The Wallace Foundation's Education Leadership Professional Learning Communities

A Case Study from

The Power of Learning:

How Learning Communities Amplify the Work of Nonprofits and Grantmakers

Introduction

Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (GEO) is currently undertaking a multi-year initiative, Scaling What Works, to support the success of the Social Innovation Fund and "to expand the number of grantmakers and public sector funders across the country that are prepared to broaden the impact of high-performing nonprofits." As part of this effort, GEO is interested in gaining a deeper understanding of "learning communities," especially how grantmakers can employ them to support collective learning among their grantees.

GEO selected the Research Center for Leadership in Action (RCLA) at New York University's Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service to conduct a study on learning communities (LCs). The study addresses questions about different types of LCs, their design elements, the common challenges they face and their role in helping scale effective practices as well how they define success and common elements of success in facilitating learning to change practice.

About Grantmakers for Effective Organizations

Understanding that grantmakers are successful only to the extent that their grantees achieve meaningful results, GEO promotes strategies and practices that contribute to grantee success. In 1997, a handful of visionary leaders saw a need for a place where grantmakers committed to improving organizational effectiveness could convene to share knowledge and best practices, and inspire their colleagues to act. Today, GEO is a powerful coalition of more than 2,700 individual members representing 360 grantmaking organizations committed to building strong and effective nonprofit organizations. GEO helps grantmakers improve practices in areas which, through years of work in philanthropy, have been identified by innovators in the field as critical to nonprofit success.

About the Research Center for Leadership in Action at NYU Wagner

RCLA is a research center founded at NYU Wagner in 2003 with support from the Ford Foundation. As the hub for leadership research and practice at NYU, RCLA faculty teaches courses at the undergraduate, masters and executive masters levels. In addition, RCLA works across the diverse domains of public service to build knowledge and capacity for leadership that transforms society. The Center's greatest asset is its unique ability to partner with leaders to create collaborative learning environments, translate ideas into action and build knowledge from the ground up. As a result, RCLA contributes breakthrough ideas to the worlds of scholarship and practice. The Center does this work with the conviction that today's pressing social problems require moving beyond the traditional image of a heroic leader to facilitating leadership in which people work across sectors and boundaries to find common solutions.

How to read the case study

RCLA conducted six case studies, half of which we refer to as "funder-grantee LCs" and half of which were "peer LCs." In the former, the LC was a supplementary activity to a grantmaking program. In three cases, participants who received grants from the LC organizer were required to participate in the LC as part of their grant agreement. Both the grantmaker and the grantees participated in the LC. In peer LCs, participants were not grantees of any one program and did not share a relationship with any one funder. This does not mean that there was no funding sponsor. However, the sponsor did not participate in the LC as a learner. Participants in peer LCs shared a common profession or field of practice, challenge or opportunity. The distribution of the case study LCs along these two categories was as follows:

Funder-grantee LCs	Peer LCs
▪ Community Clinics Initiative-Networking for Community Health (CCI-NCH) ▪ Schools of the Future Community of Learners (SOTF-COL) ▪ Wallace Foundation Professional Learning Communities (WF-PLC)	▪ Embedded Funders Learning Community (EFLC) ▪ Council of Michigan Foundations Participatory Action Learning Network (CMF-PALN) ▪ Eureka-Boston

Each case starts with a discussion of how the learning community was instigated and how it has emerged to fulfill its purpose. Then, each case is described through a three-part framework proposed by Snyder and de Souza Briggs[1] that builds on earlier work by Etienne Wenger. Snyder and de Souza Briggs find that learning communities have three key features: community – who belongs to the group; domain – the common issues or problems that members wrestle with; and practice – what members do as they learn together and what it is about their learning that is embedded in practice. Put simply, the three features are about who does the learning, what the learning is about and how the learning happens. Each case is discussed through each of these three features, which in reality are intermingled but separated here for analytic purposes.

A box titled "What Success Looked Like" offers a glimpse into how success was defined for each LC and what it looked like. When LC organizers did not have measures of success, we discern them through the LC's articulated purpose and goals. While three of the LCs were part of larger grant programs with monitoring and evaluation systems in place, we attempt to delineate outcomes of the LC itself from outcomes of the grant program and highlight the former. We include anecdotes of success that may have been intended or unintended outcomes and that exemplify the value generated by the LC when learning was at its best. A subsequent section

---

[1] William M. Snyder and Xavier de Souza Briggs (2005). *Communities of Practice: A new tool for government managers.* Collaboration Series. IBM Center for the Business of Government.

teases out elements particular to each case that amplified the LC's success. Some of these may not be directly transferrable to another LC, or may not resonate with the experience of another group. However, they contributed to the success of each case. The last section of each case includes advice for designing and carrying out LCs provided by those interviewed or inferred by the researchers from each case.

The Wallace Foundation's Education Leadership Professional Learning Communities

The Wallace Foundation, a New York City-based national philanthropy, tackles complex public problems such as improving education and enrichment for disadvantaged children in US cities. One way that Wallace does this is by focusing on strengthening school leadership, a critical ingredient to school reform. In fact, research shows that school leadership is the second most important school-related influence on student achievement.[2] Since 2000, the foundation has provided grants and other forms of support to states, districts and nonprofit organizations. Wallace's strategy is to support "innovation sites" to develop and test possible solutions, commission research and evaluation to fill gaps in current knowledge and learn lessons from the work in progress, and share knowledge broadly about what works and doesn't work.

The Emergence of the Professional Learning Communities

Since 2000, Wallace has supported states and school districts to develop and test ways to improve leadership by principals and other key figures to better schools. One underlying assumption is that districts have enormous power to support principals in driving instructional improvement in their schools. Yet historically, federal and state policies have barely recognized district central offices as catalysts for school renewal, nor have districts consistently made instructional improvement their top priority.

At the midpoint of this ten-year initiative, Wallace recognized that its funded states and districts were grappling with similar issues and were more likely to accelerate and expand their work through real time cross-grantee learning. Wallace also recognized that grantees' work on the ground was happening at a more rapid pace than researchers were able to generate lessons

Purpose: The goal was to support grantee just-in-time learning and to lift lessons for the field of education about school leadership.

Community: Members were Wallace Foundation grantees from states and school districts working on strengthening school leadership, as well as researchers, field experts and representatives of various professional organizations.

Domain: The focus was on common issues jointly identified by Wallace and its grantees related to accelerating their progress in achieving their grant objectives.

Practice: The model included networking, large group engagement and action research work. Project groups of 12-15 participants from across states, school districts and support organizations work on action research projects that both improve their own practice and further knowledge for the field.

---

[2] Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., and Wahlstrom, K., 2004. *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. University of Minnesota and University of Toronto, commissioned by The Wallace Foundation.

from rigorous academic studies and evaluations.[3] To address this time lag, the foundation launched "just-in-time" professional learning communities (PLCs) with the first cohort of Leadership Issue Groups (LIGs) in 2004, with funding of $425,000 per year and 131 individual participants. On a parallel track, Wallace funded related longer-term research projects. The research topics were aligned with the ongoing professional learning community work and each informed the other on a continual basis.

LIG participants came from 16 states and 15 major urban districts within those states to generate knowledge on issues like using data to inform decisions, or the roles, responsibilities and authority of school leaders. Wallace invests significantly in ongoing evaluations and various research studies and had indentified these issues as areas of challenge, or "pain points," according to Lois Adams-Rodgers, a facilitator from the DC-based Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Each LIG identified common areas of struggle and designed an action research project with an articulated deliverable to work on with the support of a facilitator and periodic input from academic researchers. In addition, all groups came together to share their work and hear from experts in semi-annual convenings, and had further opportunities to refine their work through periodic Webinars.

In 2008 and when grantees had about two years left in their grants, a sub-set of the LIGs morphed into the Leading Change Learning Community (LCLC), whose focus was on scaling and sustaining the work of participants' respective grants. About half of the total members of LIGs were selected to participate in the LCLC.[4] In many cases, this meant continuing the work of the LIGs, but with particular attention to sustainability. For example, if a group was working on a principal mentoring tool in the LIG, the LCLC group would address questions about scaling and marketing the tool for wider use.

The learning community, or "professional learning communities" as Wallace refers to them, were considered by both the grantees and Wallace as part-in-parcel of the grantmaking process. Participating in a learning community meant that a grantee organization was both advancing its scope of work established in the grant and contributing to collective learning. Not everyone needed to be working on the same issue, but everyone's program was strengthened as a result of the collective learning when the groups came together to share. It was also a safe place where grantees knew they could share their problems as well as their successes and get advice. "That's the value of being in a learning community," said Lois Adams-Rodgers.

---

[3] The time lag between knowledge needed by practitioners on the ground and that generated by rigorous research is a challenge gaining recognition in the field of philanthropy. See the Grantmakers for Effective Organizations: Briefing Paper series - *Topic 7: Expanding the Impact of Grantees: How Do We Build the Capacity of Nonprofits to Evaluate, Learn and Improve?*

[4] In 2011, Wallace launched a new learning community in conjunction with its new $75 million "Principal Pipeline Initiative" to learn lessons from six urban school districts as they develop a pipeline of effective school principals and to see whether, in five years, this will improve student achievement across the district, especially in the highest needs schools.

It was critical that the work of the professional learning communities directly furthered grantees' objectives. According to Jody Spiro, director of Education Leadership at The Wallace Foundation:

> The professional learning (PLC) community should not be an add-on to what grantees are already doing. We always say to them that 'if the PLC work is not directly related to what you're doing anyway then let's stop doing it and go on to something else that is.' We always ask ourselves, 'Is this convening or Webinar or project group meeting furthering the work you need to do to accomplish your grant objectives and work plan?' That's the only reason for pursuing it.

Community – who does the learning

Both the LIGs and the LCLC brought together Wallace grantees at the state and district levels, partner organizations and commissioned researchers. Participants in groups typically included a senior official at the state level, such as the state director of leadership development, and officials at the district level, such as the head of human resources, leadership development or curriculum design. Often a district would bring one or two principals as members of the team. There were also other grantees that were nonprofit groups working on education – for example, the New York City Leadership Academy.

Since everyone was participating for the first time in the LIGs, Wallace identified the project group topics from doing a crosswalk of the grantees' scopes of work. Wallace also assigned PLC members to specific project groups – making sure there were "exemplar" districts in each group as well as others that were less far along. Grantees could be in more than one group; some district representatives could be in a group where they were faring well on the topic, and at the same time, others from that district would be in other groups where they were not doing as well.

However, for the LCLC, since members had previous successful PLC experience, members themselves defined their project topics and participated in the project group of their own choosing. However, this time, each participant was limited to participating in single project group so their efforts were not diffused.

For both the LIGs and the LCLC, each project group was assigned a "resource facilitator" who brought expertise on the topic and helped keep the group on track. Both Wallace and grantees found the facilitators invaluable to the process and asserted that without them, people would go back to their home organizations after the meetings and, despite all good intentions, not get around to doing the work. The people recruited for this role were experienced group process and education consultants who received contracts to perform this work part-time (approximately 15 days per year). The facilitators were critical in holding each person to their commitment, connecting the members' assigned tasks and giving the group an overall sense of mission. When they were at their best, facilitators helped bring out everyone's perspective. For example, Kate Fenton, chief schools redesign officer at Springfield Public Schools in

Massachusetts, recounted how some people loved to take the stage at the group-wide meetings to gain visibility at these national forums. She commended the role of the facilitator Lynn Scott from RAND Corporation for his ability to acknowledge everyone's contribution. "Once we saw Lynn's style, we didn't feel the need to get on the microphone," she said. The facilitators formed their own learning community of sorts. They met periodically among themselves and with Wallace to discuss how their groups were doing and to share progress and challenges.

There was a strong sense of community among the participants that developed through working together over a period of time. A large part of the meetings' success also had to do with the level of preparation that went into group-wide meetings that took place over two days, twice a year. A lesson learned for Wallace was the importance of bringing new members up to speed and preparing all members before coming together face-to-face, and the organizers often did this through structured pre-convening Webinars where the group shared specific problem statements, background papers, bibliographies on the issue and template projects. Wallace program officers, who spoke with grantees at least monthly, brought related resources and relevant discussions individually to each grantee.

Although some tension may be inevitable in funder-grantee learning communities, the professional learning communities had the privilege of working with Wallace for several years and having demonstrated results to build trust and goodwill. The risk-taking spirit encouraged by Wallace also helped to open up the group to discussing failures and challenges, and the foundation's position as partners in the learning process helped ease the power asymmetries. "We tried to set up the PLC as a safe space, focused on common problems, where people felt supported in bringing issues and receiving resources, advice and, yes, even more questions," commented Jody Spiro. Peter Winograd, currently a professor at the University of New Mexico and at the time of the grant policy advisor on Education to the governor, explained, "The issue was leadership, and Wallace was trying to figure out solutions. It wasn't the foundation coming in and saying 'Do this.' It felt genuine from Wallace to say, 'This is the problem, now how do we all fix it?'" Kathy Nadurak from the New York City Leadership Academy shared this view: "I did not feel constrained as a grantee. Yes, Wallace was funding and you could lose funding if you didn't do well. But I have to say it was the way they did it. It was like, 'You are all here because we funded you to change leadership. This is the problem we need to fix.' Being so focused on the problem meant that you could disagree and it would be about how to tackle the problem." Focusing on the problem and the solution served to alleviate tension in the conversation.

Domain – what the learning is about

The groups worked on a range of issues from data-informed decision making (DID) to the roles, responsibility and authority of school leaders. The issues that participants chose were at the core of their individual organizational grants, but these challenges were shared and Wallace expected that the collective wisdom generated would be greater than the impact of organizations working independently on these issues.

The projects took the form of action research in that they usually involved some kind of data gathering by each group that was then challenged or validated by university researchers working on a parallel track. An example was the project group working on assessing leader performance. The group studied state standards adopted by Kentucky, Delaware and others and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. "It was a game changer," said Kate Fenton, a participant in this group, "Instead of a checklist, we said we need to evaluate principals on their behaviors in certain domains." The group developed a tool to be used between a new principal and his/her mentor called the Leadership Performance Planning Worksheet (LPPW), now offered by the NYC Leadership Academy and used in a growing number of states and school districts across the country to support and promote principal growth. LPPW contains 40 core leadership behaviors organized into nine essential school leadership dimensions that a principal must master to improve learning and instruction within the context of the school's vision, mission and goals.

> **Issues tackled by Leadership Issue Groups**
>
> - Use of data to improve leadership policies, practices and ultimately teaching and learning
> - (Re)allocation of resources and creation of incentives to support instructional improvement
> - Roles, responsibility and authority of school leaders
> - Assessment of leader effectiveness
> - Identifying issues regarding district and school governance
>
> **Issues tackled by the Leading Change Learning Community**
>
> - Scaling and sustaining leadership academies
> - Scaling and sustaining effective university leader preparation programs
> - Scaling and sustaining the mentoring tool
> - Scaling and sustaining the School Administration Manager (SAM) program

In the DID group, the members looked at how to use data to influence education policy. The team conducted a survey in six states to see what principals do when they have data. They came up with the notion of 'killer questions,' referring to the key questions that come up over and over when leaders look at good data (e.g., student achievement, graduation, dropout, health and safety indicators, financial resources, workforce needs) and say, "How do I use these data to make a difference?" Answering killer questions requires judgment, the ability to deal with ambiguity and the authority to allocate time, people and money. The better one's data system, the more one is confronted with the killer questions. For example, if the policy challenge is how to improve student success in high school and college, then a data question

could be, "What percentage of students score proficient or above on achievement tests in math or reading?"; the policy question could be, "How should the certification requirements for teachers be strengthened?" and the political question could be, "Who has the influence to change how teachers are prepared?" The group held that identifying and addressing the killer questions is important whether one is at the school house or the state house and helps drive the data gathering needed to make good decisions.

Practice – how the learning happens

An important feature of the professional learning communities is that they were advancing issues they were struggling with in real time, thus learning in action, while being informed by research taking place on a parallel track.

Variety of learning and convening modes
- Periodic group meetings to advance projects
- Twice a year, two-day in-person meetings
- Webinars
- Moderated online discussions
- Online platform for document sharing

Kathy Nadurak described three components to the learning community that were well balanced in her view: the work that the professional learning communities did together, the national meetings across the communities that were each focused on a policy issue, and the research input that was provided through issue experts and researchers.

From the beginning all PLC members signed a "compact" with Wallace that outlined their commitment to participate fully in the learning community, do the work required and attend all the meetings. Once the project groups began their work, each one was expected to develop a product that addressed a common important problem in the defined area. Through the larger learning community their project could be prototyped, fine-tuned and scaled up. The action orientation was established right from the start, and while the project groups were working, research was taking place on a parallel track and providing input to those teams on a continual basis. The full membership of the learning community served as a "critical friends" forum through which the project teams shared their works-in-progress and received feedback and questions they used to make consequent revisions in approach and/or content.

The project group advanced their work through guidance and accountability measures from the resource facilitators. Facilitators used Wallace's online platform extensively to prod the groups toward fulfilling their commitments. Each group had a micro-site – a go-to resource for the group to communicate in between meetings, post products and check on deadlines. When facilitators noticed that the group was going through a lull, they would spark conversations online. The general Wallace Foundation site also built an online repository where groups generously shared their works-in-progress and final products, as well as products from their own organizations that may be outside the scope of the grants. Kate Fenton commented, "Someone could have created an online curriculum and spent a million dollars on it. They would post it and say, 'Here, you want it? It's yours.' This generous culture really promoted reaching outside one's own networks."

When the project groups came out with a pragmatic and useful product, it catapulted the learning across the country. The project group working on the roles, responsibilities and authority of school leaders identified a main problem as the need to change the conditions in schools that prevent principals from devoting more time to instructional leadership. To do this, they adapted and scaled a program developed in Louisville, KY called the School Administration Manager (SAM) project, wherein a role is crafted for an administrator to support the principal in making this change.

In the initial design a SAM was always a new staff member hired to play the dual role of handling management tasks and working closely with the principal to encourage him or her to delegate more administrative work and spend more time on instructional tasks. Later, in response to local concerns about the cost of a new position, the project devised the alternative of adding SAM responsibilities to an existing position in the school. In these schools, the SAM continued to perform some or all of his or her existing job and also met with the principal to discuss time use, but was not necessarily expected to take on additional management tasks. As of this writing there are more than 400 SAM/principal teams in 37 districts in 18 states participating in the National SAM Innovation Project (NSIP) – now a national nonprofit organization. Among the 181 principals who had participated in the project for at least a full year by 2011, the time devoted to instruction-related tasks increased by an average of 71 minutes per day, or almost six hours per week.[5]

---

[5] Turnbull, B. et al (2011). *Evaluation of the School Administration Manager Project*. Policy Studies Associates, Inc. This evaluation, commissioned by Wallace, helped drive program improvements as well as scale and sustainability.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;">

What Success Looked Like in the Professional Learning Communities

The PLCs set out to advance grantees' own work on improving school leadership through just-in-time learning and to draw lessons for the field. In both of these goals, Wallace placed great emphasis on research and knowledge building. Over a decade, Wallace has issued more than 70 research reports and other publications covering school leadership, on topics ranging from how principals are trained to how they are evaluated on the job. The Foundation is gratified that school leadership is now part of the federal reform agenda and seen as important by many districts and states.

While there were many impressive outcomes from the work of the PLCs, including wide scaling of several action research project outputs, a noteworthy outcome was the development of relationships and trust as well as participants' own sense of contribution to the field. We deem these to be precursors to other important impacts. According to a 2007 survey conducted by Wallace, participants felt it was important that they were part of a mechanism to add new knowledge to the field and were pleased to have a way to make policy-to-practice connections. Yet perhaps nothing captures participants' sense of agency better than their referral to a large research project evaluating the work of the various participating districts as "our research." This is partly due to grantees' participation in the research, through their provision of feedback on draft findings, for example, but there is also a larger dynamic related to the PLCs ability to foster commitment to a grand purpose.

</div>

Amplifying Elements

The following discussion teases out elements particular to this case that amplified the learning.

Long-term investment and commitment. Of course, not every foundation will have the luxury of making intensive investments in grantees over a period of a decade. The sheer duration of time helped solidify relationships between Wallace and the grantees, yet it was also Wallace's commitment to active learning alongside the grantees.

The role of research. Several grantees pointed to the value added by having researchers working on parallel tracks and offering input periodically that would bolster the groups' learning. According to Kate Fenton:

> The road was bumpy at the beginning but the thing that straightened
> everything out and made it viable was when they brought in the experts
> like Joe Murphy. Before we were doing action research in our sites and
> we are all practitioners. You then add the national research to support
> or challenge, and it became a different conversation. It matured from
> LIG to LCLC. ... I've been an educator for 32 years. We were going on
> past success and some intuition. We had some research, but not at this
> level, and we changed programs at home because of the research input.

Structure provided by The Wallace Foundation, particularly at the beginning of the PLC work when participants did not have a history of successful experiences with such groups. In the literature on learning, scholars usually recommend less structure. The Wallace Foundation, on the other hand, has used a great deal of structure in meeting agendas and "rules of the road" until these have been firmly established as the group's culture. For example, whereas in the LIGs and LCLC participants identified the issues together with Wallace and signed up for the groups they wanted to join, in new professional learning communities Wallace is now defining the issues and asking key people to join certain groups. The notion of the "compact" is another example of increasing structure and clarifying expectations at the beginning. In the interviews we conducted there was no negative feedback about the structure from grantees – on the contrary, people acknowledged earlier bumps along the road that were well addressed through new design elements. We note this point here only because it seems to contradict what is mentioned in the literature.

Advice from The Wallace Foundation's Professional Learning Communities

- *Create a well-defined purpose.* All interviews mentioned the importance of having a clear purpose for the learning community. Kathy Nadurak commented, "If you focus around a problem that people are struggling with, people will come." What set apart this community from others was the fact that it was a working group. People were in it to solve a specific problem, and it advanced their own work along the way.

- *Make it well worth participants' time.* It is of utmost importance that participants' time is respected. Wallace made sure that this was the case by asking specific questions through their evaluations. Participants' consistently rated the sessions highly on being worthwhile and immediately applicable to their work.

- *Feed the group with outside expertise.* It is important that the groups do not become too inward-focused. This can be achieved by bringing in outside perspectives to elevate the learning. Wallace did this through the university researchers working on a parallel track.

- *Bring in expert facilitators.* In highly action-oriented programs, when participants are expected to implement change or deliver a final product, facilitators can keep projects on track. Wallace's facilitators did not lead the group or dominate it, but gently guided the group and kept it on schedule.

- *Continually gather feedback and enable the community to evolve.* It is very rare that organizers get these kinds of learning communities right from the start. Structuring and facilitating the community for the purpose it is meant to serve is itself a continual learning process. Wallace gathered feedback from participants, both formally and informally, on a regular basis. Organizers were fully prepared to make agenda changes on the spot if participants' feedback indicated that would be desirable – and often did.

- *Learn alongside grantees.* Wallace was repeatedly commended for how they positioned themselves as partners in the learning with grantees. They did not come in with a solution, but worked with grantees to define the problem(s) facing educational leadership and design the solutions together. In all of this there was a sense of purpose that engaged everyone in something important and larger than they could tackle alone.

- *Demonstrate what success looks like through exemplars.* One of Wallace's goals is to create enough examples of how educational leadership can actually be changed and to do this by identifying a through-line of change from state to district to school. Demonstrating what success looks like through tangible examples is an excellent propeller for action.

- *Facilitate, yet minimize the transition of group members:* New people coming on board in different meetings and activities can slow down the group and initially affect its unity. In the event that new members come on board, make sure to bring them up to speed even before their first encounter with the whole group. Where possible, enforce a policy of "no substitutions."

- *When working with grantees, understand their time constraints.* It helps when there is a convincing purpose right up front. "Otherwise it will feel like a condition of the grant and feel overwhelming," according to Kate Fenton. It also helps when grantmakers take something else off the table. So if reporting is done on a quarterly basis, perhaps it should be reduced to twice a year and the work in the learning community should count as progress toward fulfilling the grant. After all, these learning communities carry value for both the grantees and the grantmaker.

- *Ensure both commonality and diversity within groups.* Sharing a common struggle helps create buy-in to the group. But diversity also helps to push the learning. Kathy Nadurak reflected on this from her experience, "When you have people who are faced with the same issue but face it in very different contexts, there is a specificity of language that you have to develop that clarifies the thinking and so as that gets clearer, you can become a little more precise with your solutions. You could always think that you got somewhere, but someone else's circumstances meant you didn't, so you had to think about it in different ways and constantly pushed to refine it. I think this is dealt with in a learning community as a whole."

- *Trust your grantees to do great work.* A comment from Peter Winograd captures this point well: "If you are a foundation, and you have gone through and have betted on certain organizations and people and have given funding, trust them and support them. Tell them the goal [improving leadership] and say, 'Let's work together.' Let people take risks, let there be failures and facilitate people working together."