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I've been asked to provide:

1. “A brief history/overview of action learning
2. the evolution of Action Learning from Europe to the US
3. how it has evolved in business and in business schools in the US
4. and your thoughts/insights about action learning's next evolution as it spreads among business schools and businesses across the world."
Some Varieties of Action Learning Approaches Today:
“THE HOUSE OF ACTION LEARNING HAS MANY DOORS” Yury Boshyk

- “Traditional” or “Classic” or “Gold Standard” Action Learning
- “Americanized” or “Modified Version of Action Learning
- Action Reflection Learning™ (ARL)
- Business Driven Action Learning (BDAL)
- Learning Coach-Led Action Learning (WIAL) (KALA)
- Critical Action Learning (CAL)
- Virtual Action Learning (VAL)
- Audio Action Learning (AAL)
- Online or remote Action Learning
- Self-Managed Action Learning (SMAL)
- Auto Action Learning (Individual-based)
- “Future Search as Action Learning”
- Action Learning as outdoor exercises and simulations

Our Criteria: when someone calls something “Action Learning” and outlines the values, philosophy and operational approach, and ideally (but not always), the differences and similarities with other approaches
Another perspective: “Schools of Action Learning” (O’Neil & Marsick, 2011)--Theories and Practitioners

1. *Tacit*
   - Theory: Incidental learning
   - Practitioners: Dotlich and Noel; Tichy

2. *Collaborative, Self-Directed*
   - Theory: Communities of Practice, Self-Directed Learning
   - Practitioners: Aubusson; Albers

3. *Scientific*
   - Theory: Alpha, Beta, Gamma [Systems]; P + Q = L  [Programmed information + Questioning Inquiry = Learning]
   - Practitioners: Revans; Boshyk

4. *Experiential*
   - Theory: Learning from experience
   - Practitioners: McGill and Beaty; Mumford

5. *Critical Reflection*
   - Theory: Learning through critical reflection
   - Practitioners: Marsick, O’Neil; Rimanoczy; Rohlin; Vince; [Trehan]
SOME VARIETIES OF ACTION LEARNING:
(In chronological order)

1. “Traditional” or “Classic” or “Gold Standard” Action Learning

- AL term used publicly in 1972 by AL’s founder Reginald W. Revans (1907-2003)
- Definition: “Learning-by-doing is an insufficient description [of action learning]. It is rather learning to learn by doing with and from others who are also learning-to-learn by doing”. (Reg Revans)
- Intellectual and societal foundations: the scientific exploration and discussion of experimental physics at the Cavendish Laboratory in Cambridge; systems thinking and cybernetics, computers, New Liberalism and tolerance, Quakerism, pacifism, social justice, equality, education and social reform, “small is dutiful”, the human element in business, values, business and community
- People dealing with real organizational dilemmas, issues and opportunities (“problems not puzzles”)
- Learning must be equal to or faster than the rate of change: \( L \geq C \)
- Learning = P (Programmed information) + Q (Questioning Inquiry): \( L = P + Q \) (with Q being most important)
- “No action [change] without learning and no learning [insight] without action” [paraphrase of Kurt Lewin, no action without research, no research without action]
- Influenced by General Systems Theory and thinking, and formulated by Revans in 1970*

**System Alpha**: management decisions are framed by 1. the values of the managers, 2. the external environment that they exploit, 3. the internal system by which they exploit it

**System Beta**: has 5 management tasks: 1. survey stage, data on all of Alpha identified, 2. trial decision stage, using System Alpha, 3. action stage, trial design implemented, in part or on whole, 4. inspection or audit stage, 5. control stage

**System Gamma**: “The symbiosis of a person changing a situation (action) and of a person being changed by this action (learning).” Personal change along with organizational change
“It is not uncommon for fundamental discoveries in one field to be made by men in other disciplines.

The unfettered outsider is still willing to ask himself questions that the expert has accustomed himself by past experience no longer to ask.

In a case that contradicts his traditional knowledge the expert often cannot perceive the unusual but critical question. It is important for every manager to know whether he may be afraid of starting what clever (but often short-sighted) men consider to be stupid enquiries and, if so, why?”

Source: Reg Revans, Developing Effective Managers

Company Experiences: As a rule, General Electric’s participant selection and program participant profile does not allow those who are “experts” on the Business Challenge to participate in their action learning programs.
FOUNDATIONS OF “Q” (QUESTIONING INQUIRY):
Unfamiliar Problem, Unfamiliar Setting Often Results in the Best Learning and Business Results—Based on Revans’ experiences (Dilworth 2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>Unfamiliar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAL BOARD PROGRAM</td>
<td>H.I.C. PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWORKING FIRM PROGRAM</td>
<td>BELGIAN EXPERIMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VARIETIES OF ACTION LEARNING
1. TRADITIONAL ACTION LEARNING & ITS PIONEER, REGINALD (REG) W. REVANS

- U.K., born in 1907, d. 2003
- Research fellow and Ph.D. in Physics at the Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge 1928-35 (and at U of Michigan, 1930-32 as a Commonwealth Fund Fellow)
- Member of the British Olympic Team 1928 (triple, long, and high jump)
- Active in the areas of physics, reform of education, healthcare, and management education;
- Professor of Industrial Administration (Management) in the U.K., Manchester College of Science and Technology, 1955-65; leader in the pioneering days of modern European management education
- In 1972 publicly introduces the term „Action Learning“, and emphasizes that it has deep roots in all cultures and civilizations (Boshyk, 2011a)
SOME VARIETIES OF ACTION LEARNING:
(In chronological order)

1. Traditional” or “Classic” or “Gold Standard” Action Learning (cont’d)

Evolution and Current Practice:

- At first in the early years, usually voluntary “sets” (small groups of < 6) of managers and/or others
- A “set facilitator” is often used to start (and often further help with) the process and now sometimes involving “professional facilitators”
- Focus on the individual dilemmas, real issues
- Mostly middle management—in general—a philosophy encouraging questioning, reflection, small group empowerment (sets and disciplined process of discussion), self-help, and the self-organization of sets as “partners in adversity”
- Mainly developed and practiced in the U.K., especially in healthcare sector (National Health Service) but used in public, private and not-for-profit sectors;
- Action Learning Facilitation certification offered and endorsed by the Institute for Leadership and Management, London, U.K.
- Other centres and associations of practice: International Foundation for Action Learning (IFAL), Ashridge, Lancaster University, Roffey Park, University of Manchester (Business School and also Revans Academy)
- Actively used especially in the U.K., Australia, Canada, Sweden

**Some Sources:** Boshyk and Dilworth (2010); Pedler (ed), (2011); the journal *Action Learning: Research and Practice*; Revans (2011); Revans (1980); Revans (1982); Revans (1983); Weinstein (2002); Abbott and Pedler (2012).
2. “Americanized” or “Modified” Version of Action Learning

- No connection to Revans and Traditional Action Learning—and comes from the education sector first (perhaps today’s equivalent of “Service Learning”) before being introduced into business education.

- In business education: A considerable “improvement over more traditional lecture-based programs”...In its Americanized form, team members do learn and teams do assist organizations in addressing difficult problems—it is just that they fall short of their potential. It is as if many US companies have grasped the outward form of Action Learning, that is, teams working on problems, without, however, attending to its essence.”* (Dixon, 1997)

- The “Americanized version” does not usually involve the implementation of team recommendations and at the same time does not maximize individual development and behavioral change. (Dixon, 1997)

- We can also add that the multiple learning dimensions, in general, are not taken into account in the “Americanized” version.

2. “Americanized” or “Modified” Version of Action Learning

- Comes from educational reform movement of the 1960s and early 1970s, and community/societal activism

- In the U.S., the term “Action-Learning” was used in education. “An early proponent” was the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). It was used in 1972-4 to denote work-study education (work-based learning) and voluntary participation in community work.* [Revans used the term for the first time in 1972]

- “In late 1972, NASSP conducted a national conference in Washington, D.C., to explore the concept. A conference report entitled American Youth in the Mid-Seventies focused upon (1) the need for action-learning, (2) views by labor, public agencies, accreditation bodies, and professional educators on action-learning, and (3) examples of action-learning at the secondary and college levels. Among the conclusions of the conference was the recommendation that action-learning be made available to all young Americans.”*


- This approach to Action Learning may be the foundation of what is today called “Service Learning” in the U.S.
2. Action Learning and Business Schools in the U.S.--
The early years

- 1969: MIT and Harvard faculty involved in Revans’ Belgian company-university business school consortium (Inter-University Program for Advanced Management), providing feedback and specialist knowledge on respective individual business projects. (Revans, 1971). Among those involved, David Kolb and Ed Schein from MIT.


- 1972, Southern Methodist University business school in Houston launches the first action learning university-level program with Revans and C. Jackson Grayson (Dean)
2. Action Learning and Business Schools in the U.S.--The early years

  - *Editors of HBR* comment that AL is “learning by experience, through solving a real company problem...[and creates in the process] an effective way to provide a seasoned pool of seasoned managers.”: [but nothing on principles, values and foundations of Action Learning].

- 1979: First international action learning conference in Houston at the American Productivity Center, headed by Grayson
2. “Americanized or Modified” Version of Action Learning in Business (cont’d)

- Almost a decade after the HBR article, “Action Learning Comes to Industry”, “action learning” started at General Electric in 1985 by Noel Tichy; (Tichy was with GE from 1985-87; his supervisor at Columbia was Morton Deutsch, a colleague of Kurt Lewin)**

- Definition of Action Learning used at GE:” “The process of developing employees on hard (e.g., marketing, financing) and soft (e.g., vision, leadership, values) skills by having them work with others on real organizational challenges and reflecting on their decision-making and experiences throughout.”

- In reality, based on my personal experience of 15 years: Project-based, process-driven, in-house consulting with some leadership development but with an emphasis on project consulting; deeper personal leadership development was done outside of the “program”

- Other companies, like J&J and DuPont, developed AL in their own way (e.g. Bossert, 2000) (LeGros and Topolosky, 2000);
2. “Americanized” or “Modified” Version of Action Learning

- A considerable “improvement over more traditional lecture-based programs”…In its Americanized form, team members do learn and teams do assist organizations in addressing difficult problems—it is just that they fall short of their potential. It is as if many US companies have grasped the outward form of Action Learning, that is, teams working on problems, without, however, attending to its essence.”*

- The “Americanized version” does not usually involve the implementation of team recommendations and at the same time does not maximize individual development and behavioral change. (Dixon, 1997)

- We can also add that the learning dimensions, in general, are not taken into account in the “Americanized” version

- **Some Sources:** Bossert (2000); Dixon (1997); Dotlich and Noel (1998); Noel and Dotlich (2008); LeGros and Topolosky (2000); Mercer (2000a), Mercer (2000b), Mercer (2010); Tichy (1993)
VARIETIES OF ACTION LEARNING:
2. “Modified or Americanized” Approach and Evolution

- In the U.S., Revans’ “Action Learning” does not catch on for a variety of reasons:
  - The influence of Organization Development (OD)
    - More widely used was “Action Research” coined in 1947 with Kurt Lewin, and also the National Training Laboratory, T-Groups, Sensitivity Training, and sometimes propagated by the Tavistock Institute in the U.K.
  - From the 1970s on Chris Argyris with “Action Science” and later his student, Peter Senge influenced and popularized the learning dimension in organizations in the U.S.
  - Confusion in the ranks: In the U.S., “Action Learning” is often viewed as a part of Organization Development (OD), or incorrectly as “Action Research” or “Action Science”
  - Cultural, intellectual and societal differences between the U.S. and the U.K. (see next slides)
2. U.K. and U.S. Differences: About OD but perhaps the same applies to Action Learning?

An observation by one U.S. academic (Greiner, 1977, pp. 74-75) as to the similarities and differences [in Organization Development] with the U.K. orientation perhaps helps us to appreciate some reasons why Action Learning came to mean one thing to U.S.-based practitioners and theorists and another to those from the U.K. and elsewhere:

- “Though seldom acknowledged by American specialists in organizational behavior, Great Britain has been a rich source of thinking that has greatly influenced our own theoretical developments. We tend to cite names like Joan Woodward, Tom Burns and G.M. Stalker, W.R. Bion, A.K. Rice, Melanie Klein, Fred Emery, Eric Trist, Elliott Jacques, Cyril Sofer, and others as if they are ‘one of our own’. Or even more unfortunately, there are many Americans involved in the OD movement who have not even been exposed to the provocative concepts and experiments of these outstanding scholars. NTL [National Training Laboratory] at Bethel, Maine is a household word but a not uncommon question is, ‘What and where is the Tavistock Institute?’...
2. U.K. and U.S. Differences: About OD but perhaps the same applies to Action Learning? ...

- "There are obvious similarities between [American and British OD approaches]..."

- We see the same underlying cornerstone features—an intense focus on behavioral processes and relationships, a concern for improving behavioral capacities to cope with the future, and a value orientation toward participative methods.

- In addition, a close parallel exists in terms of developmental stages ...for Tavistock from 'group relations training' (similar to T[raining] Group) in the 1950s through a broadened organizational focus in the 1960s to a variety of problem-solving arrangements in the 1970s...
2. U.K. and US Differences: About OD but perhaps the same applies to Action Learning?

- “But distinct cultural differences also appear and give...a decidedly British flavor to their orientation...[O]ne can observe a strong penchant for intellectualizing, an appreciation and patience for the historical flow of events, a persistence in elaborating concepts that began years before, a willingness to describe events in the most clinical terms, a tolerance for great complexity, and a strong sense for situational and individual differences.

- In marked contrast, the American OD movement reflects more a ‘Yank’ flavor for ‘shooting first and asking questions later’, a desire for more simple terminology and concepts, an assembly-line approach to training, a ‘here and now’ optimism that believes just about any change is possible, a willingness to shrug off or even forget history, a quest for objective ‘hard’ results, and an enthusiasm to convert people and organizations to an ideal model.” (Greiner, 1977, pp. 74-75.)
SOME VARIETIES OF ACTION LEARNING: 
3. Action Reflection Learning™

- Indirect connection to Revans and other influences;

- Developed in late 1980s by Lennart Rohlin of Management in Lund (MiL Institute), Sweden (founded in 1977) & and USA professor/consultants among them Victoria Marsick from Columbia University, Teacher’s College; influenced by Mezirow’s “transformational learning” and Lars Cederholm

- Some professor/practitioners: Victoria Marsick, Judy O’Neil;

- Focus on the individual, small groups, and emphasizes the role of a “learning coach”, “reflection” and the certification of coaches

SOME VARIETIES OF ACTION LEARNING:

- Philosophy and results-based approach developed in 1996 by company practitioners from GE and others and Yury Boshyk, integrating Organization Development based Action Learning and Traditional Action Learning (BC Organizational Business Challenge(s) AND PC Personal Leadership and Business Challenges)

- Definition:
  - Focuses on resolving organizational and individual business and other challenges and exploring opportunities, while developing people at an accelerated pace (OD + Traditional AL philosophy and approach)

- Involves organizational, team and personal learning (7 Component Parts and 7 Dimensions of Learning), in a holistic way, used by global companies and other organizations; and a very focused and comprehensive “outside-in” external dialogues and discussions

What is Business Driven Action Learning Today?

Personal Challenges (PCs)
Work on Personal Challenges
(Professional & Leadership Dilemmas, Issues)

Business Challenges (BCs)
Work on Actual Business Challenges
(Organizational & Team Opportunities, Issues, Projects)

Action
Requiring Action & Results On PCs and BCs

By Action Learning “sets”

By Business Challenge Teams

Learning
Accelerates, Enhances, Sustains Business Outcomes, Change, & Longer-Term Organizational & Business Performance & Leader Development

Using Some Traditional Action Learning Principles & Practices

Using Some Organization & Leadership Development Approaches
Business Driven Action Learning & Its 7 Component Parts:

1. TOP EXECUTIVE OWNERSHIP: SPONSORSHIP, SUPPORT & ENGAGEMENT

2. KNOWLEDGE CAPTURE & SHARING

3. COMPANY WIDE SHARING & COLLABORATION WITH BC STAKEHOLDERS

4. INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT WITH PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT ADVISORS (PDAs)

5. TEAMWORK ON BCs & ACTION LEARNING “SETS” ON PCs

6. 'OUTSIDE – IN' DIALOGUES & EXTERNAL PERSPECTIVES

7. RECOMMENDATIONS ON BCs & FOLLOW UP: ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION, EVALUATION PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT ON PCs & FOLLOW UP: INDIVIDUAL & TEAM ACTION PLANS

A. Organizational Business Challenges (BCs)

B. Participant Personal Challenges (PCs)
Business Driven Action Learning & Its 7 Components:

Levels of Action & Learning: Company, Team, & Individual Levels Throughout

1. TOP EXECUTIVE OWNERSHIP: SPONSORSHIP, SUPPORT, ENGAGEMENT
   - Sponsorship, Teaching, Evaluation, Monitoring Results, Evaluation and Follow Up,
   - Defining the «Business Challenge(s) » and Deliverables, Success Factors
   - Selection of participants, Executive Advisors and Sponsors,
   - Leaders Teaching Leaders; Leadership Journeys, Dilemma Sharing

2. KNOWLEDGE CAPTURE & SHARING
   - Program web site with collaboration tools

3. COMPANY WIDE SHARING AND COLLABORATION WITH « BC » STAKEHOLDERS
   - e.g., MCI—Mobilizing the Collective Intelligence of the organization, Involving those who internally and externally know, care, or can do something about the Strategic Challenges/Opportunities

4. INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT
   - Feedback on 360; psychometric; Learning Styles Questionnaire by Honey and Mumford; learning journals; opportunities for reflection; 7 Dimensions of Learning; « My Story »

5. TEAMWORK
   - Action Learning Sets/Groups on Personal Challenges (PCs); Facilitation;
   - Personal Development Advisors (PDAs); « Learning Coaches » as required and appropriate;
   - Work on the Business Challenges (BCs) in BC Teams;
   - Peer-to-peer learning

6. « OUTSIDE – IN » DIALOGUES & EXTERNAL PERSPECTIVES
   - Comprehensive, and with knowledge capture & sharing
   - Subject specialists
   - Best or good practices practice benchmarking,
   - Environmental Scanning, Market Intelligence
   - Strategic « discovery learning », Learning Expeditions,
   - Customer & Supplier & Stakeholder involvement

7. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT LEARNING & FOLLOW UP:
   - INDIVIDUAL & TEAM ACTION PLANS
   - Business and leadership related
   - Personal Development Plans & Actions
   - Action Learning Sets & Participant Follow Up
   - Sharing the Learning with Others
   - Alumni Networking

A. Business Challenges (BCs)

B. Personal Leadership & Business Challenges (PCs)
BUSINESS DRIVEN ACTION LEARNING AND THE
SEVEN DIMENSIONS OF LEARNING

Big Picture
What do I want to/did I learn about the external environment of my business, industry, country, region? (examples: about the politics, economics, society and culture, technology, and other matters outside of my business)

Organization
What do I want to/did I learn about my organization? (via the business challenge/issue discussion)

Team
What do I want to/did I learn about team effectiveness?

Individual
What do I want to/did I learn about myself? My values?

How I/we learn
What did I learn about how I/we learn?

What can be used in another context
From my/our learning, what can I/we apply in another situation?

Who needs to know
Who else needs to know about this learning (points 1-6)?
5. Learning Coach-Led Action Learning:
   - Michael Marquardt (World Institute for Action Learning but not part of ARL; and variation in S. Korea, Cho and Bong (2012) but not affiliated
   - Learning Coach certification from WIAL
   - Some Sources: Marquart et al. (2009); see Willis’ (2004) comments
   - In S. Korea case, Learning Coach certification through the Korean Action Learning Association (KALA)
   - Some Sources: Cho and Bong, (2012) and (2011)

6. Critical Action Learning:
   - Some Sources: Trehan (2011); Vince (2011)

7. Virtual Action Learning:
   - Some Sources: Goodman and Stewart (2011)
### Action Learning: Other Variations

- **8. Audio Action Learning (AAL)**
  - Some Sources: Caulat and De Haan (2006)

- **9. Self-Managed Action Learning**
  - Some Sources: Bourner (2011); Pedler et als (2005)

- **10. Auto Action Learning (Individual-based)**
  - Some Sources: Pedler et als (2005)

- **11. Future Search as Action Learning**
  - Some Sources: Weisbord and Janoff (2010)

- **12. Action Learning as outdoor exercises and simulations**
Action Learning and Business Schools: some trends and opportunities

1. There is a growing convergence of Traditional and Americanized approaches (BDAL) to Action Learning (see next slide)

2. This requires a renewed commitment by business schools to assist companies with their real business issues through truly tailored “external” executive programs

3. Special training and development of faculty, program directors and others at business schools will be necessary to do so (see GE slide example below)

4. Training will be required to learn the art of facilitating learning and not just teaching, learning together with these companies and their participants: “the best curriculum is the experience of people in the room, and the best teachers are they themselves” (Revans)

5. Also required-- greater engagement with top executives; deeper relationships with companies, especially regarding research and ‘just-in-time’ learning, and continuous learning after the program; executive programs being more than just “events”

6. As part of these programs, a greater emphasis on “outside-in” elements, including meetings and discussions with peers etc.; preparation and rigor required in debriefing the learning and applicability (based on the “concept engineering” approach developed in Japan)

7. B2B Company Action Learning consortia (very significant role for business schools possible, but difficult—(see summary slides below)
What is Business Driven Action Learning Today?

**Personal Challenges (PCs)**
- Work on Personal Challenges
- (Professional & Leadership Dilemmas, Issues)

**Business Challenges (BCs)**
- Work on Actual Business Challenges
- (Organizational & Team Opportunities, Issues, Projects)

**Action**
- Requiring Action & Results
- On PCs and BCs

**Learning**
- Accelerates, Enhances, Sustains Business Outcomes,
- Change, & Longer-Term Organizational & Business Performance
- & Leader Development

**Using Some Traditional Action Learning Principles & Practices**

**Using Some Organization & Leadership Development Approaches**

**By Action Learning “sets”**

**By Business Challenge Teams**
AL at Business Schools:: a “new” type of program manager? --The AL program manager at GE*

7 roles for the action learning program manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning the project/program</td>
<td>business partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building the Team</td>
<td>designer/OD expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide relevant content</td>
<td>trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coach the project process</td>
<td>executive coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consolidate</td>
<td>consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Report Out</td>
<td>master of ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implementation/follow up</td>
<td>linkage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8: political savvy in GE, 9. Assessment skills, 10. interactive lecturing,
11. leading inter vision sessions, 12. travel planning, 13. interview skills,
14. survey skills, 15. country specific network and knowledge,
16. customer relations skills, 17. briefing,
20. everything else that needs to be done......
Trends in Business Education & Development:
Consortium BDAL Programs:
example--The Global Learning Alliance
GLA Consortium: Some key objectives

• Develop new perspectives on the complex interplay of economic, social and cultural dimensions in both emerging and mature markets in the global marketplace.

• Gain applicable insights about key leadership challenges through interactions with successful leaders, organisations, experts and thought leaders.

• Exchange experiences and ideas between participating senior executives from diverse industries and cultures.

• Explore different business models and challenge existing approaches with new ones.
18 business school consortium programs examined in a 1999 INSEAD study

The view of business schools surveyed is that while attractive, consortium programs have “additional” complexities (compared to managing open enrolment and company specific programs)

Additional complexities” of such programs:
- membership issues, attracting the right companies
- starting up and sustaining a consortium—”members are hard to find…and keep“
- “Consortiums require a high demand on resources” for example:
  - A high level of support is required regarding staffing:
    - Program Director (faculty member)
    - Program Manager
    - Program Coordinator
(Action Learning) Business School Consortium Programs: Characteristics and Lessons Learned
INSEAD 1999 Study & Much that is applicable today

- 1. Modular
  - Over 75% of programs are modular

- 2. Less than 3 weeks in duration
  - 94% are less than 4 weeks in overall length
  - 75% less than 3 weeks

- 3. They span for less than 6 months
  - 82% last 6 months or less

- 4. Content was about general management issues and also about leadership

- 5. Projects
  - More than half had “action learning”, “team-based projects”
6. Off-site activity (not just on campus)

7. Package pricing—per team (no membership fee)
   Package pricing gives a certain stability

8. Core proactive membership (a Consortium leader) OR
   Flexible with core group + open to larger pool of non-members
   *Flexibility over exclusivity*

9. “Clonable” …but there is more work involved in consortium programs than people think
Thanks You!
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- See also the Resources section at www.globalforumactionlearning.com
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