"What type of developmental experiences will prepare us to be grounded enough to be able to support our clients (not to mention ourselves) in working in such complex change environments—not just conceptually but in practice?"

Building OD Education for the Infinite World of Tomorrow

By Matt Minahan and
Mee-Yan Cheung-Judge

In 1986 James Carse published *Finite and Infinite Games: A Vision of Life as Play and Possibility*, in which he forewarned the evolving nature of change will require change leaders and agents to work very differently.

He defined "finite games" as closed systems, predictable, making sense to most because they tend to agree on the goal, the rules are relatively known, and the field of play has clear boundaries.

On the other hand, "infinite games" are open systems and unpredictable as boundaries are often unclear or non-existent. There are rules but the rules can change without notice. There are still plans and guide books, but many games are going on at the same time, and sometimes the winning plan can seem to be contradictory. In such situations, we can plan but we may not know how our plans will turn out as there is too much interdependence happening with their corresponding unintended consequences.

In an infinite game, there is really no stable, permanent, reliable boundary to define reality. Most of the changes that are happening now in organizations belong in this category. Today's speculation is that the world will be increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (Stiehm, 2002). Many of the factors contributing to these dynamics are laid out in "Future of Organizations and Implications for OD Practitioners" (Cheung-Judge, 2017a) and are even further amplified by the political instability and extremism which seems to be flourishing in too many places around the globe.

The big question is, how equipped are we OD practitioners to function in such situations? What type of developmental experiences will prepare us to be grounded enough to be able to support our clients (not to mention ourselves) in working in such complex change environments—not just conceptually but in practice?

This article looks at the past, present, and future of OD education. We have included data from OD programs globally and in the UK but with a focus on those in the US where the majority of programs are located.

From Finite . . . Toward Infinite . . .

This shift from the 1960s when the first OD programs were formed until now can be seen in geopolitics, capital markets in the US, definitions of OD, and OD theories and books.

Geopolitics: Geopolitical forces governed the environment such as large fluctuations in the price of energy that caused turmoil in the automobile and truck industries. The first Gulf War created simmering resentment of American ideals and principles within the world's fastest growing region and its dominant religion. The fall of the Berlin wall opened business and trade between the former Soviet bloc and their former Western adversaries. International trade, formerly held closely among a few close allies suddenly became a major avenue for economic growth with the additional hope that economic engagement would also bring social development and

the expansion of human rights. Larger nations and international institutions evolved a growing awareness that poverty anywhere was bad for people everywhere and that prosperity and health were global public goods that were the responsibility of every nation. Yet, water shortages, food rationing, international refugees, and human trafficking seem only to be getting worse.

Capital Markets: Similar changes were being reflected in bellwether economic indicators. In the 1970s, 70% of the companies listed on Dow Jones Industrial average were in the industrial/automobile sectors, mostly in the industrial heartland of the US and Canada such as Proctor and Gamble, Esso, Kodak, Corning, International Harvester, Harley Davidson, etc. These were capital-intensive businesses characterized by long planning horizons in steady state sectors. As much as we talked about change during those years, these were still large form, long term industries that were largely insulated from sudden change.

By contrast today, 75% of the companies that compose the Dow Jones Industrial Average are in the finance, consumer products, or pharmaceutical sectors, most added in this century, and characterized by rapidly shifting consumer preferences, technology-driven innovation, and very short product life cycles. The large industrials have contracted to a small fraction of the global economy, largely shedding what had been a reliable source of OD jobs and work.

OD Definitions: We are seeing a similar evolution in our own field. Richard Beckhard's is the most widely cited definition of OD, beginning with Organization Development (OD) is "an effort, planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top, to increase organization effectiveness and health through planned interventions in the organization's processes, using behavioral-science knowledge" (1969).

By contrast, "Organization Development is a body of knowledge and practice that enhances organizational performance and individual development, viewing the organization as a complex system of systems that exist within a larger system, each of which has its own attributes and degrees of alignment. OD interventions in these systems are inclusive methodologies and approaches to strategic planning, organization design, leadership development, change management, performance management, coaching, diversity, and work/life balance" (Minahan, 2016).

The structure, the language, and the focus of this latter version reveal an important shift toward what we know and want to know about the complexity of organizational life and what OD practitioners do today, in contrast to OD as it was seen and practiced in 1969, when OD was mainly about individual and group level interventions.

OD Theories and Books: Kurt Lewin's own change model—*unfreeze, change, refreeze*—implies that systems are static, then start to change and then stop changing (1951). You can see the same shifts in books. The very title of *The Planning of Change* (Bennis, et al, 1976) conveyed that we believed that change could in fact be planned and managed. Peter Block's Flawless Consulting (1981) became the cookbook for OD success.

The first mainstream management book, *In Search of Excellence*, was published in 1982 opening for the first time the once arcane world of leadership and strategy to everyday readers and executives, and is still the 4th bestselling management book of all time.

Within a few years, Ed Schein's *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (1985) was an early look at the ephemeral, nonlinear variables in organization change. Peter Vaill was seeing around the corner into this century when he wrote *Managing as a Performing Art: New Ideas for a World of Chaotic Change* (1989) and *Learning as a Way of Being: Strategies for Survival in a World of Permanent White Water* (1996).

Imagine what executives' bookshelves would contain were it not for Michael Porter, Daryl Connor, Jim Collins, Jerry Poras, Stephen Covey, Gary Hamel, C. K. Prahalad, Patrick Lencioni, Ralph Stacey, Laszlo Bock, and others. These authors and others have educated our clients and help to shape what they ask of us; a great leap forward from 1982.

OD Programs in the Age of the Finite

Academic programs in OD in the US began to emerge in the 1970s, mostly as an outgrowth of other disciplines. Relying upon the prodigious memory of Peter Sorensen (personal communication, April 18, 2017), Roger Williams College started to train leaders for the YMCA in the mid-1960s and expanded into an OD program in the mid-1970s. Bowling Green State University began an undergrad degree in OD in 1971 and its MS degree 5 years later (Varney, 1974). In this same time frame, Herb Shepard brought his years of consulting and industrial engineering to Case Western, where he started the first doctoral program in OD. Loyola of Chicago's Community Development program morphed into the Community and Organization Development, or CORD program.

In the late 1970s, Pepperdine started its master's program. In 1980 Edie Seashore saw the need to grow new OD practitioners and young NTL members, and worked with Morley Segal, and Don Zauderer to create the American University/National Training Labs Masters in OD. That same year, Don Klein founded the MS in Applied Behavioral Science at Johns Hopkins University. Fielding's PhD in OD was accredited in 1982 (Fielding Institute Accredited, 1982). That was also the year of the national OD Network conference at Lake Geneva in Wisconsin, so it was a time for expanding energy and new ventures in OD.

More programs emerged in the 1980s and 1990s rooted in the reality of organizations and the environment of the time. The principle organizational metaphor was shifting during these years from the organization as a machine to the organization as a living entity, a metaphor first offered by Lawrence & Lorsch (1969) in their OD book in the foundational Addison-Wesley series.

In 1986, the Roger Williams OD program migrated to Benedictine University. Through the late 1980s and early 90s, the

demand for OD education grew programs at St. Thomas University, University of San Francisco, Pepperdine, and later at Queens University in Charlotte, St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia, and most recently, Penn State University.

In the UK, although the Tavistock Institute had played a significant role in shaping the theories and practices of the field of Organization Development, its contributory role was mainly felt in US rather than in UK. In the UK, the field of OD remained mostly obscure until over a decade ago. While there have always been some individual academics and practitioners who have learned the trade mainly in the US and have been doing their part to propagate the knowledge of the field, OD in the UK has never gained the visibility needed to develop a coherent education and development program, even unto now—especially in comparison to what is happening in USA.

OD Programs Today in the US

Degree Programs: The number of OD academic programs in the US peaked at 30-35 approximately around 2000. Since then, significant programs closed at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, JFK University, Johns Hopkins University, and others. Most closed due to lack of enrollment, some of which was due to poor leadership, and being outside the mainstream of what most universities were offering. They were also easy targets for budget cuts due to their small size and the few faculty affected. Several others shifted from OD toward organizational learning, knowledge management, or strategic leadership at schools such as George Mason University, Friends University, LIOS at Saybrook, etc.

One database returns 57 US programs oriented to organization development, but most are about organizational leadership, HR, OB, learning, knowledge management, organizational psychology, etc. One program that describes itself as OD says its focus areas are training and development, management and leadership, teams in organizations, organizational systems and dynamics, executive coaching, and human resource management, missing most of the

---

Table 1. *The Essential Elements of OD Programs, as developed by OD Program Directors and the OD Education Association*

Foundations of ODC

1. History and evolution of organization development and change
2. System perspectives which includes (a) organization design and (b) organizational acumen and mastery

Theories, Models, and Practices of Changes

3. Classic and emerging theories and models for change
4. Designing/choosing appropriate interventions which includes (a) facilitation and process consultation for individuals, groups and teams; (b) process improvement methods

Leading Change and the Use of Self

5. Leading the consulting process
6. Values-based practice
7. Use of self

Cultural Competence and Diversity

8. Organizational culture
9. Global culture
10. Diversity and Inclusion

Organizational Diagnosis, Assessment, and Research

11. Organizational Inquiry
12. Organization assessment.

Source: http://www.odnetwork.org/default.asp?page=essentialelements

---

"Essential Elements" of an OD program (see *Table 1*).

Today, there are 22 programs listed in the OD Network's Education Directory (*http://www.odnetwork.org/?page=EducationListing*), including schools in Mexico, Canada, Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand. An estimated 10–15 additional programs have not added their own listings.

Certificates and Other Professional Development: A dozen or more shorter certificate programs were developed in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. One of the first in the early 1970s was NTL's four-week long Program for Specialists in OD (PSOD), serving practitioners who were shifting from T group training to working more with businesses, initiated by Dick Beckhard and Warner Burke (Bunker, 2016). Other programs included NTL's Graduate Student Professional Development Program (GSPDP) and its OD Certificate, the Principles and Practices of OD at Columbia University led by Barbara Bunker, Dick Axelrod, and Warner Burke. Later,

Georgetown University's OD certificate served as a precursor to its widely-respected Coaching certificate program. Today's NTL's US-based OD Certificate contains 5 one-week modules with options and choices for participants. With this redesign, NTL has removed the T-group requirement for the certificate, despite its long-standing commitment to the T-group as an indispensable vehicle for self-knowledge.

Many of these programs are designed to teach OD fundamentals especially to people who want to remain in their roles in finance, IT, operations, HR, etc., but who also want to improve the effectiveness with which they operate. In addition, several private firms and individuals offer OD training and certification programs, including Carter McNamara's program (*www.consultantdevelopmentinstitute.org*).

OD Programs Today in the UK

Similar to the US, systematic and comprehensive research has not been done, but the following review is a good reflection of OD education in UK.

Degree Programs: Of the 1045 management, organization, and leadership Master's degree programs, only 38 fall into organization behavior Master's degrees. A search for "organization development" reveals 15 programs, of which only 4 have OD in their title. Only a handful offer doctoral programs.

Other programs listed in OD-related subjects are mainly on organization and change, organization and leadership, organizational behavior, and organizational psychology.

Certificates and Other Professional Development: Several universities offer individual modules, masterclasses, or seminars on OD—ranging from 1 day to 5 days. Other OD courses can be found as part of the offerings in professional association, e.g., CIPD—the HR professional home for several OD offerings in the HR business partner development program; Roffey Park has three 2-day modules for OD practitioners. There is only one certificate program, the NTL OD certificate, which spreads 25 days over 6 modules in 12 months, including a T group.

However, schools in the UK have not organized themselves as the US and other global programs have, and have not yet undertaken anything similar on their own. There is no coordination among UK schools such as ODEA for the US and other countries; there is no agreement about core elements of an OD curriculum such as the Essential Elements mentioned above; there is no conversation about the profile of the future-ready OD practitioner; there is almost no laboratory learning; and there is almost no intentional reach for minority practitioners.

OD Programs Globally

In addition to the programs in Canada, Mexico, Thailand, Japan, and the Philippines affiliated with the ODEA mentioned above, there are a handful of OD certificate programs offered in Europe beyond the UK. The Institute for Management Development offers OD certificate programs in Singapore and Switzerland. John Scherer, one of the founders of the Leadership

Institute of Seattle in the 1970s, is training managers and OD practitioners in Poland. In Asia, NTL's offshoot Indian Society for Applied Behavioral Science (*www.isabs.org*) offers dozens of experiential courses each year and their own OD Certificate. The Tata Institute has a large catalogue of OD-related programs for working executives, and has just been authorized to offer the first graduate OD program in India.

Finite Resources, Finite Knowledge in the Finite World

Master's Programs: Most of today's OD master's degree-granting programs in the US are 33 to 36 credits with mostly 3-credit courses cut from much of the same cloth. Most have one full time faculty, who is also the program director, recruiter, boundary manager with the university, faculty evaluator, dean pleaser, member of many university committees, preparer for accreditation examiners, program designer, and implementer. Oh, and they teach 2–4 courses a year, and are expected to publish as well.

In most cases, courses are taught by adjunct visiting professors and lecturers who are the second, third, and fourth generation acolytes of OD founders, brought to the field by the desire to improve the world and with a value set around inclusion, equality, fairness, opportunity for all, and empowerment of employees and citizens. With such loosely coupled systems, it is a perpetual challenge for directors to hold a center of gravity and bring coherence to a curriculum that is more than just the sum of the 12 free floating courses.

Doctoral Programs: What most programs do not have is full time OD faculty conducting ongoing research in the field. The gold standard in OD graduate programs and full time faculty is at Case Western Reserve. Their long-standing faculty includes Richard Boyatzis, Harlow Cohen, David Cooperrider, and Ron Fry who continue to research and write, but even there, they are professors of organization behavior, not OD. The most recent doctoral program redesign is just being implemented with a second cohort forming at St. Thomas. In their program redesign, they looked at all

the doctorates in the field, reviewed curricula, and their own knowledge of changing practices to build a program to differentiate them from other doctorates.

It is no accident that the most recent branch on the tree of OD knowledge is Appreciative Inquiry, born out of David Cooperrider's dissertation as a Case graduate student. But that was almost thirty years ago. His current and now global focus on making business an agent of world benefit is rooted in his ongoing research as a faculty member at Case Western (*https://weatherhead.case.edu/centers/fowler/*), but still not directly related to OD.

All Over the Place: Another challenge to coalescing the field is that OD programs can be found all over the map. Depending upon the school, you will find the OD program in the school of business, or education, or human development, or public affairs, or continuing studies, or graduate education, or leadership studies . . . each with its own emphasis and preferred world view which directly affects what gets taught, how, and by whom.

New Knowledge: The most exciting development in the knowledge base of the field is the growing contrast between diagnostic and dialogic OD (Bushe & Marshak, Eds., 2015), but even that is not research as much as a conceptualization that leads to a new taxonomy that helps us see the role of open systems, social construction, discourse, and complexity in our work, describing a shift going on in our field since the 1980s (Marshak & Bushe, 2013). It has definitely broadened the field to cover some different philosophic and foundational assumptions, and it leads us toward new practices rooted in values, which is paramount.

A recent summary of the "new golden age of OD research and knowledge" (Sorensen, et al, 2017) names less than a dozen significant researchers, and only a handful are full time, tenured faculty.

Doctoral students are doing high quality dissertation research at Fielding, Case, St. Thomas, and Benedictine, but full-time faculty members are too few and far between to create an ongoing stream

of inquiry and to advance the body of OD knowledge in any systematic or organized manner. In many ways, these graduate programs are reflective of the field of OD, themselves loosely coupled, as is the research that these schools are generating.

The relative shorter history of OD in the UK resembles the earlier days of OD programs in the US, especially regarding any research agenda or effort to play a key role to propagate the knowledge of the field, with just a handful of OD degrees and few full-time faculty conducting research. In terms of scope, content, processes, structure, resources utilization and reach to diverse practitioners' population in educational programs in the UK, it is a struggle for educational change to keep up with the speed of external changes. Much the same applies to the global OD programs as well.

So, what can we say? It has been 40 years since the birth of these OD graduate programs, and our effort can be summarized in the following ways:

Nip and Tuck: During these years, our OD education programs soldiered on, nipping here, tucking there, adding a course on culture, getting serious about working diversity and inclusion issues internally, building experiential learning around use of self, etc. Several programs added international residencies to deal with multiculturalism and globalism. Systems thinking is now a part of most programs. Most added practica to give their ever-younger students real life experience. Several universities pressured OD programs to be more virtual as a means of reducing costs. For most programs it was and has been evolutionary change in an environment of revolutionary change.

The Crammed-In Credit Crunch: The outside world is now demanding that their OD graduates be smarter, more agile, more ready to hit the ground running, knowing more about how organizations actually operate, being able to read a balance sheet, understand income dynamics, and hold a credible conversation with a CFO about rates of return on human capital investments and OD engagements. As responsive and responsible educators, OD program directors have built—we would say, crammed—these topics into their already overstuffed curricula which is holding at 1980 levels of 36 credit hours.

What We Have Lost: What has been squeezed out, and at what expense? There is very little psychology or sociology taught in OD programs today. There is a focus on use of self, rooted in self-reflection, but there is little connection to the core body of knowledge around theory of personality, psychodynamics, the role of power and authority in organizations, a solid grounding in group development theory or sociology. Programs that were grounded in community organizing are spending little if any time on the history of social action and the pivotal role that women's suffrage played in the history of social change around the world. Students are not reading Mary Parker Follett or Frederick Douglas or Studs Terkel or Pablo Neruda who are foundational to the values and beliefs that underpin the field. If they even know the term, students at many schools see T-groups and experiential learning as a quaint relic of their grandparents' era or for non-US students, an "odd" intervention that one has to endure.

Students know the name Kurt Lewin but are less and less able to explain his work and why it matters. A recent graduate class well into its OD curriculum could not associate Emery and Trist with socio technical systems. Without a solid grounding in these core concepts and the women and men who developed them, how can we expect new OD practitioners to deal with the complexities of the organizations of today? The duality of being firmly grounded in the CORE of OD and yet being able to flex and stretch to work in an emergent way is a key mindset we need all OD students to develop.

It is Expensive: One other major factor is severely pinching the real world of OD education. The costs of a university graduate degree in the US have increased by 90% between 2000 and 2015 (*https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_330.50.asp?current=yes*) at the exact time that the number of organizations making a long-enough term investment in staff development by underwriting graduate education has decreased dramatically. Small OD programs are seldom endowed with scholarship or grant funds, as a result, access to an OD graduate education has become increasingly restricted to students who can qualify for loans of well into the $60,000 and $70,000 range. That greatly ups the ante on getting a real job in a real hurry in order to pay back student loans. Another unfortunate result is a lower proportion of African American students in many OD programs than was the case previously, though more international students are bringing a welcome diversity to many programs in the US and elsewhere. In the UK, the NTL OD certificate program deliberately spent the last 10 years focusing on getting a diverse group of delegates by setting aside funding for scholarships. The result is that the cohort formation has a much wider reach of delegates.

The structures and education strategies that served the world of the 1980s and 1990s just do not work today. The organizations of that era have largely not survived, and our 1980s-born approach to OD education should not either.

It is Too Loosely–Coupled: Meanwhile, OD as a field remains a too-loosely coupled system with a weak center of gravity. We do not have standard texts. The "values glue" embodied by the founders of the field is rapidly eroding as the "vision of a better world" is being replaced by students who want a return on their educational investment (Minahan, 2013). We cannot agree on a definition of the field. We fret that there are not as many OD Director and VP jobs as there were in the industrial age of the 1970s and 1980s. The OD jobs that are advertised include training or succession planning or talent management or other functions that rightly belong in HR (Minahan, 2010).

In the UK and in other parts of the world, such as India, Singapore, and other countries in southeast Asia, things are somewhat different. There are more organizations both in the private and public sector which have created OD jobs (despite the

fact some of them do not really know what value OD can add to the organization), but there are not enough well educated OD practitioners in the supply. It would be wonderful if the demand there resulted in the creation of new OD programs.

In the US, the regional OD Networks have as much as 10 times the membership of the national and international OD Network and they remain unable and unwilling to consolidate to create a larger, stronger organization with a more solid center of gravity.

Other disciplines have arisen: While we have been debating about our definition and future, the coaching world has sprung from our loins (Minahan, 2006) and created an entire industry and a huge certification body. Change management is now seen as separate from OD, its organization is growing at 10 times the rate of OD organizations, its conference draws 10 times the number that the OD Network's annual conference attracts, its strong connection to business enables it to attract top name speakers and keynoters, and it is on the verge of establishing a change management certification program. Project managers have training programs and certificates. OD people and HR VPs have been asking for an OD certification since 2006 (HR VP and Director Forum, personal communication, OD Network Conference, October 22, 2006). Historically, OD has positioned itself—ourselves—on the margins of organizations. We favor those who themselves are marginalized in the work place and society. We have told ourselves that you can only truly see a system from the outside in; you cannot see the system as a whole when you are in it. But the very marginality that makes us successful defeats our ability to gather together, create a center of gravity, and take concerted action together.

If the Past is Prologue, There is Reason to be Hopeful

In general, OD programs have done well at adapting to incremental change in the past 10 years. The last look ahead at OD education in 2008 (Minahan & Farquhar, 2008) called for more specialization of

content and focus; more highly differentiated features across programs, much of which is occurring. Until recently, tuition, location, format, and scheduling were the main differentiators across many programs. Due to distance learning and long form residencies, location is less of a decision factor. Different philosophies and learning foci will become important differentiating factors among OD programs. Look for increasingly heavy use of technology in programs, a better array of student services such as writing skills, career centers, alumni networks, financial aid offices, international student support, etc.; and to stronger and better integrated course designs and curricula. Most schools have adapted well to these demands, which sets the stage for the next big shifts.

In 2008, an informal group of OD academic program directors formed the OD Education Association, consisting now of nine core member schools and approximately 15 affiliated schools (Minahan, 2014). They organized in order "to establish, advance and promote the body of knowledge required in OD education" (*http://www.odnetwork.org/?page=ODEA*).

In an historic contribution and a first-time achievement for the field of OD, one of ODEA's first efforts developed the *"Essential Elements"* of a comprehensive OD curriculum. (*http://www.odnetwork. org/?page=essentialelements*). While individual authors had written books and developed outlines that attempted to itemize knowledge elements of OD, this was the first consensus-based agreement among the majority of schools including OD programs from around the world, committing to what they believe are the indispensable, essential elements of a solid OD curriculum (see *Table 1*).

They also committed to the OD values embedded in the OD Credo. (*http://www. odnetwork.org/?page=HistoryofOrgDev&hhSearchTerms=%22values%22*)

It took 10 years to overcome the resistance, but the OD Network undertook a 3-year research, drafting, and validation process and in 2016 finally published the Global OD Competencies. They are not yet broadly accepted or used, but that's for the future.

All of these represent a huge step forward for a field that has studiously refused to coalesce around much except our own individuality.

Building OD Programs for the Infinite Future

How do OD programs operating in universities that are clearly in the finite realm build themselves and develop students for the infinite future and remain true to the principles and values that lie at the heart and foundation of our field? There are five areas to consider, purpose, content, structure, resources, and diversity.

Be Clear About Our Purpose
Our programs need to be focused on graduating "change guides" for organizations, to assist them through the challenges of change wherever they may emerge, rather than selling planned, pat change management tools and methods designed to provide comfort in their predictability, but that do not allow and encourage the release of energy and potentiality in all of its unpredictability (Cheung-Judge, 2015). With complex adaptive systems working in the infinite change scenario, while the plans can still be done, the reality is their utility is low and can sometimes just be self-delusional. This means that those of us who have a need to know and are used to playing a role in predicting what is going on for our organizations and clients will find ourselves paralyzed when we have neither the power of prediction nor the ability to hold onto certainty and be in the know. This impact can be disproportionally tough at the intrapersonal level as our professional identity as an expert and the relevance of our professional beings are being called into question.

We still need to address the "red flags" that Larry Greiner raised back in the salad years of OD (1972). We still have not figured out how to stop (1) putting the individual before the organization, (2) focusing on the informal organization instead of the formal organization, (3) driving for behavior change without a solid organizational diagnosis, and (4) putting group and interpersonal process ahead of task.

At one level, it is easy to be impressed by his forecasting skills. At another level, it is depressing that this is still a fairly accurate description of many young OD graduates, now more than 4 decades later.

On Content: Reach Back, Reach Out, Reach Ahead

We are doing the right thing by making OD programs more organizationally relevant and grounded in business dynamics, but it is too little and too slow. Every graduate

This is an area where the schools could collaborate, or reach out to NTL Institute or other organizations to design learning experiences that expedite these embodied learnings for 50, 60, or more graduate students from across many schools at one time, creating efficiencies and economies of scale that individual schools cannot match. The International Society for OD and Change has a gathering of students once a year to share knowledge. Pepperdine, Fielding, Alliant,

the globe without breaking the bank, how to pay a workforce equitably across the wide range of countries and incomes, and how to stay one step ahead of the customer/competition/stock index/loan repayments/bankruptcy/all of the above (Cheung-Judge, 2017b).

Structure and Resources

The field might have to sacrifice some of its iconic independence. Without larger programs supporting more full time faculty, we have little hope of building an integrated body of knowledge and sustained research and development capacity. This might require smaller OD programs to merge. It might require that OD programs merge with industrial psych or sociology programs or affiliate with leadership, management, or MBA programs. In this world, size matters and many of our programs are just too small to thrive, always one too-small intake away from the dean's budget cuts.

> **Without compromising more current content, we need to return to our roots in social and societal change. The very forces that generated these movements a century ago are at play even more so in today's organizations, especially around the privilege of power and authority and the denial of labor's right to organize. It is OD that works to serve the organization and the individual. We are perfectly positioned to integrate both sides for the benefit of all.**

course should have a senior leader or two from a local business, nonprofit, or government attend to speak to the real-world realities of running a large organization in a complex, multi-stakeholder environment that is shifting even before it can be described.

When describing their experiential education, almost all OD programs refer to their class projects and applied thesis requirements. And while these help to build the OD practitioner of tomorrow, the academic credit crunch has crowded out personal growth experiential learning, learning about how we learn, learning in public, operating in leaderless groups, dealing with authority and each other in the here and now, learning what comes up for us when there is no structure, or too much, or no leadership, or too much. Experiential education, via T-group, Tavistock, personal growth groups, etc. remains a powerful part of the knowledge that OD practitioners need to have. Too many of today's OD graduates are missing the breakthrough self-awareness and knowledge that is so foundational to use of self as an OD practitioner (Cheung-Judge, 2012).

and others each have their own residencies that bring together students across cohorts in sessions that are thoughtful and well designed.

Without compromising more current content, we need to return to our roots in social and societal change. The very forces that generated these movements a century ago are at play even more so in today's organizations, especially around the privilege of power and authority and the denial of labor's right to organize. It is OD that works to serve the organization and the individual. We are perfectly positioned to integrate both sides for the benefit of all.

We cannot allow dualistic thinking to prevail, favoring the study and focus on the social system and informal organization at the expense of the formal structure, business processes, and use of authority. We must be able to hold the both/and of these realities and equip OD graduates to be effectively agile in both realms, and be comfortable with polarities, such as how to be global and local at the same time, how to manage the tension between control (centralization) and freedom (decentralization), how to attract top talent around

Appealing to the last vestiges of altruism among university deans and provosts, if OD programs were actually larger and covered their own costs, they might persuade a friendly dean to charge smaller amounts and reduce tuition charges, as fixed program costs can be spread over a larger number of students. Ideally, that would return access to those who cannot afford a 10-year loan or who do not have the collateral or countersigners to qualify.

As they have accommodated an ever-increasing body of knowledge that graduates must know to compete in today's world, most OD programs are not currently doing justice to the foundational concepts of our field, crowded out at the expense of more current content. Some OD programs have abandoned the semester long three-credit course structure for smaller, shorter courses in order to accommodate the expanding knowledge requirements. But the 36-credit hour container for this universe of knowledge is an outdated anachronism. A minimum of 42 credit hours should be considered and some programs could be even larger.

Diversify Our Targets

We can no longer be the hideout for students seeking refuge from real world challenges such as organizational power and politics. Too many of our recent grads come to learn team building and small scale change believing it an escape from the rough and tumble reality of organizational life.

As the number of pure OD jobs has declined, programs are expanding their focus to managers and staff in other disciplines who just want to be better CFOs and IT managers and leaders of other technical functions.

NTL in the UK has been practicing this for over the last eight years with some encouraging success. We have had a CFO from a major NGO, a CMO, marketing head and board member from a major global pharma, a CEO and chief strategist from a global advocacy NGO, the senior campaigning officer from a different international advocacy NGO, as well as the chief peace negotiator between religious leaders in Israel, etc. The impact of their learning in OD has been stunning to follow up. They also spice up the program with a welcome diversity of experience and perspective. Such recruitment does not come by chance, but by clear intent.

This should be just the beginning. Our OD programs should be positioned as better, shorter, deeper, and cheaper than MBA programs. If done effectively, that could increase the reach and size of OD programs.

Another target market would be middle managers. OD programs typically do not target them directly, but we know that they are in fact key agents of change, and that nothing important gets done without them (Weisbord, 2012). And, there are lots of them.

Getting Down to Action

This is a call to action for educators, administrators, professors, teachers, graduates, students, and practitioners all over the world, from every geopolitical system, in Africa, Asia, Europe, the UK, and the US.

For academics, look for ways to collaborate with doctoral students to build on existing research and extend the reach of OD knowledge. Build them into the questions you are exploring and help shape their research to refine and extend previously done work rather than necessarily starting from scratch.

For graduates, start a conversation with fellow alums about the value of your degree and what would have made it even better and then tell your program director.

For practitioners who are coaching or mentoring new professionals, bring them to your client meetings and look for ways to help them understand the true political and economic realities that are driving today's organizations.

For internals, reach out to the nearest OD graduate program and offer to host a practicum project or take on an intern.

For UK OD education providers, it is time for us to organize an informal dialogue about what and how UK OD education can contribute to the continuous development of the field.

For OD program directors, well, there are already plenty of ideas here—maybe too many?—to take action on individually, but together, the possibilities are exciting.

As the iconic television ad for women's cigarettes says, "You've come a long way baby, to get where you got to today." But if we are to truly realize the dreams of Kurt Lewin, Leland Bradford, Wilfried Bion, Fritz Perls, Douglas MacGregor, and countless others who have launched us toward the infinite, as a field we need to set aside our rugged individualism and take our own medicine, or as high tech startups say, eat our own dogfood. Just as we advise our clients, our OD programs need to work together even better to support the good of the many over the good of the one and to support the good of the world. To make us more than the sum of our parts. Otherwise, we doom ourselves to the finite world with only a glimpse of what might be possible in the infinite.

References

Beckhard, R. (1969). *Organization development: strategies and models.* Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W., Benne, K, & Chin, R. (1976). *The planning of change.* New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Block, P. (1981). *Flawless consulting: A guide to getting your expertise used.* San Diego, CA.: Pfeiffer.

Bozzuto, B. (2011). Clockware and Swarmware. (downloaded from *http://www.solutionsiq.com/clockware-and-swarmware/* on April 18, 2017).

Bunker, B. (2016). Reflections on gender and organization development consulting. In D. Noumair & A. Shani (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development.* Bingley, UK: Emerald House Publishing.

Bushe, G. & Marshak, R. (Eds.) (2015). *Dialogic OD: The theory and practice of transformational change.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Carse, J. (2013). *Finite and infinite games: A vision of play and possibility.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Cheung-Judge, M. (2012). The self as an instrument: A cornerstone for the future of OD. *OD Practitioner 44*(2), 42–47.

Cheung-Judge, M. (2015). Response: Navigating the not so friendly landscape with grace and savviness. *OD Practitioner. 47*(4), 24–25.

Cheung-Judge, M. & Holbeche, L. (2015). *Organization development: A practitioner's guide for OD and HR.* London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Cheung-Judge, M. (2017a). Future of organizations and implications for OD practitioners. *OD Practitioner, 49*(1), 7–19

Cheung-Judge, M. (2017b). Future of organizations and implications for OD practitioners, Summary. *OD Practitioner, 49*(3), 7–13.

Chunking: *https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chunking_(psychology)* downloaded April 18, 2018

Fielding Institute Accredited. (1982). *OD Practitioner. 14*(2), 16.

Greiner, L. E. (1972, June). Red flags in organization development. *Business Horizons.*

Lorsch, J., & Lawrence, P. (1969). *Organizational development: Diagnosis and action.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Lewin, K., & Cartwright, D. (Eds.) (1951). *Field theory in social science.* New York, NY: Harper.

Marshak, R. (2013). My journey into dialogic organization development. *OD Practitioner, 47*(2), 49–55.

Minahan, M. (2006). The foundations of coaching: Roots in OD. *OD Practitioner, 38*(3), 4–7.

Minahan, M. (2010). OD and HR: Do we want the lady or the tiger? *OD Practitioner, 42*(4), 17–22.

Minahan, M. (2013). Edging toward the center: An opportunity to align our values, our practices, and our purposes at work. *OD Practitioner, 45*(4), 2–8.

Minahan, M. (2014). ODEA: An idea whose time is here. *OD Practitioner, 46*(3), 22–26.

Minahan, M. & Farquhar, K. (2008). The future of OD education in a global and sustainable world. *OD Practitioner, 40*(4), 12–15.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Sorensen, P., Yaeger, T., & Narel, R. (2017). The new golden age of organization development research and knowledge. *Organization Development Journal, 35*(1)

Stiehm, J., & Townsend, N. (2002). *The U.S. army war college: Military education in a democracy.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. ISBN 1-56639-960-2

Vaill, P. (1989). *Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change.* San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vaill, P. (1996). *Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Varney, G. (1974.) Graduate education in organization development for practicing managers. *OD Practitioner, 6*(3), 10.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory: foundations, development, application.* New York, NY: George Braziller.

Weisbord, M. (2012). *Productive workplaces: Dignity, meaning, and community in the 21st century.* San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Matt Minahan is president of MM & Associates, specializing in strategic planning, organization design and development, and leadership development. He is a past chair and co-chair of the Board of Trustees of the OD Network, a member and former board member of the Chesapeake Bay OD Network and NTL Institute, and is twice the recipient of the OD Network's Service to the Network Award. He writes regularly for the *OD Practitioner.* He is also a program dean for Human Interaction Labs. He teaches in the OD program at American University and is a guest lecturer in several doctoral programs. He can be reached at *matt@minahangroup.com.*

Mee-Yan Cheung-Judge, BSc, MA, PhD, is a "scholar-educator-practitioner" working globally with organizations to deliver powerful transformational change. She is a senior visiting Fellow of Roffey Park Management Institute in the UK and the Singapore Civil Service College. She founded the OD Network in Europe and has been the Dean of the NTL European OD certificate. She is the author of numerous OD articles, books, and reports. Cheung-Judge was a recipient of the ODN's *Life Time Achievement Award* in 2013, the *Richard Beckhard Award for Contribution to the Field of OD* by IODA in 2016, and UK HR Magazine voted her one of the top influential thinkers in the field of HR in 2008, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. She can be reached at *lmycj@quality-equality.com.*

Building Tomorrow is a non-profit organization bringing access to inclusive, transformative education to children in underserved areas. Tomorrow is Now. Responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, scaling our impact for the future. Learn more Donate. Our Impact. As of March 2021. 55,143. Out-of-school children re-enrolled via Fellows or new school construction. 81. Building Tomorrow Primary Schools (open or under construction). David B Morgan National Education Service needs to consider parental and community involvement if it is to deliver on its vision of a progressive and inclusive service meeting the needs of all. … Promoting Public Services through UK Aid. Posted on September 23, 2019September 23, 2019 by admin. Dan Carden MP There are 260 million children worldwide not currently enrolled in school. And too many who are enrolled simply don't receive the education they need to equip them for life…. Towards a Comprehensive 14-19 Curriculum: a Socialist Perspective. Posted on September 22, 2019September 22, 2019 by Education can equip learners with agency and a sense of purpose, and the competencies they need, to shape their own lives and contribute to the lives of others. To find out how best to do so, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has launched The Future of Education and Skills 2030 project. The aim of the project is to help countries find answers to two far-reaching questions: â— What knowledge, skills, attitudes and values will today's students need to thrive and shape their world? â— How can instructional systems develop these knowledge, skills, attitudes and values... This OECD Learning Framework 2030 offers a vision and some underpinning principles for the future of education systems. It is about orientation, not prescription.