cultures and communities of others?

Knowledge Development
- Is there a greater understanding of global issues and international affairs?
- Do individuals have greater knowledge of their field or other fields or knowledge bases relevant to their work?
- Do individuals have the capacity to understand "systems thinking"?
- Do individuals have deeper knowledge of broad issue areas such as government and politics, mass media, economics, environmental issues, etc.?

Leadership in Action/Demonstrating Leadership
- Do individuals demonstrate increased involvement in community activities, civic affairs, and volunteer work?
- Are individuals developing new projects, programs, products, or organizations?
- Are individuals engaging others to get work done rather than doing it on their own?
- Are individuals more pro-active than re-active?

Leadership Development
- Are individuals actively promoting the leadership development of others? Self-Awareness and Reflective Capacity
- Do individuals have a better understanding of themselves and their values?
- Do individuals have a personal theory of change that they can articulate?
- Do individuals know their strengths and limits as a leader?
- Do individuals have the ability to evaluate themselves?

Personal Development
- Are individuals more capable of acting in accordance with their deepest values?
- Is there a working and effective balance between personal life and professional life that values both?
- Are family relationships improved?
- Have individuals made a personal commitment to the creation of healthy communities?

Perspective Development
- Do individuals have an understanding of shared mission and vision for a community?
- Do individuals have a greater understanding of their community and their concerns within local, regional, national, and international contexts?
- Are individuals more thoughtful in their approach to their work?
- Do individuals have a wider perspective of issues facing their country and the world?

Professional Development
- Have individuals career or career goals changed and grown?
- Have individuals advanced in their leadership responsibilities?
- Have individuals developed the confidence to take risks with their careers?
- Have individuals learned about new career possibilities?
- Have individuals accepted leadership positions or affiliated with professional organizations?
- Has the likelihood of individuals remaining in the field, and not "burning out," increased?

Skill Development
- Have individuals developed new, or improved existing, skills that enhance their ability to lead? (e.g., facilitation, strategic planning, problem-solving, training, team-building, goal-setting, fund development, conflict resolution, etc.)
- Have management skills improved?
- Do individuals have an ability to use data and information to plan for and drive decisions?
- Are individuals able to effectively use technology to enhance and forward their work?
- Are individuals better able to develop and attract resources to their work and the work of others?

Visibility
- Are individuals more recognized as leaders?

Organizational Outcome Indicators

Collaborations, Networks, and Partnerships
- Have new strategic partnerships been formed?
- Is the organization cooperating with other organizations in the community?
- Are organizational leaders in similar positions at different organizations supporting each other?

Development of Leadership
- Are staff and volunteers more diverse?
- Has the organization initiated leadership training programs or mentoring programs?
- Have new staff been hired?
- Are young leaders being given leadership opportunities within organizations?

Effecting Change
- Is the organization having a social impact?
- Is the organization an effective catalyst for social change?
- Is the organization able to mobilize people in communities to support a change agenda?

Leadership/Governance
- Does the organization have a responsive, functional management team?
- Is succession planning effective and carried out?
- Are clients and constituents participating in decision-making?

Management
- Does organizational leadership have improved management capabilities? (e.g., projecting what programs will cost, measuring program impact, determining organizational needs, financial management, strategic planning, etc.)
- Has the performance of organizational core functions improved?

Programming
- Has existing work been strengthened?
- Have new programs been implemented?
- Have services been provided to new populations?

Sustainability
- Has the organization's ability to attract resources (financial, talented staff, etc.) improved?
- Is the organization better able to leverage existing resources to attract other resources?
- Has the organization secured resources from new sources?
- Has the overall budget increased?
- Is there an increased understanding of and participation in financial systems and markets?

Visibility
- Has the visibility of the organization increased locally? Regionally? Nationally? Internationally?
- Is there increased media coverage of the organization?
- Have new materials been developed or more public appearances made?

Community Outcome Indicators

Collaboration, Networks, and Partnerships
- Is there inter- and intra-community cooperation?
- Is there more frequent community dialogue about addressing problems?
- Is there greater collaboration among key individuals, organizations, and institutions?
- Are there new community coalitions or collaborations?
- Are there activities being jointly organized?

Community Change
- Are there tangible improvements in the quality of life or functioning of the community? (e.g., new policies)
- Have new projects or programs been developed in the community?
- Are new forums for citizen engagement being created?

Community Decision-Making
- Are policymakers more aware of and attuned to the public's voice?

Community Leadership
- Is there a heightened sense of community conscience and responsibility?
- Are the community's strengths being maximized and utilized to develop community-relevant solutions?
- Are citizens from all walks of life sharing responsibility to tackle complex problems?
- Is there respect for diverse points of view?

Engagement/Participation
- Have new vehicles been created to engage citizens?
- Have trust and credibility been developed to allow the community to carry on important work?
- Is there increased confidence within the community that problems can be addressed?
- Are community efforts aimed at building a civic society?

Knowledge Development
- Are community members better informed and more knowledgeable?
- Is the whole community constantly learning?

Leadership Development
- Are new leaders emerging from within the community?
- Are citizens taking on leadership roles within the community?

Public Awareness
- Has awareness of community issues increased throughout the community?

Resource Development
- Are there new resources or greater resources being brought into the community?

Social Capital
- Is there trust among members of the community?

Field Outcome Indicators

Leadership Development
- Do opportunities for leadership development exist within the field?
- Are model leadership programs being replicated?
- Are established leaders in the field supporting the development of emerging leaders?

Development of the Field
- Are there more opportunities for leaders to pursue work within their field?
- Has new research been added to the field?
- Is there greater awareness of common ground and shared interests?
- Are members of the field actively contributing to building the field's knowledge base?

Diversity
- Is there increased involvement of underrepresented groups in the field?
- Is the field open to new ideas and welcoming of diverse perspectives?
- Do members in the field actively integrate knowledge from other disciplines?

Knowledge Development
- Are leaders in the field more knowledgeable about policy?
- Do members in the field understand systems thinking?

Collaboration With Other Fields or Sectors
- Are national relationships and partnerships growing and developing?
- Are members of the field building relationships with people in other fields?

Collaboration With Field
- Is there increased trust between leaders?
- Are members of the field building relationships with others within their field?

Taking Action
- Are members of the field actively participating in professional associations?
- Are members of the field publishing and making presentations?

Visibility of the Field
- Is there greater interest in and recognition of the field and its work?
- Have history-making events been organized and executed?

Systemic Impact Outcome Indicators

Culture Shifts
- Are organizations and institutions valuing and implementing collaborative models of leadership?
- Is there greater awareness and recognition of change leaders in communities?
- Is the national dialogue about what constitutes quality leadership shifting?

Institutional Transformation
- Is non-traditional leadership being reconciled with traditionally hierarchical forms of leadership within the institution?
- Are change efforts being integrated into the institution's formal structure?
- Do change efforts have the support of top institutional leadership?
- Are individuals from across and outside the institution involved in change efforts?

Policy and Policymaking Change
- Are policymakers more knowledgeable about the needs of communities?
- Is the policymaking process improving and yielding better results for communities?
- Is there new policy, new regulation, or new precedent or case law?

Collaboration
- Is there greater collaboration and cooperation among sectors and institutions to address social problems?

Bibliography

Aguirre International. *Making a Difference: Impact of AmeriCorps State/National Direct on Members and Communities, 1994-95 and 1995-96.* San Mateo: Aguirre International.

American Leadership Forum. *Collaborative Leadership in Action Final Report.*

American Leadership Forum. *Tools for Making Change: Building Diversity/Building Community, Lessons from the Front Lines.*

American Leadership Forum. *Tools for Making Change: Collaboration with Young People as Partners.*

American Leadership Forum. *Tools for Making Change: Heart Matters, Valuing People and Process in Collaboration.*

American Leadership Forum. *Tools for Making Change: Making Collaborative Leadership Work in Your Community.*

Annie E. Casey Foundation. *Building Leaders for Change: An Overview of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Children and Family Fellowship.* Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2001.

Aspen Institute. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Volume 1, Concepts, Methods, and Contexts.* Eds. James P. Connell, Anne C. Kubisch, Lisbeth B. Schorr, and Carol H. Weiss.

Aspen Institute. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Volume 2, Theory, Measurement, and Analysis.* Eds. Karen Fulbright-Anderson, Anne C. Kubisch, and James B. Connell.

Beineke, John A. and Roger H. Sublett. *Leadership Lessons and Competencies: Learning from the Kellogg National Fellowship Program.* Battle Creek: Kellogg Foundation.

Brindis, Claire, Gale Berkowitz, Elaine Peacock, and Zoe Clayson. *Expanding the Sphere of Influence of Women Leaders: Summary Report of the Women's Health Policy Initiative.* San Francisco: Center for Reproductive Health Policy Research, September 1999.

The Center for Creative Leadership, Handbook of Leadership Development. Eds. Cynthia D. McCauley, Russ s. Moxley, and Ellen Van Velsor. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Chrislip, David, and Carl E. Larson. *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.

Constantine, Wendy, Liz Schwarte and Carol Woltring. *CDC/UC Public Heath Leadership Institute Retrospective Evaluation (1991-1999).* Center for Health and Leadership Practice. July 2000.

Couto, Richard A. and Stephanie Eken. *To Give Their Gifts: Leadership, Community, and Health Care.* Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (forthcoming).

The Ford Foundation, *Broadening the Bounds of Youth Development: Youth as Engaged Citizens.* The Innovatioon Center for Community and Youth Development, 2001.

The Ford Foundation, *Youth Leadership for Development Initiative: Broadening the Parameters of Youth Development and Strengthening Civic Activism.* The Innovation Center for Community Youth Develpment.

Green, Zachary Gabriel. *LAMPS: A Leadership Learning Community Four-Quadrant Model for Continuous Evaluation and Development of Programs in Leadership and Reflective Practice.* www.leadershiplearning.org.

The James Irvine Foundation. *Expanding the Sphere of Influence of Women Leaders: Summary Report of the Women's Health Initiative,* September 1999.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation-James R. Sanders, Chair. *The Program Evaluation Standards, 2nd Edition: How to Assess Evaluators of Educational Programs.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994

Jones, John F. *Moving Communities Forward: As Assessment Summary.* Blandin Foundation.

Jones, John F. *Training for Rural Development: A Community Impact Study.* Regional Development Dialogue. Vol. 22, No. 1. Spring 2001. pp139-150.

Kroll, Janet, Robert F. Sexton, Beverly N. Raimondo, H. Dickson Corbett, and Bruce Wilson. *Setting the Stage for Success: Bringing Parents into Education Reform as Advocates for Higher Student Achievement – A Report on Lessons Learned for the Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership of the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence.*

Leadership Learning Community. *A Conceptual Map of Leadership Development Models.* www.leadershiplearning.org

Leadership Learning Community. *Emerging Wisdom in Program Design "Successful Designs, Innovations, Cautions and Challenges".* www.leadershiplearning.org

Markus, Gregory B. *Building Leadership: Findings from a Longitudinal Evaluation of the Kellogg National Fellowship Program.* Battle Creek: Kellogg Foundation, 2001.

Matusak, Larraine R. *Kellogg National Fellowship Program: The First Ten Years, 1980-1990.* Battle Creek: Kellogg Foundation.

McCauley, Cynthia D., and Martha W. Hughes-James. *An Evaluation of the Outcomes of a Leadership Development Program.* Greensboro: Center for Creative Leadership, 1994.

Millett, Ricardo, Claire Reinelt, and William Weber. *Developing Leadership in an International Context: A Summary of the Final Evaluation Report of the Kellogg International Leadership Program II.* Kellogg Foundation.

Nevin, David. *Left-Handed Fastballers: Scouting and Training America's Grassroots Leaders, 1966-1977.* New York: Ford Foundation, 1981.

Ospina, Sonia. Bethany Godsoe, and Ellen Schall. *Co-Producing Knowledge: Practitioners and Scholars Working Together to Understand Leadership.* Leadership for a Changing World. January 2002, www.leadershipforchange.org

Parsons, Beverly, *Using a Systems Change Approach to Building Communities.* 1997. http://www.muohio.edu/forumscp/policymakers/pdffiles/v2fp.pdf

Pew Charitable Trusts. *Returning Results: Ready, Fire, Aim.* October 1998. www.pewtrusts.com

Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative. *Looking for Leadership in All the Right Places: Interim Report.* www.pew-partnership.org.

Pew Partnership. *Collaborative Leadership.* www.pew-partnership.org.

Pew Partnership for Civic Change. *Crafting a New Design for Civic Leadership: A Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative Report.* www.pew-partnership.org.

Pond, Anna-Nanine S. *Briefing Paper: The Potential for Leadership Programming.* The California Endowment, February 2001.

Public Health Institute. *Women's Health Leadership: Celebrating Our Beginnings – Visioning Our Future.* Center for Collaborative Planning, January 1999.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. *National Program Report: Health Policy Fellowship Program.* February 1999.

Rowitz, Louis. *Public Health Leadership: Putting Principles Into Practice.* Gaithersburg, MD, Aspen Publishers, 2001.

Senge, Peter, Art Kleiner, Charlotte Roberts, George Roth, Rick Ross, and Bryan Smith. *The Dance of Change: The Challenges to Sustaining Momentum in Learning Organizations.* Doubleday. March 1999.

Stufflebeam, David L. *Foundational Models for 21st Century Program Evaluation.* The Evaluation Center, December 1, 1999.

United Way of America. *Achieving and Measuring Community Outcomes: Challenges, Issues, Some Approaches.* United Way of America, April 1999.

United Way of America. *Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach.* Outcome Measurement Resource Network. 1996.

Wellman, Barry. *Networks in the Global Village: Life in Contemporary Communities.* Westview Press, July 1999.

Whent, Linda S., and James G. Leising. *A Twenty-Year Evaluation of the California Agricultural Leadership Program.* Journal of Agricultural Education, Fall 1992.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. *Leading from the Heart: The Passion to Make a Difference, Leadership Stories told by Kellogg National Fellowship Program Fellows.* Battle Creek: Kellogg Foundation, 2001.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. *Logic Model Development Guide.* Battle Creek: Kellogg Foundation, October 2000.

Woltring, Carol, Wendy Constantine and Liz Schwarte, *Does Leadership Training Make a Difference? The CDC/UD Public Health Leadership Institute: 1991-1999.* Journal of Public Health Management and Practice. (forthcoming in 2003).

Young, Dianne P., and Nancy M. Dixon. *Helping Leaders Take Effective Action: A Program Evaluation.* Greensboro: Center for Creative Leadership, 1996.

W.K. KELLOGG
FOUNDATION