

## ACADEMIC

# Effective Leader Development

Tom Kolditz, Brig Gen (Ret), USA, Founding Director, Ann and John Doerr Institute for New Leaders, Rice University

Interviewed by: Douglas Lindsay

**Lindsay:** Do you mind sharing a little bit about your leadership journey? How you started and how you ended up where you are today? I find that the journey can be a very powerful developmental experience that we can all learn from.

**Kolditz:** When I went to college, I had an ROTC scholarship and I was very interested in psychology. So, when I graduated from Vanderbilt, I went to the University of Missouri and got a Ph.D. in Social Psychology. I thought the Army would make me a research psychologist because I knew what research psychologists in the Army did. Instead, they made me a field artillery man. It was actually fortuitous because the first person who I reported to as a lieutenant, he was also a lieutenant and his name was Patrick Harris. He was a West Point basketball player under Coach Mike Krzyzewski. He was powerfully focused on leadership, and so he mentored me and kind of showed

---

Brigadier General (Ret) **Tom Kolditz** is the founding Director of the Ann and John Doerr Institute for New Leaders at Rice University. Prior to Rice, he taught as a Professor in the Practice of Leadership and Management and Director of the Leadership Development Program at the Yale School of Management. While in the Army, he led the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership at West Point for 12 years. A highly experienced global leader, General Kolditz has more than 35 years in leadership roles on four continents. His career has focused on either leading organizations himself, or studying leadership and leadership policy across sectors. Dr. Kolditz has published more than 75 books, book chapters, and articles as well as presented leadership content to more than 350 governmental, corporate, and social sector audiences worldwide. He developed the concept of in extremis leadership—an original crisis leadership model—while serving in the oil fields and palace cities in Iraq. His second book, *Leadership Reckoning: Can Higher Education Develop the Leaders We Need*, is driving a leader development reform movement in higher education in collaboration with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He is an American Psychological Association Fellow and a member of the Academy of Management. He holds a Bachelor's degree in Psychology and Sociology from Vanderbilt University, three Master's degrees, and Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Missouri. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gqTRJzCYINw&list=PLpqq5wLcCO7oJTGlD3yZfaOL78lbLrGX7&index=9&t=6s>

me the challenges of actually applying leadership and actually leading in the context of the combat unit. I brought the lens of social psychology to start figuring things out.

My military career went on, and it was a constant back and forth between tactical jobs in regular combat artillery units and more cerebral jobs that they would send a Ph.D. in psychology to do. So, I did things like work in the Human Resources Directorate in the Pentagon, I was the aide-de-camp for a two-star general Chief of Artillery, and I worked in the Center for Army Leadership at Ft. Leavenworth. But always back and forth between doing leadership and then writing leadership policy and so forth.

I made a very hard decision after I commanded a battalion in Korea. When I was at War College, I decided to basically veer away from the tactical army and go to West Point to be the Chairman of the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership. In doing that, I was really able to focus on how people developed as leaders, and I came to the conclusion that it had next to nothing with the courses that we taught, and it had much more to do with the interactions between cadets and very well trained tactical officers. At that time, we were sending our tactical officers to get a 36-credit hour Masters in Leadership from Columbia. I can remember thinking “If I had the opportunity to apply some of these leader development lessons in a private university, I could do this as well or maybe better than the service academies.”

I subsequently got an opportunity to go to Yale and build a program in their business school and I substituted International Coaching Federation (ICF) trained coaches for tactical officers. We didn't have the same kind of people walking around but the process the tactical officers used to develop cadets, we call it

coaching on the outside. I built a program where all second year MBA students would have a coach along with other aspects. After that, I was hired by Rice University to start a program from scratch and was able to do that in a way that cost half as much as classroom instruction. It enabled them to affordably offer every student in the university an opportunity to be coached for a semester. As a result, between 30 and 40% of any given class works with us and has a coach for a full semester. We have 17 different offerings for programs, and a student who comes to Rice and wants to get a great education at a tier-one research university and wants to develop as a leader can do that.

At the same time, John Doerr, who gave us the endowment to do the Doerr Institute, which enabled the above work, thinks very big. He wanted to make sure that we were going to impact the way leaders are developed across all of higher education. That gave us this notion of working with the Carnegie Foundation to design a classification, an optional classification, in leadership education and development called Leadership for Public Purpose. That's a bit of a carrot for universities to be able to get that kind of classification and at the same time we wanted to launch a national movement around it called the Leadership Reckoning Movement. So we wrote a book called *Leadership Reckoning: Can Higher Education Develop the Leaders We Need?* We sent three copies of that book to every president and provost in the top 200 schools in the country. That has caused a lot of movement in universities. We've had dozens of university presidents visit the Doerr Institute, we had the chancellor of the Texas Tech system and four of his presidents come. We've pulled together a consortium of schools that are interested in improving leader development and interested in the Carnegie Classification comprising 129 colleges and universities, which represents 2.5 million students. So, it's a pretty substantial movement

and the Carnegie Classification isn't even on the street yet. When that happens, we'll probably get three times that, roughly 400 schools, probably 15 million students. So, what we're about is more and better leaders. We don't

*We don't think that incrementally contributing to leadership knowledge is going to change the world. It has to be execution. It has to be actually creating a net leader development effect in individuals that is psychologically measureable.*

really sell anything, we give away a lot, we give away our business models, we give away instruments that we've validated, we give away strategies for measuring leader development outcomes. We are very generous because more and better leaders in higher education is our goal, that's our mission. For representative scale, those 129 colleges and universities are roughly equivalent to all of the universities in the UK. When we get to 400 that number will exceed all of the colleges and universities in the UK, Canada and Australia combined.

**Lindsay:** That's an amazing scope.

**Kolditz:** It really is. We are focused on, and this sounds really almost arrogant, but we are focused on changing the world. We want to change the impact that higher education has on society by getting more leaders. Because they promise that and failed to deliver on it. We're not just being outraged to be outraged. We want to provide solutions - workable, practical, affordable solutions. And academia has not been set up to provide that. It has been set up to do teaching and research. That is the way that a lot of leadership work has gone

in academia. But the problem is classroom teaching and academic research does not create more and better leaders. It creates knowledge about leadership. So, we are very much on the execution side. John Doerr has a favorite saying that I probably refer to at least once a day in some way, what he says is "ideas are easy, execution is everything."

That attitude led him to his *Measure What Matters* book on how to set goals using objectives and key results (OKRs) and it's our way of viewing the world at the Doerr Institute. We don't think that incrementally contributing to leadership knowledge is going to change the world. It has to be execution. It has to be actually creating a net leader development effect in individuals that is psychologically measureable.

**Lindsay:** Right. So you are suggesting that it has got to be more than simply the cognition of leadership. It has got to be the behavior. It has to be the skills and it has got to be what people are doing with that knowledge right?

**Kolditz:** In some ways yes, in some ways no. We think that probably the most important variable is a cognitive variable we measure called leader identity. If a person increases his or her leader identity, they are more likely to be confident in their ability to lead, more likely to seek out a leader role, they are more likely to step up as a leader in the context of work, and so forth. But we also measure behavioral skills, competencies, and we give the vast majority of our students an emotional intelligence measure so that they have some sense of what their emotional make up is. They can apply that in their own development as well. So, we measure behaviorally, cognitively, emotionally, and all of that contributes to a person's ability to lead. For example, if you have an increased and strong leader identity, if you don't have the skills to give feedback or make decisions

or do the things that leaders do, it really doesn't matter. So it's really a constellation of cognitive, behavioral and emotional factors that gets us to more and better leaders.

**Lindsay:** And the opportunity to do something with that, right? The actual, practical application of that.

**Kolditz:** Yes. We have an area now called thought leadership and it often starts with a TED Talk or something and then the speaker begins to become more popular and their ideas begin to spread. It is remarkable to us as we watch this, how little impact many thought leaders have. They might be famous and have a TED Talk and spread all kinds of good ideas, but ideas are easy, execution is everything. So they haven't figured out a mechanism to improve society. Maybe they monetize their silly little idea or whatever, but they haven't really done it in a way that creates an impact on the world that makes it better.

**Lindsay:** They may make a ton of money, but that doesn't necessarily mean they are changing anything.

**Kolditz:** Exactly! I know people with two million LinkedIn followers, who don't really do anything. Do they change the world?" They're stuck. John Doerr is a big thinker. He put the original money into Google. He thought Google was a good idea. He put they money into Amazon. He put the money into Netflix. Those are game changers. That is the way we are approaching the leadership reckoning movement. We are going to change higher education, and make them accountable and proud of their ability to improve leadership in their student bodies to some degree, and as a result, industry has to pay less to develop them. Right now, you've got a lot of businesses spending a lot of money on leader development, when what they should be doing is creating widgets and selling services- whatever

it is that their business does. Instead, they are getting a steady flow of high school level leaders who have college educations and then they have to fix them. It's a broken strategic system. And so, the only place to fix it is in higher ed.

**Lindsay:** I agree. In *Leadership Reckoning*, you mention that a lot of leader development has been haphazard, incoherent, and evidence-free. Oftentimes with leader development and leadership consulting, there can be very little accountability. What you are suggesting is building that accountability into the system. With that in mind, what has been the reaction? It has likely been all over the gamut from universities when you challenge them by saying "you say you develop leaders, but where is the evidence, what are you doing?" How have you been able to manage that with external universities but also with your own faculty and staff? It sounds like faculty become a part of the process.

**Kolditz:** Well, we don't deal with faculty at Rice. We don't consider ourselves faculty. We don't educate, we develop. Faculty are generally ill equipped, as they haven't been trained to develop students as leaders. They are incredibly busy with teaching, research, and service- which is also how they get evaluated and promoted. So to ask faculty to do it is generally a really bad strategy.

To answer your question about how schools react to this is that some schools react with benign indifference, and most of them are in the top 10. Because honestly, they are arrogant and they don't want to change. Yale University is probably 325 years old, and it's very difficult to enact change in circumstances like that. Other universities see the opportunity and they see that they are going to be able to achieve this Carnegie Classification. They know that they'll be able to attract more and better students if they create more and better

leaders. I think that some schools have done a lot of soul searching and we get a lot of people slapping their foreheads with their palms, going “you are right, we need to do better.”

Probably the biggest form of resistance is not deliberate but it comes from the long term underfunding and acceptance of low standards in leader development in higher education. A lot of people doing the programs are like “Gee, we just don’t have the funds for that.” They don’t understand how universities work. Not having funds is a way for a university to tell you that you are not important. But it’s almost as if they have accepted this. It’s a bottom feeding kind of phenomenon where they just scrape together the money they can, they do a lot with volunteers, they try to use existing faculty, and they wind up with a completely unprofessional program.

We’ve demonstrated quantitatively that what we do at Rice costs half as much as classroom stuff. What I tell some of these university presidents when they talk about not having funds is I ask them “is this worth the two worst courses you teach? And the salaries of the two worst professors at the university?” That’s really what we are talking about. We aren’t talking about massive amounts of money. We are talking about reasonable amounts, and if something costs half as much as something you are already doing, then it’s a choice. We are really just turning this mirror on universities and saying you are choosing not to develop students as leaders. That is a choice that you are making, maybe unconsciously, but it’s a choice. That is an example of how we interact with schools and what kind of buttons we are trying to push to move this forward.

**Lindsay:** I like that idea that what you are offering is not just a mirror back to people, like you said, you are offering up data, assessments, and a way ahead. So it’s

not just saying “Hey you need to do this because you have this opportunity and you are not taking advantage of it” it is “Here is what you should be doing, and here is an effective, proven, validated strategy for making it happen.” You are actually providing the tools, techniques, procedures that universities would need to happen.

**Kolditz:** Exactly. You know the Carnegie Classification is self-examining, so you basically pull a big committee together at the school and you look at how you are developing leaders among staff, faculty, students, and the curriculum. It’s an across the board thing. Once that self-examination is complete, we’ve won. Because universities are perfectly smart, they are smart enough to create a bang-up leader develop strategy if they want to. There is not a major university in the country that couldn’t do it in a year. So, the self-examination aspect of it is really important. We also recognize that maybe the way we do things at Rice, isn’t the best for the University of Texas, or the University of Colorado-Boulder. They were the first ones to complete the pilot, and they’ve got a terrific centralized system of leader development led by the Chancellor that is really exceptional. We’re happy when schools figure out their own path forward.

It doesn’t have to be the path that we chose but we argue that there should be four fundamental principles that drive it:

- 1) Leader development is the core function of a university. If you don’t think it’s your function, then why do it? But most universities have it in their mission statement or in their vision somewhere.
- 2) We use evidence based techniques and to us that means we do things that have been successful in some other context.

- 3) We only use professional people. So no untrained mentors, no untrained faculty, no peer-coaches. We use professional people, and most of them we pay by the hour rather than bringing them on full time, so it can be affordable.
- 4) We measure outcomes - objectively, independently and ruthlessly.

So no one who has a program does their own measuring. We have research psychologists who basically have a measured strategy for every workshop, for coaching, for every one of our programs we have measurement data on, and we kill a program that isn't effective. We do it unemotionally. If one of my leader developers has something that doesn't work, we just take that money and put it toward something else that does work. It's just a matter of not wanting to kid ourselves, or oversell ourselves, or waste our own time. But there are tremendous amounts of activities that very, very seldom produce leader development effects that people spend tons of money on. Speaker series for example. Leadership speakers do not change people. Newsflash, they don't. We don't see much use in most leadership conferences. We don't find use in what we refer to as contrived events, like a leader reaction course.

That is a contrived event. People tend to have very low investment in contrived events. They are much better at being invested in their job, or function, or group of friends. But temporary retreats and things, they often just don't do anything. They are good for other kinds of training, particularly in the military, but I found that in the totality of what people would say is leader development at West Point, where I worked, probably 70% of it is career development. Its officership, it's how to be a better officer and the actual learning to have influence - the actual leadership, is a fraction of cadet

development. So, that's the part that we are delivering to higher ed. There are other people, you know we have a big career development office at Rice, they can work on career development. You know mentors are very good at career development, but they are far less good at actual leader development. But most of the time when they are used for career development people point to it and say "oh that's leader development." No, probably not. That person is probably not a better leader, but they are better able to function in a career field.

**Lindsay:** I think you hit on something there that I've noticed as well too. It's the emotionality piece of it. It's not emotional, it's about what works and what doesn't work. If it doesn't move the needle on what it is that we want to move it on, to be able to look objectively, use the data, use the science to sit there and say "that is not giving us what we want regarding leader

*Objective measurement is a cleansing process. It takes away the falsehoods, it takes away the overselling, it's just truthfulness. If we can't be intellectually honest in leader development, we are in trouble.*

development" and just call it what it is. But also to identify what we are doing that is about the profession, the career development, and what is about leadership. To understand that all are important, but they are different with different outcomes.

**Kolditz:** Yes, and that is why objective outcome measurement is so important. There are a lot of other reasons why important politicians and general officers are drawn to come into a place like the Air Force Academy or West Point. Sometimes it's important

to have interaction between the military and senior leaders in certain ways. But don't just claim that that is making cadets better leaders because I will get the data, and I will embarrass you. The way I look at it, it's either measurable or it's not. You know there are a lot of things that you hear that immediately cause my skepticism to rise. One is "Well, you know they do this at such-and-such tech company" another one is "We won't see the effects of this for many years." Why would that be true? Is there some kind of slow dissolving capsule around the development? Probably not. Objective measurement is a cleansing process. It takes away the falsehoods, it takes away the overselling, it's just truthfulness. If we can't be intellectually honest in leader development, we are in trouble.

**Lindsay:** True. You hit on something that I think is very different about your approach compared to many other approaches that I've seen in other universities and organizations worldwide, it's that focus on professional talent, the coaches, and being able to invest in people who have the skills. I've seen a lot of, and I'm sure you have too in your career, people try to daisy chain these programs together, on a budget and say "we can't afford that so we're going to teach our faculty how to be coaches and that's going to be good enough." They don't realize that there is a reason that coaches have certifications and there is a time requirement and an investment by certified coaches as well. The ability to say that "we're going to invest in that because it's important" is unique about what you do and it's good to see that because many universities try to do it on the cheap and just cobble something together.

**Kolditz:** Yes. If you really look at where the money is going a lot of those universities are doing some very expensive things that they think are developing students as leaders, but they don't. I was part of a

three-person team that analyzed a leader development institute at another university. It was a 5-year review for their director. They complained all the time about not having enough money to really develop students, their programs tend to be small, their president wants them to develop more students but they just don't have the money. We analyzed their budget and on a per-student basis they were spending about 30 to 40% more per student than the Doerr Institute does. But they were spending it ways that caused money to go away really quickly with no gain. For example, internships are really expensive to send a student on a one, two-week, maybe a month internship. Unless they are being coached, and deliberately developed by a professional, they are going to come back and they are going to be no better than when they left. They were paying students salaries to participate in leadership work, they were paying faculty to teach leadership courses, and by the time they got done, they had frittered away more money than we have in our budget at the Doerr Institute working with 40% of the Rice student body. It's just a matter of priority. They paid research assistants, but research assistants aren't going to make anybody a better leader, it's money downrange. A lot of schools spend a lot of money on it.

You know the other thing I found at Rice? When I came to Rice, there were 17 different organizations claiming to be developing students as leaders, but they had a lot in common. They had relatively small budgets, less than half a million dollars a year which means nobody pays attention, they didn't measure outcomes, they didn't use any professional people and so the money was just kind of going away. But when you aggregated the budgets of all 17 of those programs, it was close to 8 million dollars a year.

**Lindsay:** That is significant.

**Kolditz:** It is. It's like four times what the Doerr Institute spends a year working with 40% of the student body. So, because of the stove piping and the fragmentation in academia and the lack of accountability for mediocre performance, the money just, it's like a sieve. There is plenty of money in universities to do this, even in universities that are kind of on the ropes. We're not talking about big sums, we are talking about smart, measured-outcome utilization of the resource.

**Lindsay:** Territorialism can certainly be a challenge in higher education. Everybody wants to be able to say "Oh, we do leader development. We're a part of that process." Case and point, when I retired from the military, I went to Penn State to create and stand up an online master's degree in leadership for their World Campus. We wanted to call it a Masters of Professional Studies in Leadership, and we were informed that we couldn't claim the word "leadership." We had to modify it some way. After about 18 months, we were approved to call it the Psychology of Leadership. The Business School was able to claim Strategic Leadership. It came down to territorialism and who could actually claim the word "leadership." My take was that no one owns it. It should be a corporate thing where we all have different competencies. There was a heavy investment toward leadership education and activities, but it was sectioned off in such a way that you really couldn't focus or get a critical mass on it.

**Kolditz:** That is very common. The schools that do it best, however, have a centralized university wide program, like the University of Colorado system, Rice University, and to some degree, Seton Hall University. We are seeing more and more of that. One of the challenges when we built our consortium was that we had to let almost anyone from a university come into

the consortium. Why? Because there is no person at a university that is in charge of leader development. Which is pretty doggone remarkable when it's in most of their mission statements. That just makes me laugh. What organization has a mission function that is unattended to by a Senior Vice President or someone else in the organization? It's not just going to happen magically.

**Lindsay:** It's just going to happen over the four years, or longer, that a student is at the university. An osmosis effect. It's just going to happen by the time they graduate, right?

**Kolditz:** Right. At Rice, we compared leader identity scale scores between the people who come to the Doerr Institute and 2,300 students who did no leader development at all, not just at the Doerr Institute but the Rice Center for Engineering Leadership, Center for Civic Leadership, or any of the other entities. We found that when they graduated, there was no change in their leader identity. A four-year degree does zero to prepare a person as a leader. It's an orthogonal construct. Also, how people do in leader development programing when correlated with their grades, the correlation is zero. No correlation between grades and leader development because it is a completely independent capability. But you know people in universities it's one of the first things they ask, "Will this make them have better grades?" A lot of leadership programs try to argue that, "Oh yeah, they'll be leading and they'll have better grades," No. It's a different thing. That is one of the reasons why we find people who fail out of universities sometimes being incredibly successful entrepreneurs. It is because it is not about knowledge acquisition. It is about the capacity to lead. That is independent of other things in the university. That's why the traditional university structures are incapable of creating net leader

development effects. They are set up to do something else, they are set up to educate students.

**Lindsay:** And they can do that very well right? But that is, like you said, a different process by which to do that. With your approach, in terms of bringing in certified coaches to provide that expertise, it's also to have other professionals in the leader development space at the institute to help inform that, about assessment, about professors of practice. In that way, I'm assuming so it's not just about the cognitive piece, it's about the application piece of it- about the identity development of it.

**Kolditz:** Yes. Our fellows and board members include names like Jim Collins, Jim Kouzes, and Bruce Avolio. We have some of the best thinkers and researchers in the country with us but honestly, they do more listening than talking because they are not used to seeing what we are doing. We get a lot of support from those kind of people. When we wanted to do a coaching technique for how to coach a student through an ethical dilemma, we were able to pull together four of the finest philosophy professors and ethicists to work with us for a day about what this technique should be, but then we took it and executed it. We didn't write a paper about it, we executed it. And so, we do get a lot of help, a lot of support. We have board members who are incredibly generous with their time, Al Gore being one of them, Colin Powell being another, Klaus Schwab, who founded the World Economic Forum as another

**Lindsay:** That speaks a lot to your approach because people only have so much time they can invest. When you have people who are at that level, they've learned the value of accountability, assessment, investing time in things that work. I think, in a way, that is a validation of your approach that they are willing to partner with you all in terms of your approach. It

is rare in universities, and it's rare in organizations, in general, for an approach to be so focused on the outcome, the accountability, what works, what doesn't work, and really staying true to your purpose. It's got to be an interesting balance for you though because you are running the Doerr Institute for New Leaders which a lot of that is a down and in approach, but what I've been hearing you talking about is you getting pulled up and out to mentor, coach, and really help lead other universities in doing that. How do you manage that balance about staying true to the university and what you are doing at the Institute in taking care of the students, but also kind of being that thought leader with action to other universities?

**Kolditz:** Step one, I hire a lot smart people. Once we built the programming and the systems to deliver it at Rice, then I can turn outward. At that point, I'm free to do that and I've got great people who can run the programing and develop the Rice students. I use Rice as an example to other schools. You can develop 40% of your student body. Don't try to do 100%, if you do, you'll have a whole lot of people who cloud your metrics with bad performance. Let them self-select in. That was hard for my researchers to understand. They consider self-selection as a bias. Self-selection is our friend. The light came on for them when we started doing time series designs. We would have people who would select into programing and then we would randomly wait-list 50 of them to use them as a control group so that when we are measuring effects 100% of the people had volunteered or self-selected in but only part of them got the intervention and that way we could show causality. We can eliminate the idea that "well these are just people who want to be leaders." No. That wouldn't be a very sophisticated metric. That is what you get when you don't have professional measurement people. "See these people went and got jobs", "these people wrote..." it's remarkable what I get from other schools

as evidence that their programs work. We just have to keep pushing to make this a professionalized process.

**Lindsay:** It's got to be encouraging to have Mr. Doerr with that same vision of its not just about Rice University, it's about making an impact higher education wide and actually, business wide because you are developing leaders and graduating them to go be leaders in organizations. So it's for a purpose. It's got to be very nice to have not just a benefactor, but someone who shares that vision of making a difference and supporting you in that way as the organization grows.

**Kolditz:** Yes. I can't say enough good things about John Doerr. Not only is he really generous, but he also lets people do their jobs. He is not a meddling donor, of which there are many. When I initially met him I asked him "What is your vision for the Institute?" and he said "I don't have one that is why I'm hiring you." That was with 50 million dollars in his hand. But, he understands risk and his approach that we have the ability to change the world, that is pretty infectious. He knew that Google would change the world. He knew that Amazon would change the world. Maybe he didn't know exactly how in both cases, but he understood the power of those ideas. Now he is focused on other things, mostly on climate, and I think we all see why that is important now. But he wanted an impact. He and I talked a lot about online delivery and monetizing concepts and how that would be good to do. Then COVID hit and online delivery became something that all of us do all the time. So our conversations around that have shifted a bit. He understands the Carnegie Classification and the power that will have in higher education over time.

We are also in the process, and you might find this interesting, Ryan Brown, who is our managing director for measurement, is creating a course on how

to measure leader development effects. Our plan is to make that course available broadly to grad students if they have had a three course stats sequence and a methods course. It will be free to grad students. It'll cost about \$1,000 for faculty members, and about \$5,000 for a corporate attendee. The purpose is to create a list of grad students who know how to measure leader development effects in populations. Then as they get their Ph.D.'s and graduate, they starburst into a thousand directions. We will retain their list, and if you are at let's say, the University of Illinois, and you have a leadership program and you want someone to measure the effects for you, all you have to do is look down our list until it says University of Illinois, and there will be a list of faculty members who are certified in our method when they graduated. We are going to create, embedded in higher education, a leader development measurement capability. I think we can do that in two years. I'm talking somewhere between 500 and 1,000 trained grad students.

**Lindsay:** That is amazing. Because what you not only do is, you are not only creating this cohort or this cadre of folks who understand what measurement and assessment looks like for leader development, you are actually putting accountability into the system because you've got these people going out, not just knowing what they are doing, but they are impacting the organizations that they are going. There can be a ripple effect of having someone on the faculty that says "that's not an outcome, that's not measurable, you can't say that because that is not what assessment really is." I think there are a couple of second and third order effects that go along with that, beyond just the cohort or cadre of people but the impact that they will have on broader assessment efforts moving forward.

**Kolditz:** Yes, and you and I have been around higher ed long enough that we know what is going to happen

when we start teaching all these grad students how to do it. One of them is going to start a journal that is going to be associated with the process. One of them is going

*Almost every university that does a lot of chest thumping about how they develop students as leaders, when they take a hard look at themselves, they are kind of embarrassed going “Oh, we can do so much better than this.”*

a leadership job, you can do it. You can be a presumed expert almost overnight but there is just so much bottom feeding that goes on by people who don't know what they are doing. They just spend some of the money and they bring in inspirational people and they bring in influential donors to speak because then they are courting money at the same time. It's just an untenable state of affairs in higher ed. Almost every university that does a lot of chest thumping about how they develop students as leaders, when they take a hard look at themselves, they are kind of embarrassed going “Oh, we can do so much better than this.”

to start a new business that is going to be available to people to buy into. It will develop. But we are going to make it really embarrassing for someone in a university to say “oh you know leadership...that's intangible....you just can't measure that.” That simply isn't true.

**Lindsay:** In addition, referring to your list, you have got three faculty members on your faculty who could actually show you how that's done. That's going to be the fun part as they get met both ways—from the faculty side but also the institutional side. That will be fun to be sandwiched in the middle there with some of those.

**Kolditz:** And it'll change the quality of people who are engaged with this. I was talking to a guy who is in charge of a leadership program at a major university. He is a retired football coach, and he said “I can't figure out how to do this measurement stuff.” And I said “Well, yeah, you need some skills!” That is why our course has some prerequisites—a stats sequence and a methods course. Because when we say time series design, we don't want to have to take 15 minutes to explain to someone what that means. Not everyone can do this. Under current conditions, if you can talk yourself into

**Lindsay:** That point right there is one of the things that I truly enjoy about what I get to do with this journal. Not only do I get to highlight good information that is out there and bring that into the university, which allows me to support the university, it can also help it grow as an institution by becoming aware of what is going on in broader leader development. We do many things well here, but since we are in the space of development, that means we are continually refining, assessing, and growing. I imagine not all universities are open to that. Thank you for your time and insights.

♦ ♦ ♦