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by Kelly Hannum, Jennifer W. Martineu, Claire Reinalt, and Laura C. Leviton (Jossey-Bass & The Center for Creative Leadership, 2007)

This month, ILA member Richard Couto continues in his role as a special guest interviewer for this feature. Richard Couto helped found the Antioch Ph.D. program in Leadership and Change as well as the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond, Virginia. His recent books focus on community leadership, To Give Their Gifts; democratic theory and practice, Making Democracy Work Better; and higher education, Courses in Courage.

Kelly Hannum is an Enterprise Associate at the Center for Creative Leadership® in the Global Leadership and Diversity research group and the Design and Evaluation Center. Her primary interest is in the application and development of research and evaluation methodologies in global contexts. In addition to her work at CCL, Kelly has been involved in research and evaluation projects with a number of organizations, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. She has presented her work at a number of conferences, and her work has been published internationally. She is co-author of the Evaluation Fieldbook. Kelly is also a lecturer for the Educational Research Methodology Department at University of North Carolina - Greensboro. Her Ph.D. is in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation with a minor in Statistics from UNC-G.

Claire Reinalt is Research and Evaluation Director for the Leadership Learning Community (LLC, www.leadershiplearning.org). She is the Convenor of LLC’s Evaluation Learning Circle which supports evaluators, practitioners and funders of leadership development programs and initiatives. Claire has designed and implemented over 15 leadership development evaluations for national, state, and local foundations including the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Claire holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from Brandeis University. She is author (or co-author) of the following publications that are available on-line: Evaluating Outcomes and Impacts: A Scan of 55 Leadership Programs www.wkkf.org; Developing Leadership in an International Context www.wkkf.org.

Richard Couto: The book starts a discussion between practitioners of leadership development and evaluators. Why did you want to start that conversation?

Kelly Hannum: From my perspective, it was ultimately about bringing...
the book came about. It seems to have been a collaborative effort that included some of the conversations that you referred to just now.

Kelly: This was one of the largest collaborative projects I've worked on. It was also the most exciting and intellectually engaging. It was wonderful to hear different perspectives and see connections and differences between them. It obviously made the process a little more challenging, as well, but the authors are passionate about their work. We all saw this as an important and valuable task so we were committed to getting the work done. That focus helped us stay on track and also allowed us to have an honest and deep dialogue, even when we disagreed or came from different perspectives.

Claire: The Leadership Learning Community (LLC) has had an evaluation learning circle for the past six years. It brings together funders, scholars, practitioners, and evaluators, who are all interested in studying and exploring issues related to leadership development and how to better support and develop the leaders we need in our society. One of the common themes of interest to folks from the beginning has been how to understand the impact of what we're doing and how to do it better. Kelly and I began a conversation at an evaluation learning circle meeting about the potential and the need for a book like this. We were excited about some of the evaluations that were being done in this field and regretted the lack of accessibility people had to this work in the larger field. We really wanted to put this book together to have a larger impact on the field. The way we went about it was in a collaborative, participatory way, modeled as a learning circle, a learning community; an approach to working together that we had been experimenting with already as part of LLC.

Kelly: This was one of the largest collaborative projects I've worked on. It was also the most exciting and intellectually engaging. It was wonderful to hear different perspectives and see connections and differences between them. It obviously made the process a little more challenging, as well, but the authors are passionate about their work. We all saw this as an important and valuable task so we were committed to getting the work done. That focus helped us stay on track and also allowed us to have an honest and deep dialogue, even when we disagreed or came from different perspectives.

Claire: The Leadership Learning Community (LLC) has had an evaluation learning circle for the past six years. It brings together funders, scholars, practitioners, and evaluators, who are all interested in studying and exploring issues related to leadership development and how to better support and develop the leaders we need in our society. One of the common themes of interest to folks from the beginning has been how to understand the impact of what we're doing and how to do it better. Kelly and I began a conversation at an evaluation learning circle meeting about the potential and the need for a book like this. We were excited about some of the evaluations that were being done in this field and regretted the lack of accessibility people had to this work in the larger field. We really wanted to put this book together to have a larger impact on the field. The way we went about it was in a collaborative, participatory way, modeled as a learning circle, a learning community; an approach to working together that we had been experimenting with already as part of LLC.

I think we were given a really unique opportunity by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to be able to bring authors together. It enabled us to develop and strengthen our relationships, to feel ourselves as part of a community of practice that can continue to be sustained by organizations like the Leadership Learning Community and the evaluation learning circle. I think, there's just something really special about that process that I would encourage others who are involved in projects, particularly an edited collection like this, where multiple authors are contributing, to consider using that approach. I think we got much richer outcomes from our efforts and made it easier and more fun for people. This was really a joy to work on. It was just wonderful.

Kelly, Claire put this work in the context of the LLC. I wonder if you want to put this in the context of CCL?

Kelly: Sure. The center has been around since the early 1970s. A lot of its early work was around individual leadership development and over the last, at least decade or so, we’ve been working more to include this notion of collective leadership and collec-
tive leadership development, which is similar to the focus of LLC. This has obvious implications not only for leadership development but also for leadership development evaluation, which is where I spend a lot of my time. Jen Martineau [co-editor] and I were talking about the interesting conversations we were having about leadership, leadership development, and evaluation in that context. We were experiencing and hearing about the challenges, and the shifts taking place with regard to that work. We thought, let’s bring people together and do a collective work that explains what the different perspectives are so we can have more of a shared and connected conversation.

The book also represents a shift towards a more collective notion of learning and knowledge generation. CCL’s *Handbook on Leadership Development* talked about how leadership development happens from a CCL perspective. That book documents what CCL has learned about leadership development, which is obviously an important thing to do. However, with *The Handbook on Leadership Development Evaluation* we wanted to do something different. That book is less defined by CCL’s perspective; it is a more collaborative work representing a broader, less integrated, view.

I would also echo Claire’s thanks to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for taking a chance on something like this. This isn’t something they would typically fund. We had a successful collaborative process, being able to get together physically face to face and have conversations. Nothing substitutes for that; not video conferences, not phone calls. We needed to get together and develop the relationships and develop our ideas in a setting that fostered that. We did this by hosting two conferences with authors. They were the opportunity for the authors to engage with each other and thereby develop their thinking and their chapters.

We really wanted to put this book together to have a larger impact on the field. The way we went about it was in a collaborative, participatory way, modeled as a learning circle, a learning community...

We had a successful collaborative process, being able to get together physically face to face and have conversations. Nothing substitutes for that; not video conferences, not phone calls. We needed to get together and develop the relationships and develop our ideas in a setting that fostered that. We did this by hosting two conferences with authors.

Since we had different perspectives, we needed a way for authors to get feedback about the language they were using or the examples they were using so that their chapters would be less jargon-y. It wasn’t necessarily jargon-free but it was less sector-specific or perspective-specific. Our conversations were opportunities to make sure things were clear to a broad group of people even though we had different perspectives and experiences. We wanted the book to be accessible to as broad a group as possible.

Perhaps the contributors’ sharing helped cut down on the replication and duplication from one chapter to the next. The chapters and the sections are distinct but interrelated parts.

Claire: One of the more challenging parts of the book was to keep people focused on evaluation and the evaluation process as opposed to the leadership development work. So while some context is needed in order to describe whatever it is that is being evaluated, it was amazingly difficult in some instances to help people see that we really are focusing on how we evaluate leadership development. It’s not about what we’re learning about leadership development. It was an iterative process for people to get there in their chapters, but I think bringing people together really helped us clarify what it was that we were trying to get at in the book. We did write guidelines for contributors, but being able to talk face to face and clarify things with each other really helped.

You were trying to have a conversation about the nexus of several topics. It is neither an evaluation “how-to” book nor a book about what we’ve learned about leadership development. It’s a book precisely on leadership development evaluation. Do I have that right?

Claire: I think we intended it not to be a “how-to” in the sense of this-is-how-you-do-it-and-there-is-one-way-to-do-it; but we wanted it to be practical and give people advice. We also recognize the complexity of evaluating leadership development, however, and that it looks very different in different contexts. We wanted to honor that difference in the chapters and provide an opportunity for people to share what they were struggling with and some of the solutions that they had come up with in the process of doing the evaluation that might be useful for other people as they’re embarking on similar projects.

The “how-to” of this book seems to invite people to examine a whole range of experiences and then choose what seems to be
most appropriate. There is a very practical nature to it, but only after people become aware of how many options there are, and what the rich experience within the field is.

Kelly: That type of eight-step, “how-to” book is in other places. For instance Jen and I had written a guide about how CCL evaluates leadership development. But what wasn’t there was a single place to learn more about all the different approaches and all the different thinking around leadership development evaluation. This book is like a survey course on leadership development evaluations. Each chapter is sort of a mini “how-to” in a sense but with references that would give you more depth. We were hoping people could read through the handbook and broaden what they thought about leadership development evaluation; see what would be of most use to them after considering other possibilities; and then also have the resources to dig in further.

Claire: One of the innovations of this book is a companion website we developed that brings together all the resources that are described and listed in the book on an interactive website platform. So it gives a summary of the chapter and links to all the resources and references that are in the book. It makes it very easy for people to navigate and get further information about things that they’re interested in pursuing their own learning. [http://www.lead-ershiplearning.org/static/evalhandbook/index.html].

I know that a lot of people do leadership development in one form or another but I did not know about the many people evaluating those leadership development efforts. How large is the field of leadership development evaluation?

Kelly: I think it’s hard to quantify how large the field is because both the evaluation field and the leadership development field are growing and both are fairly young in terms of a defined field. If you put them together, that intersection is growing as well. I don’t know that you can draw the boundaries of either field.

It’s also hard to quantify because some people are doing evaluation work but don’t call themselves evaluators. Then there are also people who would say what they’re doing is leadership development work but I’m not sure that I would call what they do leadership development work. So there’s not a common frame for the fields yet.

Claire: It’s difficult for me to quantify the field as well. It exists in different sectors. There is not one association or one group that brings everybody together. So we do our work within AEA (American Evaluation Association), or ILA, or LLC, and other ones as well. So leadership development evaluation exists in these little subsections of different associations, which makes it difficult to understand how big it is.

I think Kelly is right: it’s a growing field but I don’t have a sense that it’s a huge field. This book is trying to stimulate more exchange and a conversation between people who are doing leadership development evaluation in the non-profit and in the for-profit sectors. They really have not overlapped very much, in my experience.

A couple of issues ago, Bruce Avolio talked about leadership development as being the least studied and the least theorized of all the aspects of leadership studies. He explained that’s why he went in the direction of authentic leadership. Do you think this book contributes to a better understanding of both the theory and practice of leadership development?

Kelly: I hope so. I don’t think we’ve settled anything or provided any definitive answers but I certainly hope we’ve opened up the discussion and shared information that would have been more difficult for people to access otherwise. I think what’s interesting about leadership, in particular leadership development, is that both of those (theory and practice) are shifting so that there is not a stable gap to fill. I think notions of leadership are changing; the modalities and the thinking behind how to develop leadership are changing based on that but also based on new learning modalities.

That’s part of what made this book exciting: we were working on something that isn’t clear; it’s not a fixed entity that you kind of figure out, and then it’s over. You have to continuously think about it, think about your opportunities, and think about connections.

I think one thing that helped us collectively get through the process of writing a book is that we felt, “We need to get this information out! We can’t wait for things to stabilize or for us to come up with a model that really captures everything.” From our perspective that just didn’t seem like it was ever going to happen. We just acknowledged this is a really big, messy thing. We have to share the best of our thinking collectively, the best of our work, in an effort to help other people deepen their understanding and also hopefully deepen and better their practice. I think that also helped people get beyond some of the differences among our perspectives.
I’ve often thought that reflective practice was an essential part of leadership, and it seems that that is one of the messages of this book as well: if we’re going to do leadership development, let’s be reflective in its practice and evaluation is our reflection on practice.

Claire: Yes, I definitely think so. Since I’ve been involved in the field of leadership development and evaluation over the past 10 years I’ve seen movement both within evaluation towards more of a participatory engagement of stakeholders in a reflective learning process as a methodology for learning and doing evaluation work. On the leadership development side, I have seen movement and recognition that effective leadership development is more than just training but really involves people in deeper, reflective inquiry that raises their own awareness about their strengths and weaknesses as leaders and supports them to be continuous learners on this journey of developing their own leadership. So with these changes I think there’s much more of an intersection and overlap, in the spirit and in the process of evaluation and leadership development.

Kelly: I would just echo what Claire has said. Both fields are converging more towards multiple perspectives and perhaps multiple truths, and really getting more focused not on figuring out which one is right but figuring out how to work together. This means letting go or at least lessening our grip on things that are not shared.

Might that include research in general? There’s an emphasis that you have in the book about participatory modes of evaluation and the importance of involving stakeholders, etc. Are there important lessons to transfer from evaluation research to the realm of general scholarship and research?

Claire: Some research pushes very close to what we would describe as evaluation. Learning by engaging in action research and more participatory approaches to doing research are very similar to the evaluation approaches that are represented in the book. Something that I hope comes through in the book is the value of using multiple approaches when doing evaluations. So that it’s not just qualitative, or just quantitative, but that there are mixed methods approaches that, in most cases, lead to better collection of evidence and data to think about the program; to determine to what extent it works; what its applicability is across a broad population; as well as to go more deeply into the experience of becoming and strengthening oneself as a leader. You need to get breadth and depth, and a mixed-method approach is really the way to do that.

I don’t know if that addresses the research/evaluation question directly but a call for mixed methods and appropriate choices among methods is one thing that was common across almost all the chapters in the book and that’s certainly true in many research books as well.

Kelly: We felt it was important to make a distinction between evaluation and research within the book. In the conversations we had, the contributors said a lot of people who commission evaluations assume that researchers and evaluators are basically the same and you can interchange them. We wanted to point out that that is not always the case. Over the years we’ve encountered quite a few people in organizations who have hired someone who’s trained in a traditional research frame to conduct evaluations. What they ended up with was more of a research study than an evaluation study. That’s not to say that research can’t do evaluation studies. Certainly, they can and vice versa. But I think that there is a distinction between the ends of each. Overall research is more about understanding dynamics. Evaluation is about that as well but evaluation is often more focused on a specific group of people in a particular context. But even in saying that, you could certainly find examples where that is not the case. I suppose it all goes back to having a deep understanding about what you want to achieve and having the tools, processes, and such to help you get there.

Evaluators are sometimes seen as unwelcome intrusions into an organization—snitches, as it were; going into groups and focusing on the deficits rather than stressing their assets. The book, however, stresses appreciative inquiry.

Claire: I think an appreciative approach really is one of the things that we were trying to emphasize; particularly because evaluation has often been misused in communities. I think that all of us have found that when you enter into and work with a community that there is this process of clearing the slate if you will, and dealing honestly with the history and the legacy of how evaluation has often been misused.

That goes to the larger question: who
Kelly: I would just add that I think it is a matter of finding the right balance. I think evaluation, or some parts of evaluation at least, were out of balance. They looked more critically at things and less at what was going well. To be helpful to multiple entities, you have to do both, and that the right balance is going to be context dependent. But if you only look at what’s going wrong, well that’s obviously going to be pretty de-motivating. There may be value there that is going unseen. However, only looking at what is going well might lead people to miss opportunities or to not adequately use resources (for example to continuing investing in a program that is not working). A lot of it, like Claire was talking about, is the balance between needs, perspectives, and goals – and the processes by which those are known and shared. There’s also the balance between an internal organizational perspective—and there are obviously multiple internal perspectives—as well as somebody coming in fresh and looking at the multiple perspectives; being open to different kinds of perspectives and different kinds of information. Not to make them all agree necessarily but to really understand the situation fully – defining who “we” are and what we are trying to do and determining a way to get a sense of if we are accomplishing our goals, etc.

Claire: Also, I think the authors collectively make the point that there’s real value in beginning the evaluation process at the beginning of a leadership development program so that you’re engaged with participants along that journey. When you come in at the end, the perception of evaluation and its purpose is something for the field or for the funders but it’s not going to benefit the participants in the program. What evaluation can actually contribute is much, much more if you’re involved from the beginning.

Claire, I wonder to what extent your approach to evaluation was fashioned in the work that you were doing with women’s shelters in your early research?

Claire: I was interested in some of the challenges that domestic violence organizations were encountering as they grew and developed. One of the early challenges for feminist organizations that were providing services to battered women was the fear that they were selling out if they got money from the state. I wanted to show, through demonstrating with more ethnographic studies, that activists weren’t selling out by taking that money; that accepting those funds created a new platform for their activism; and that if we got beneath the rhetoric of that fear of state support that we could see it as another political arena. So my interest has always been in looking at the potential, the possibilities, and the opportunities, recognizing that there are always challenges. I think we get much further much faster by focusing on what is possible and the potential for change than we do if we are always worrying about and focusing on the negative.

Let me ask you how evaluation can influence social change. One of the chapters on cross-program evaluation suggests that it might be useful in identifying elements of successful social intervention, i.e. teen pregnancy. Related to that, new approaches to leadership development evaluations assume new perspectives on leadership such as collaboration. So there is discussion of evaluating social networks. Can you talk a little about evaluation and social change and evaluation of social networks?

Claire: Certainly when we talk about social change we’re talking about a collective or collaborative leadership process. Because significant social change doesn’t happen as the result of what an individual does, or even a small group of individuals however important they may be. I don’t want to underestimate the importance of social entrepreneurs or champions; I
think their role is very important. But broad based social change really depends on mobilizing many people on behalf of and around change efforts. I’ve seen a shift in leadership development over the past five years or so; moving much more towards exploring the collective nature of leadership in order to have the kinds of impacts that we’re talking about. That’s the real challenge for evaluation. At first we got pretty good at developing some tools to assess, and CCL has been a leader in this area, how individuals are developing as leaders.

We’re just now recognizing that while those tools are very valuable and contribute to our learning, there’s this whole other area of collaborative leadership, collective leadership and we are just beginning to develop assessment tools to take a look at them. One of those is social network mapping and social network analysis that has really been enhanced by some new technology that enables us to rather easily take a look at and map social networks within communities and within organizational contexts. You can look at an organization chart and see how people are related on the organizational chart, but that doesn’t really tell you anything about who goes to whom for advice or how information travels through the organization; or those things that really affect the day to day practice and success of the work of an organization.

So as these tools become more available and we can apply them, I think they will shift our own understanding; they will help people begin to recognize aspects of their relationships and their work that they haven’t seen before. From an evaluation perspective we can begin to track changes in relationship over time and maybe that will tell us something interesting about how relationships influence change. Again it is still speculative, but as networks become more connected and dense, does that indicate a growing movement and force for change in society? Can we begin to see correlations between what is happening in the network and the political force that the group is exercising around a policy issue or a social change agenda?

I’d say that the two most common outcomes of leadership development, broadly speaking, are increased self-awareness and the connections to people. Increased self-awareness certainly is something that a lot of us have worked and focused on, but I think that connections people develop with each other, the networks of social and professional connections that people make as part of leadership development programming, is equally important and deserves more attention. Likewise people also make connections to a bigger picture, to new ideas, that lead them to see themselves in a new light, or see their context more broadly, all of which opens up a world of opportunities. You can finally get people connected and they can mobilize themselves towards something that’s a common, shared goal. It’s just so much more powerful than a solo or isolated effort.

Our conversation suggests that leadership development evaluation may also be a form of leadership. You describe how evaluators should go about their work: clear goals, involvement of stakeholders in design, participatory implementation, feedback, etc.

Do you see an analogy between the evaluator’s role and the leadership role?

Kelly: I certainly do. Part of the way I like to do evaluation, and so do many of the authors in the book, is to facilitate a process by which people come together, to understand different perspectives about why they want to invest in leadership development – what’s the big picture, the shared goal? , how they will “do” leadership development and how to determine, document, communicate and learn from their progress (or lack thereof in some cases) That’s part of leadership, especially part of leadership where there may not be a clear hierarchy or there may be a complex problem that needs to be dealt with or to be understood.

I think a very clear example is reflective practice; a very specific skill to leadership itself as Claire mentioned, that also can be used collectively within an evaluation frame among a group of people.

Claire: Yeah, I think that is how we come at it. As leadership development evaluators, we have interest in both developing the leadership of evaluators and strengthening the capacity of leaders and those doing leadership development to reflect on and evaluate what they’re doing. We’re looking for the intersections, and I think the things that you laid out are very much where that intersection is. If you can do those things well, you’ll be a better leader and you’ll be a better evaluator.

Thanks so much for this interview and your important contribution to the field of leadership studies.