Up Next

**Generation Change
and the Leadership
of Nonprofit Organizations**

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public policies, human service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities, and neighborhoods fashion more innovative, cost-effective responses to these needs.

The Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund

The Haas, Jr. Fund is dedicated to celebrating and building community. It seeks to create vibrant, safe neighborhoods that support the healthy development of young people and the well-being of their families. The Fund also seeks to strengthen the bonds of mutual respect among people from all walks of life to pursue common interests and contribute to the larger community. Through its grantmaking, the Haas, Jr. Fund aspires to serve as a voice of hope and a positive, unifying force for social change.

About the Author

Frances Kunreuther is the Director of the Building Movement Project, which supports social change in the United States through nonprofit organizations. The project, now housed at Démos (www.demos-usa.org), was founded at the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations at Harvard University, where Kunreuther was a senior fellow for five years. Kunreuther was also a Children and Family Fellow at the Annie E. Casey Foundation in 1997. Prior to the fellowship, she spent seven years as the Executive Director of the Hetrick-Martin Institute, a multi-service agency for lesbian and gay, homeless, and HIV-positive youth. Kunreuther has also worked with immigrants, homeless families, domestic violence and sexual assault survivors, and substance users during her 30 years in the nonprofit sector.

The Executive Transitions Monograph Series

Up Next is the fourth volume of a new monograph series on executive transitions and executive transition management, funded in part by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund. Other reports in this series include:

♦ *Capturing the Power of Leadership Change: Using Executive Transition Management to Strengthen Organizational Capacity;*

♦ *Interim Executive Directors: The Power in the Middle; and*

♦ *Founder Transitions: Creating Good Endings and New Beginnings.*

For copies of these publications, please see: www.aecf.org/initiatives/leadership.

Table of Contents

As the Baby Boomers edge into their 50s and 60s, nonprofit organizations will soon be making room for a new generation of leaders. The sector as a whole, however, has only just begun to anticipate the shift of this older leadership cohort—directors, boards, staff members—who grew up with organizations founded in the 1960s and 1970s, a period of significant growth.

Several recent surveys have affirmed that executive leadership transitions will be an increasingly common aspect of organizational life in the nonprofit sector during the next several years.

♦ A 2004 survey sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation of more than 2,200 nonprofit organizations found that 65 percent of respondents expected to go through a leadership transition by 2009, while just 57 percent had experienced a transition during the past 10 years. Fifty-five percent of current executive directors surveyed were 50 or older.

♦ A 2004 survey of executives in organizations supported by the United Way in New York City reported that 45 percent planned to leave in the next five years.

♦ A 2002 study of 119 community foundations found that three out of five (61 percent) had had the same CEO during the last decade. Looking ahead, however, 55.3 percent of the foundation executives surveyed expected to transition in the next five years.

♦ In 2001, the Maryland Association of Nonprofits reported that it expected 78 percent of its members' executive directors to leave in the next five years.[1]

Along with these transitions, we expect a gap will develop between the number of nonprofit executives and other leaders leaving the field, and the new talent available to replace them. Some of this disparity may be overcome by current executives extending their tenure or doing part-time consulting, as well as the relatively large numbers of Boomers behind the leading edge of their generation. During the next 20–30 years, however, the leadership gap will likely expand into a chasm as Generation X, now in its 20s and 30s, is dramatically smaller than the Baby Boom generation.[2]

The Casey Foundation Response

Recognizing the expected growth in nonprofit transitions, the Casey Foundation began in 2000 to invest in refining executive transition management (ETM) services. This approach combines traditional executive search and organizational development services and can be tailored to the transition and broader developmental needs of a variety of nonprofit groups. ETM helps organizations treat a transition as a "pivotal" moment, an opportunity to reconsider mission and vision and attend to pressing strategic and infrastructure needs. During the last three years, Casey has made these services available to many of its grantees undergoing a leadership transition.

This work has led Casey to think more expansively about leadership change. Along with the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund and others, Casey has funded this monograph series to document its findings about ETM and executive transitions. Casey also has detailed the strategic uses of interim executives in transitions and the special circumstances of transitions that involve founders and long-term executives.

Most broadly, Casey has begun to examine what the transition from the Baby Boom generation to Generations X and Y means for nonprofit leadership. Are older leaders considering what's next and preparing for retirement or a new role, job, or even career? What does the next generation need to take the lead? How can those who support nonprofits make sure that we take this opportunity to reassess the work of the sector? How can we ensure that the next generation of leaders is more diverse and more representative of the communities its organizations serve?

What's Up Next?: Findings on Generational Differences

This monograph reports on the findings of a study conducted by the Building Movement Project on generational differences in leadership in small- and mid-sized social change organizations. The monograph also details follow-up sessions to discuss the study's findings with young leaders ages 25-40. In 2002, the Building Movement Project conducted in-depth interviews with directors and staff in 16 social change organizations to explore differences and similarities between older and younger people working in service, advocacy, and organizing groups. We asked questions about their current jobs and organizations, the motivations and challenges surrounding their work, and their views of leadership.

The study's results tell a more nuanced story than is often found in the popular literature.[3] We learned that younger directors and staff were dedicated and committed to social change and to their organizations. We heard how the movements of the 1960s and 1970s catapulted older leaders into nonprofit organizations where they dedicated their lives. We learned that younger leaders with a more contemporary frame of reference often felt invisible or undervalued by older leaders. We were moved by the conflict that young staff and directors felt as they struggled with how to stay in their organizations and make a full commitment to their family and friends. And we saw how much all those we interviewed, young and old, took pleasure from being able to make real changes in their constituents' lives.

To confirm the results, we took the study on the road in 2004, holding nine Generational Leadership Listening Sessions in nine U.S. cities.[4] The sessions were held with young leaders ages 25-40 in professional, nonprofit positions, and members of Generation X, who talked about the study and their own experience working in a wide range of nonprofit groups broadly focused on social change. Some of the comments and broader findings from these sessions are integrated in sidebar sections called "The Next Generation Responds."

We hope this report will provide a frame for discussing generational change in leadership in nonprofits and social change groups in the United States. The Civil Rights generation—the Baby Boomers—dominated the leadership and direction of progressive change in the latter half of the 20th Century. Now, as we make our way into the next century, building power and change for the future, we need to look at the new generation of leaders who are poised to shape and drive this work.

Summary of Recommendations

To sustain and build existing social change organizations, we believe nonprofits should be more proactive in promoting younger leaders in light of the findings described here. Specifically:

Recommendation #1
Invest in Younger Leaders

Older leaders need to play an active role in encouraging the next generation of leaders and valuing their new ideas. They can do this by setting aside biases borne of their early movement experience and by nurturing young leadership with contemporary and critically needed perspectives both within and outside of their organizations. For their part, younger executive directors should do the same with the generation behind them. Funders can support this effort by encouraging organizations to invest in young leaders and staff development.

Recommendation #2
Identify and Nurture More Leaders of Color

The leaders of nonprofit groups do not reflect the diversity of the communities they serve—particularly in places with growing immigrant populations. There is a need to develop strategies to support a more multi-racial group of leaders who better reflect our communities and who bring the full range of knowledge and ideas necessary to invent and implement effective responses to critical problems.

Recommendation #3
Make It Viable for Directors to Leave

Currently, it is extremely difficult for many older directors to leave their positions. Inadequate retirement and savings plans severely constrain older leaders' choices. Social change organizations must develop financial support mechanisms for outgoing leaders, perhaps with private funding. Such financial support will ensure that reasonable salaries, benefit packages, and/or savings plans are implemented to yield the long-term income security of the current and next generation of leaders.

Recommendation #4
Broaden Sites of Intergenerational Discussion

Intergenerational dialogue is critical in addressing many of the issues raised in this report. These conversations should include organizational leaders and staff, as well as boards of directors and other constituents. Structured conversations can include past and current assumptions about issues and their causes, how these have been addressed, and what is needed to move solutions forward in the coming decades. Intragenerational groups preceding intergenerational conversations would give leaders a chance to reflect on and recognize the changing circumstances of social change work.

Recommendation #5
Examine Current Organizational Structures and Expectations

Many social change organizations struggle to find appropriate leadership and decision-making structures that model deeply held values of empowerment and participatory democracy. These kinds of clearly defined approaches can help organizations retain younger staff and provide a fertile ground for training new leadership. Researchers and practitioners should also create and test new decision-making models and in turn develop ways to train directors and staff on these arrangements.

Recommendation #6
Promote a Healthier Balance Between Work and Personal/Family Life

Finally, we must take a critical look at the cultural aspects of social change work, particularly the notion that employees can never do or give enough to their organizations. This belief has been passed on directly or indirectly from one generation to the next. To address this issue, we need discussions (in organizations and more broadly) to understand how to create manageable jobs that allow time for family life, relaxation, and renewal. Funders can help by trying to ensure organizations set realistic goals, rather than encouraging them to try to do more for less.

In 1991, Douglas Coupland's novel, *Generation X* created a sensation as it described a post-Baby Boomer generation whose values and interests were highly divergent from generations that had preceded them. GenXers (born between 1965 and 1979) claimed to have a different attitude and orientation toward work and life than the Baby Boom generation (born between 1946 and 1964). The release of Coupland's book marked the beginning of a proliferation of books, magazine and newspaper articles, websites, and discussions devoted to generational differences.[5] GenXers were characterized as "slackers";[6] materialistic;[7] independent;[8] technologically savvy;[9] serious about work but resistant to micromanagement;[10] distrustful of government and traditional institutions;[11] without loyalty to employers (and thus likely to job-hop);[12] and interested in working to live (not living to work), while expecting a high standard of living.[13]

Generation X only described a certain sector of the next generation—upper/middle class, mostly white and often male, and working in the for-profit sector.[14] Yet despite all the stereotypes and shortcomings of these claims, the popular literature about Generation X did call attention to the fact that the Baby Boomers' experiences and values might not resonate with those who followed. As Generation X begins to take on leadership positions in corporations, government, and nonprofit agencies vacated by Baby Boomers, this idea of divergent values takes on new meaning.

The realization that Baby Boom leaders will be leaving their jobs in the next decade has begun to send shockwaves through the nonprofit sector as studies begin to focus on what will happen to their organizations.[15] Older leaders across the sector are asking who will head so many nonprofit organizations. There has been a sudden interest in identifying emerging leaders, providing training, and examining issues such as the impact of gender and race that are clearly the hallmark of a new generation in the nonprofit sector.[16]

The idea for this study grew out of a 1999 meeting with a group of 20 leaders from grassroots, social change organizations across the United States. Participants talked about tensions between Baby Boomers and younger generations. The Boomers described their difficulty finding and grooming young leadership, and their frustration with what they saw as the younger generation's unwillingness to "pay their dues" and work their way up within organizations. Younger people described the lack of support for the next generation of leadership and the struggles they faced in balancing work and personal life.[17] Subsequent meetings around the country in 2001 confirmed these views. Few older leaders could imagine leaving their organizations and worried about who would carry on their work. Both Boomers and Xers raised questions about how best to cross the generational divide and promote new leadership.[18] We intended that this study would contribute to the literature and discussion about generational differences and provide insight into the impact of these differences, specifically on the work of social change nonprofits.

What's Up Next:
Key Findings on Generational Change

The Building Movement Project has been investigating differences between older and younger people working in progressive social change organizations. It is looking for ways the nonprofit sector could support the next generation of young leaders. The project started with a qualitative study of 38 directors and staff in 16 nonprofits, located in two Northeast cities.[19] On one hand, this study seems to refute the notion of large generational differences. Older and younger people involved in these organizations share many qualities: commitment, concern, energy, interest, and a strong belief in justice. On the other hand, distinctions exist between Baby Boomers and GenXers. The most pressing issue in the study was the lack of pathways for dedicated younger staff to become leaders in organizations, especially those run by older directors.

To understand more of the obstacles faced by younger leaders, we took the initial study on the road. Meeting with younger leaders ages 25-40 in nine U.S. cites, we presented the findings and heard about their experiences. Their responses helped us understand in more detail the issues facing the post-Civil Rights generation of leaders. These included establishing credibility, finding helpful mentors/coaches, and continuing to search for appropriate organizational and decision-making structures that reflect the values of their broader social change work.

Background: Where Do Leaders Come From?

In the original study, we explored participants' personal and professional experiences, their entry into the nonprofit sector, and their motivations for joining social change organizations. We found differences in the backgrounds of the different generations, including the forces that helped propel them into social change work. These competing "histories" can have important, and too often under-realized, effects on one generation's perception of another.

♦ Older participants frequently referred to their involvement in the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s, when theories about the 'causes' of the problems facing society dominated. They entered the nonprofit sector to work in organizations where they could "change the world" and never left.

  And to see the civil rights movement was a stunning thing for a person of sixteen… these were eye-opening experiences…. (Older director)

♦ Most of the younger participants were drawn to social change nonprofits because of personal experiences – their own or what they witnessed – and a desire to help those in their communities or in situations similar to their own.

  We {our family} were always struggling … and I always had an affinity for politics and legal issues and just sort of thought a lot about justice, economic justice, in particular, because of my own personal experiences with economic justice or lack thereof. (Younger staffer)

♦ Both generations experienced a type of transformation—a combination of lived experience and learned analysis—during the course of their work for social change.

♦ Younger directors were more likely than their older peers to report having worked in the for-profit sector, which they found especially useful in their current positions. In addition, all but one of the younger directors had attended an elite college or university that no doubt added to their credibility as young leaders of social change organizations.

> *But you know, what Harvard gave me was tremendous privilege… If I'd gone to Ohio State, I wouldn't be here. And I don't take that lightly. (Younger director)*

♦ Younger staff, especially those from the organization's constituent groups, often reported how young directors had identified and then recruited them into their current positions.

The Next Generation Responds

The differences in how older and younger leaders have entered the field have significant implications, particularly for younger leaders seeking to build their careers. In our Generational Leadership Listening sessions, we heard time and again that younger leaders felt that older leaders undervalued their contributions because they lacked the experience of going through the movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

> *"I'm not on the board of one organization anymore because a lot of older people came in and told us we're doing it wrong. Because I didn't live through the '60s and struggle the same way, our legitimacy as leaders is questioned, or not understood, or challenged because we haven't had the same life experiences."*

> *"The challenge for our generation of leaders is credibility—being celebrated when we know what we need to know, but being chastised when someone else leads… a Boomer who believes we don't know enough. Balancing on someone else's beam becomes frustrating.*

Generational Similarities/Differences	Implications
No matter one's age, a transformative experience more often than not provided motivation for pursuing social change work.	The combination of experiencing (for yourself or for others) inequality or injustice and learning about systemic causes often leads people to this transformation.
Older and younger leaders have entered this work in different ways.	The two generations in some ways view social change differently and generally bring a different set of skills to the work. Older leaders may undervalue the experience of younger people who did not live through the U.S. movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

Managing the Work/Personal Life Divide

One of the common themes in the popular literature on generational differences in corporate settings is the claim that Generations X and Y "work to live," whereas Baby Boomers "live to work." Our interviews reveal older and younger leaders alike are putting in long hours and appear equally committed to work. Distinctions did arise around the challenges of managing the work/personal life divide. Younger leaders reported significant concern about having enough time for family outside work. Perhaps not surprisingly, older leaders have worked through these and related issues. Whether this is a generational or more predictable life cycle difference remains unclear.

♦ Younger participants in the study were committed to their work and to their organizations, putting in long hours on the job. However, many of the younger respondents were struggling with how to balance the demands of their work and having a life outside the job. Several, particularly the young men, worried about how to continue their work and make time for a family.

> *I can't keep twelve-hour days forever….I think that this place is very understanding and incredibly flexible and incredibly respectful of people's lives outside of work. I don't know how good I am at that balance….I would love to have this job for the rest of my life. I don't know if that's going to be possible. (Younger staffer)*

♦ Most of the older people interviewed seemed to have resolved the tensions between their work and their personal lives. It remains unclear whether they had less conflict because they were different from their younger peers or simply because they are in a different stage of the life cycle.

The Next Generation Responds

Participants in the Generational Leadership Listening sessions echoed the younger leaders' concerns about balancing work and personal life in our initial research. As one of the participants remarked, "I'm thinking beyond the sweatshop NGO or nonprofit.…" Another worried about, "trying to be development director, communications director, executive director, and, you know, program director, in this so-called 30-hours-a-week job which is really 45…."At least one younger respondent noted that seeking a better balance can also invite criticism.

> *"Those who have been doing nonprofits challenge our commitment to the cause….If I take a week's vacation, and I say don't call or e-mail, our commitment to the cause is challenged…and that makes it very difficult for us to get away."*

> *I'm a married man with two children, and my wife actually works here. And she's the documentation coordinator, and she's always worked with me on this stuff since the beginning really, sometimes formally and sometimes informally. But now, she's actually here formally. So, that in some ways makes things a lot smoother. The job can be extremely time consuming, and it does take more time than I like at this point in my life.… There was a time when I was younger I was putting in 80 hours a week. Sometimes I still have to do that. It depends.*
> *(Older director)*

♦ Younger participants did not report talking with older directors or staff about the work/personal life challenges they faced, nor did older directors seem to be aware of this conflict.

Generational Similarities/Differences

Though equally committed, younger people want more space/time out of work for family and friends. Older leaders have often merged personal and professional realms and are now in a life stage in which these issues don't predominate.

Implications

Younger people may feel like they have to choose between passionately held personal and professional values. Concern over personal life issues such as spending time with family and children are more dominant with younger staff and leaders and may affect their ability to work in social change organizations over time.

Enjoying the Work, Enjoying Leadership

Whatever the challenges associated with their jobs, representatives from both generations were unanimous in their ability to derive significant pleasure and enjoyment from their work. Most differences arose when comparing leaders of either generation with staff. Leaders were stimulated by many of the self-expressive aspects of their work. Staff people often pointed to the community of people in their organizations. Again, while the popular literature has characterized younger workers as "working to live," our younger leaders and staff were not anxious for the next opportunity and were even more upbeat about their work than their older counterparts.

♦ When asked what they enjoyed in their work, all respondents talked about the satisfaction they found in helping others, whether providing a service, advocating for reform, or providing venues for constituents to organize for their own political interests. For staff and directors who came from the communities being served, there was a special enjoyment in being able to help others like themselves.

♦ Young staff members talked about how they enjoyed working in their particular organization because of its values and because of their co-workers. They especially talked about the collegiality or family-like feeling of the staff.

> *I don't know if you think it's corny, but I just really love the fact that I could come to work with such a great group of people. And besides the fact*

The Next Generation Responds

In our follow-up sessions, several of the participants thought the study under–reported the frequency with which younger staff members change positions. Many talked about their comfort with moving between organizations as long as they continued in organizations where they could work on issues that were important to them and the people they served.

> *that now I'm doing something that's helping somebody else, you know, is icing on the cake. (Younger staffer)*

♦ Directors—both older and younger—mentioned the position's challenge as a great source of enjoyment. They liked the creativity, problem solving, and daily juggling (of time and resources) the position required.

> *The reason I stayed here for nine years is because my job constantly evolves, and it's always something new. There has honestly not been a day I've not loved my job. (Younger founder/director)*

In general, younger respondents were more effusive about their work, often talking about their "love" of their jobs. A few even mentioned how they can imagine staying in their organizations for the rest of their careers.

Generational Similarities/Differences	Implications
Both generations exhibit a strong commitment to the field, their issues, and their organizations.	The assumption that younger leaders and staff are less committed to social change efforts is likely misleading and unhelpful to recruiting new leaders to the field. This perspective may be more affected by challenges in the external environment.
Both generations gain a lot of pleasure in making a difference in the lives of their constituents.	This is not just a job for either generation. There is a strong sense of a calling or vocation related to this work.
Directors from both generations enjoy the challenges of leadership, and many plan to stay long-term in their organization.	Leadership is not seen as a short-term commitment and can be a position that people in either generation can stay in for decades.

Challenges: What's Hard for Younger and Older Leaders

When asked about challenges, older directors often pointed to the constant demands of funding and administrative tasks. Younger directors were far more engaged with building their organizations, analyzing this dilemma at great length. Young staff members seemed most concerned about their ability to meet constituent needs. Evocative of their broader commitment, all participants expressed dissatisfaction with the pace of social change.

♦ The interviews revealed differences between the generations in the challenges individuals felt their work and organizations presented to them. Those differences tended to be closely tied to an individual's role. For older directors, the challenges lay in administrative tasks and funding demands. Younger directors were more focused on the challenges of growing and changing their organizations, while still meeting their constituents' needs.

   And I'm getting less patient with having to do so much administrative work. I don't want to write grants any more, and I don't want to follow the budget....I'm really tired of kissing the ass of rich people who don't know what they're talking about. Some of them do, but many of them don't, and you can't tell them. I'm really tired of the panhandling. That's challenging.
   (Older director)

   I think that as our staff gets bigger, having a collective governance structure is also more challenging. So I think that's a concern. That's why we wouldn't want to grow more…{but} then you get to the position where you could do something really exciting and positive and excellent, and then you end up wanting to do it; so you're going to end up wanting to grow, even if you say you're not going to want to grow. (Younger director)

♦ Young staffers were particularly challenged by trying to meet the demands of constituents, which often meant they spent long hours at the job. This challenge was exacerbated in situations where young staff members did not feel that their friends and family understood why they put so much time into their work.

Participants at all ages and levels within organizations frequently mentioned their impatience with the slow pace of change. In addition, younger participants were particularly struck by the inability of different groups to work together. They expressed frustration that the larger social change goal was subverted by individual 'ego' needs.

Organizational Decision Making

We were interested in how age affected decision making processes in social change organizations. Models of decision making for older directors were similar, usually based on "input" from staff members with the executive director making the "final decision." Several younger directors expressed dissatisfaction with these processes and were attempting to create different decision-making structures.

♦ The study revealed two major styles of decision making. The first, used both by older and younger directors, ranged from input to collective decision making. These were process-oriented and required—depending on the type of model—a great deal of time and energy of all staff. The second style, preferred more often by young directors, was a more distributed decision-making model that gave staff autonomy and freedom to accomplish certain tasks. This required less time and energy.

♦ All of the directors in the study clearly valued staff input. There was an unspoken assumption that involving staff members in decision making was an important value in social change work. Some staff expressed confusion about the process, especially in organizations with the "input" model favored by older directors, and suggested more transparency to clear up misconceptions.

   There's sort of this sense that everyone gets to have their two cents in, but I really think ultimately, there are a lot of decisions {where} there are a few people who make them, even though they will take everyone's opinions about them… like, I don't know, there's a certain style where it feels like it's collaborative, but ultimately it's not.
   (Younger staffer)

♦ Younger directors were more likely to talk about and try different approaches for making decisions. For example, one organization had both a leadership circle and weekly staff meetings. Another had several team meetings led by the director. A third discussed giving the two program heads free reign over their areas in consultation with the director. The younger directors wanted to give staff maximum involvement, whether through independence or through a collective process.

*{The organization} is a democratically structured organization, where the board of directors is composed entirely of people from the neighborhood who are members of the organization and who are elected by the full membership… the staff is structured as a collective so everyone on staff has an equal say…and we decide things kind of through some sort of modified super majority voting system that tries to capture some of the benefits of consensus decision making, but not capture some of the disadvantages of consensus decision making.
(Younger director)*

The Next Generation Responds

The Generational Leadership Listening sessions evoked a great deal of response to issues related to organizational structure. Our sense is these concerns are likely confined not just to the younger generation. Many participants talked about the challenges of leading or working in organizations that struggle to live by the principles they publicly espouse. Others pointed to the difficulty of finding an inclusive, but effective management style. For example:

"How do we bring participatory democracy, in some sense, to organizations in a useful way? How do we recognize people's opinions, but also have an effective organization?"

"As a leader of an organization, I don't want us to get stuck and mired in just focusing on making our organizations perfect. But I don't want to become dictatorial and evil either. I've found the balance between the internal and external really challenging."

"We have a senior staff, but nobody called it a senior staff. It was just sort of operating out there. So I'm like, let's name it and know what they do and who's on it, so people know whom to hold accountable. I'm wary of institutions where the structure isn't apparent."

"I've worked at a lot of different social justice organizations. At a national one based in Washington, I found myself saying over and over, 'Love my work. Hate my job.' And what I hated was just the incongruity between the principles my organizations professed and worked so hard to send out into the world and the way they treated their staff, the way that things were mismanaged, and the lack of any leadership model."

Generational Similarities/Differences

Younger leaders are trying hard to figure out how organizational decision making can be more participatory to reflect the values of their work. Older leaders may have tried different organizational forms, but have for the most part ended up with a more hierarchical model with power concentrated in the director.

Implications

The structure and decision-making models of organizations still leave room for improvement. Directors are looking for ways to be effective and to provide a place where staff ideas and skills are valued.

Leadership

A major focus of the study was on leadership, including how leadership qualities were viewed from one generation to the next. We found few differences—either by age or position—in the qualities that respondents thought made good leaders. Age differences among directors appeared more related to where they were in their life cycle, with older directors reflecting on their own leadership qualities and younger directors more focused on the leadership needed to build their organizations.

♦ Older directors discussed leadership in two ways. Founders were more likely to focus on the values and skills that would be needed for their successors. Older directors who were not founders tended to describe leadership as a way to reflect on the qualities they have been able to bring to their work.

> *Here…the program is constantly developing and growing and changing; it's very specific in nature. So the leadership has to come out of people who've come in here and developed their leadership here and then know this organization, know this set of philosophies and this set of methodologies, are committed to and have the talents and abilities to carry it on. (Older director)*

♦ Younger directors were more focused on building new leadership in their organizations. They assumed that this task is an important quality in a leader. They also talked about how good leaders need to listen to and get help from others.

> *Looking at the future, it's creating the space and building leadership that will take over. So it's allowing this office to be touchable; allowing the*

The Next Generation Responds

Many younger managers at the Generational Leadership Listening sessions expressed a reluctance to take on the executive director role. They see it as a thankless position that precludes a happy and well-balanced life.

"After ten years, you know, people {just start to} burn out. I really felt like I needed to take a break. And what I realized was that, with the sheer number of years, you sort become the middle management without you recognizing it or being prepared as to what that means…I wasn't ready to be an executive director…."

> *space for folks to say, I want to be the ED, now what does it take? (Younger director)*

♦ For younger staff members, vision and communication were key components to leadership. They were more likely to have high expectations of leadership and seemed surprisingly unconcerned about their own leadership qualities.

♦ Vision, communication skills, collaborative style, and concern about staff were noted across all age groups and positions as qualities of good leadership in social change organizations.

> *{Leaders need} open mindedness, passion, commitment, communications skills, depth of experience or thought, and character. And vision. It's hard to lead any of us without being able to see the world being a better place, whether the outcomes happen or not. (Young staffer)*

Generational Similarities/Differences

Both generations have a similar analysis of what constitutes good leadership including a vision, communications skills, and collaboration.

Younger people are looking for alternative models of leadership (e.g., teams or co-directorships), while older leaders run organizations based on more traditional hierarchical models with staff input.

Implications

Next generation leaders aspire to have the same qualities as those from the previous generation.

Younger leaders and staff want their organizations to reflect the democratic values they are fighting for externally, while still seeking to run effective organizations.

Training for Leaders

Though respondents were clear about leadership quali-ties, there was less clarity about how people could become leaders. We wanted to know how people could move into leadership roles, and we found that opin-ions varied from a belief in one's innate qualities to the need to learn on the job.

♦ The respondents in the original study seemed to believe that any formal training on how to run an organization was unnecessary and perhaps even harmful. For the most part, they were skeptical of graduate programs in administration or nonprofit management, and felt that whatever skills were needed could be learned from experience on the job.

> *I'm not sure exactly the wording I want here, but {formal training} can encourage you to think inside boxes, when a lot of the work of the program director or the founder or the visionary or whatever that set of roles is in a social change organization is to think outside the box and to see possibilities where they {aren't} obvious.*
> *(Older director)*

♦ Several of the directors we talked with noted that they had gone back to get an advanced degree for "the credential." People of color and young people were more likely to talk about this need.

> *Even if I would have gotten … my master's in administration, public administration, you know, I could say that and be like, 'oh, I got my degree ….You need to love what it is that you do and really want to get it done. And I don't think school's going to give that to you, regardless of whether you go to Harvard or you go to any other institution. I think it has to do with the person, but in the end, credentials matter. In the world, you're, you know, fighting for credibility.*
> *(Younger staffer)*

The Next Generation Responds

Younger leaders in the listening sessions echoed the value of some formal leadership development oppor-tunities and graduate education. However, what they really valued (and in some cases wanted more of) was coaching or strong mentoring, particularly from older leaders.

"I benefited a lot from two executive leadership programs I got put into….{In one} we got executive coaches, and it was wonderful, like having a therapist. The other pro-gram, for 25 nonprofit execs, it just gave us community with other leaders from a range of backgrounds…{Both of these programs} clarified for me what my strengths are, what I'm good at."

"I think we're in a position where now we're supposed to know how to do this, build a structure that's going to work and will benefit staff, when we didn't have any-body to teach us how to do that. {Older leaders} may have mentored us around a passion for the work we do, but didn't necessarily know how to help us put it together or make it work."

♦ The importance of life as well as work experience was noted by younger staff members from the con-stituencies the organizations served. Young staff members talked about the importance of theory about the root causes behind the problems their work was intended to address.

> *You lived through, you know, the court battles. You lived through the media. You lived through walking down a pitch-dark street. You've lived through that, and you take from every type of situation that you're in (things) that an institution can never teach you.*
> *(Younger staffer)*

Generational Similarities/Differences

While younger leaders often hold nonprofit manage-ment and other advanced degrees, both generations are ambivalent about the value of this kind of preparation.

Implications

There is a bias toward experience in the field and content knowledge, as opposed to technical skills. This is particularly true from the perspective of older leaders.

Race and Gender

Data from the study was analyzed not only by the respondents' age, but also by race and gender. We were surprised how little difference we found. Tensions—where noted—arose when respondents were asked directly if race or gender affected leadership of organizations.

♦ Race and gender, but especially race, are still subjects that are hard to address, even in social change organizations. Age does not seem to be a determining factor, though older, white, male directors seem to be more on the defensive than their younger counterparts.

♦ Many of the people of color we interviewed—both staff and directors—talked about the race dynamics among the different groups that make up the people of color category. For leaders of color, this often meant fighting stereotypes, especially that they were interested only in serving their own race or ethnicity. Older leaders of color were also more likely to talk about how the problems of race in the social change community have worsened over the last twenty years.

> I certainly was the first woman director of {my organization}, and I don't remember feeling anything particular from the board around that issue. I think I felt more there was a lot of flack when I was hired because I was a Hispanic woman, a Latin woman, and everybody assumed, the people who were opposed assumed, that I was going to turn it into a Puerto Rican agency or something. And I was conscious of that always. (Older director)

♦ Older and younger white directors and staff answered the questions about the impact of race and gender on leadership in terms of their own organizations' efforts to hire and maintain a racially diverse staff. Race was often talked about separately from its relationship to power.

The Next Generation Responds

Issues of race and gender came up passionately in a variety of guises during the Generational Leadership Listening sessions. It arose around broader discussions of power, personal validation, organizational structure, mentoring, and the growth of immigrant communities served by social change organizations. For example, we heard:

"Power brokers all tend to be the same race and gender."

"In terms of systemic advocacy, in my experience, persons of color tend to be organizers or program people providing direct services, but there aren't a lot of people of color at that high policy level—I'm figuring out how to be that person in that place and not lose myself."

"The challenge has been: How can we do the work and not replicate the same oppressions internally that we see outside, and how can we grow and sustain women of color to stay in the work? Women of color are doing the work, so why doesn't the leadership reflect that?"

"I've had difficulty identifying women, African-American or otherwise, who would take me under their wings, or saw leadership qualities in me. Most of my leadership ability was seen more as a threat."

"An organization I worked for, like traditional Civil Rights organizations, see the world very much in black and white. Younger staffers {didn't think} that way about it and were always butting our heads against the wall—like we have to be talking about immigration, we have to be talking about gay and lesbian families, and all these different things. And they said, no, we're from a Baptist tradition, and we don't deal with those issues.

Generational Similarities/Differences

Race and gender issues continue to be present in social change groups, however, younger leaders more often talk about the challenge of running multiracial organizations.

Implications

Older leaders often worked to diversify predominately white organizations or worked in identity-based groups. There are now more multiracial organizations, which pose different concerns and needs.

{It's} an organization that is structured much the same way other organizations are structured racially…meaning the top of the hierarchy was white, and the rest of the organization were minorities…people had that attitude that, OK, this is the typical thing. Everybody else is minority, and the hierarchy is white and when it comes down to it, they're going to do what they want to do.
(Younger staffer)

♦ In general, there was less overt tension around the subject of gender. Older women directors coming out of the feminist movement talked about the impact of gender on their leadership. Most male directors did not see gender as a significant issue, though the staff did not always agree.

Where to start, I mean definitely the gender stuff, absolutely. I mean there's definitely like a guy thing and girl thing…it seems to me from working here that the men are the ones who are always willing to just sort of leap ahead and expand and do all this stuff, and then worry about it later except that they don't worry about it later. Then there's like the clean-up stuff that goes on afterwards, or there's administrative stuff that goes on afterward that's primarily done by women.
(Younger staffer)

The Future

We wanted to know how those we interviewed saw their own futures, so we asked what they planned to do next. Differences in this area were far more likely to be based on position (director or staff) than on age.

♦ Most of the older directors said they had no intention of leaving their jobs. They often had built their life around their work, and the idea that they would do something else made little sense to them. Several were at a loss imagining what they would do if they were no longer running their current organizations.

To be honest, I have no idea. I'll probably keep going, doing this stuff until I drop dead. In fact, I'll probably drop dead right in this chair like, I always tell my staff, one day somebody's going to come in, in the morning, I'm going to be dead. So that's as much as I can tell you about that. I have no idea.
(Older director)

♦ Younger directors' ideas about the future were similar to their older peers. Although several were conflicted by a sense that they should move on for the sake of the organization, leaving their positions was something that they were clearly in no hurry to do. Like their older counterparts, younger directors talked about their organizations as the places they expressed their creativity and passion.

I have always told myself that I'm going to get {the organization} to a place, where it is just fairly powerful and has a fairly large market; it's very stable. I will have built a nice wall of cash around it, both in terms of incoming cash and then in additional reserves, and have found like the right next person, and then I would leave it…Now, that said, I laugh at myself because once I do build this, I think it's going to be like my dream job.
(Younger director)

♦ Although they were clearly dedicated to their jobs and to social change, staff members of all ages found it far easier than directors to envision future work outside of their current organizations. Their responses ranged from older staff members thinking of retirement to young people talking about returning to school.

♦ Staff members who were in their mid-thirties to mid-forties experienced the most conflict. They were in supervisory or administrative jobs, but clearly they were not going to have the opportunity to head their current organizations, so they struggled with what that meant for their futures.

I don't know if I want the baggage that comes along with being the ED of this organization, unless there was a serious turnover of staff in the hierarchy, where that would give you more of an ability to try to start fresh. But you have certain ideas and attitudes that are just embedded and ingrained in the institution that would be extremely difficult to change.
(Younger staffer)

The Next Generation Responds

Younger leaders in the Generational Leadership Listening sessions expressed a wide range of emotions about the future and particularly about their older colleagues. While restive and concerned about the older generation's reluctance to leave top positions, they were also empathetic to the challenges older leaders face in considering a transition.

"I was brought on specifically to replace someone who is planning to retire. And unfortunately, that person seems to still not want to retire. I love her to death, and we all need an extra grandmother, but my title has changed four times, not to step on her toes."

"If people don't retire, it's because they won't have anything to retire on; there's no retirement plans for people in the nonprofit industry. So where are they going to go? And it's not like you can make a lateral move to some other kind of employer. You can't just go to a think tank or be an emeritus professor someplace because there are no lateral options for older activists."

"Transition shouldn't mean that things are going badly, that doesn't have to be the model. It could be that things are going well, and that's just as good a reason."

"How do you broach some of these questions? I think beyond framing it as organizational transition, it should be framed as organizational health. If there's a desire for the longevity of these organizations, structural issues need to be addressed."

Generational Similarities/Differences

It's hard for directors to make a transition, no matter where they are in their careers.

Implications

Transitions can be challenging and require close attention. Leaders who helped to shape an organization find it difficult to imagine a next step (position, role, etc.) that is as compelling. They need support. This reinforces other findings that suggest that leadership is viewed as a decades-long proposition.[20]

Among the respondents of the Building Movement study, it was evident that while there are many similarities between younger staffers and directors and older leadership, a significant generation gap exists. Older directors almost never spoke of younger staffers or peers either as people to mentor or nurture, as colleagues, or as future leaders in their organizations. Only a few of the younger directors and staff talked about learning from or talking to older peers; instead they learned from the work. If there is a real interest in sustaining and building existing social change organizations, we need a proactive approach to promoting younger leaders in light of these findings. To that end, we offer the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1
Invest in Younger Leaders

Social change organizations today work in an increasingly difficult environment. This environment is characterized by shrinking federal and local corporate investment, the rise of security as opposed to social welfare concerns, and the increased influence of paid, corporate lobbying interests. These are quite different from the environment (and associated challenges) that produced the current generation of older leaders in the 1960s and early 1970s.

Social change leadership must make sense of unique circumstances, opportunities, and problems. Older leaders need to play an active role in encouraging next-generation leaders and valuing their new ideas. They can do this by setting aside biases borne of their early movement experience, and nurturing young leaders with contemporary and critically needed perspectives, both within and outside of their organizations. Younger executive directors should do the same with the generation behind them. Funders can support this effort by encouraging organizations to invest in young leaders and staff development.

Nonprofit degree programs should continually evaluate their curricula to ensure they meet the needs of those interested in working for social change organizations. This means that in addition to management and fiscal skills, faculty should approach issues in a historical context. They must teach how to understand the changing political and economic environment, discuss new forms of organizational decision making and structure (especially those that include constituency involvement), and teach students how to approach issues through a framework of critical analysis.

Recommendation #2
Identify and Nurture More Leaders of Color

Older social change leaders are more likely to be white and male than the leadership group in the next generation. Overall, leadership of nonprofit groups does not reflect the diversity of the communities they serve, which today may include large new immigrant populations.[21] There is a need to develop strategies to support a more multi-racial group of leaders that better reflect the communities nonprofits serve and that bring the full range of knowledge and ideas necessary to invent and implement effective responses to community and other problems.

All leaders need to look more closely at how they address issues of race, gender, and power within their own organizations and in the development of new leadership. Diversifying leadership is important. Organizations also need to explore more complex issues related to race and gender that go beyond ensuring that women or people of color are fully represented among leadership and staff. They should examine how to ensure that the ideas driving strategy and direction reflect the viewpoints of people of all races and backgrounds throughout an organization (and not just the perspectives of a dominant majority at the top). Directors of social change organizations should also consider how addressing race and gender issues can help them to identify new and potential organizational leaders.

Recommendation #3
Make It Viable for Directors to Imagine and Pursue a Transition

Currently, it is extremely difficult for many older directors to leave their positions. On a personal level, inadequate retirement and savings plans severely constrain older leaders' choices. Many leaders have devoted a professional lifetime to the work, often taking below-market salaries and eschewing retirement benefits for the sake of their organizations. Social change organizations, with support from private funders and others, must develop financial support mechanisms for outgoing leaders that recognize and honor their contributions. Social change organizations should also ensure reasonable salaries, benefit packages, and/or

savings plans to solidify the long-term income security of the current and next generation of leaders.

Perhaps, just as importantly, there are few opportunities for older leaders to do the hard thinking about their next positions or retirement. Transitions are complex, both for older leaders (and even younger leaders) and their organizations, and careful planning is required. There are challenges related to handing off key stakeholder relationships and ensuring that the critical skills and competencies a director holds are sustained by others in the organization. Leaders may also be painfully aware of their organizations' fundraising or structural vulnerabilities. Organizations must address these issues before an executive becomes confident about the organization's future without him or her.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation's one-day, "Next Steps" workshops have been extremely helpful to older directors as they think about how to address these issues and consider how they can continue to make a contribution following a transition. Organizations must replicate these kinds of offerings and develop new local and ongoing forums to support executives on the cusp of a leadership change.

Recommendation #4
Broaden Sites of Intergenerational Discussion

Intergenerational dialogue is critical in addressing many of this report's issues. These conversations should include organizational leaders and staff, as well as boards of directors and other constituents. Structured conversations can discuss past and current assumptions about issues and their causes, how these have been addressed, and what is needed to move solutions forward in the coming decades.

Recommendation #5
Examine Current Organizational Structures and Expectations

Many social change organizations struggle to find appropriate leadership and decision-making structures that model deeply held values of empowerment and participatory democracy. These kinds of clearly defined structures can help retain younger staff and provide a fertile ground for training new leadership. Directors need to develop a greater awareness of these structures (for example, co-directorships or decentralized decision making), and document and disseminate

successful case studies. Researchers and practitioners should also create and test new decision-making models, and in turn, develop ways to train directors and staff on these models.

Recommendation #6
Promote a Healthier Balance Between Work and Personal/Family Life

Finally, we must take a critical look at some aspects of the culture of social change work and particularly the notion that one can never do or give enough. This belief has been passed on from one generation to the next. Although it does not cause a problem for everyone, it is painful to see how much some young people—so dedicated to social justice—are left without guidance or tools for how to balance a strong commitment to work with a desire to raise families and participate fully in their communities.

To address this issue, discussions (in organizations and more broadly) are needed to understand how to create manageable jobs that allow time for family life, relaxation, and renewal. It is important to acknowledge that staff members derive meaning from their work and at the same time, need to limit the reach work has into every aspect of their lives. Older directors can spend time with young staff and younger directors to help them develop ways to stay in the work while maintaining activities outside the office. Finally, funders can help by trying to ensure that organizations set realistic goals rather than encouraging them to try to do more for less.

The Generational Project: Looking Ahead

The results of this exploratory study and our listening sessions have convinced us that we need to turn our attention and support to the next generation of leaders. This does not need to be done in isolation. Baby Boom leaders have a wealth of knowledge and wisdom to pass on. They are also in positions wherein they can begin to promote young staff into leadership roles, diversify their boards of directors by age, and talk with funders about the importance of developing new generations of leadership.

We believe an informed dialogue between the generations will help facilitate this transition. The strong commitment to social change from both younger and older leaders evident in these interviews will ensure that this work continues to succeed and grow.

Generational Differences in Leadership Study and the Generational Leadership Listening Sessions: Who Was Interviewed

The Generational Differences in Leadership Study interviewed directors and staff members from 16 agencies that ranged in size from small (staff size 4 or less; smallest annual budget $76,848) to medium-sized (the largest had a staff of 49 people with a budget of $3.3 million). Slightly more than half of the single-director agencies were headed by older leaders (ages 45-69). Of the two agencies with co-leaders/collective members, one was led by younger people and the other by a mixed-age team.

Of the total of 19 leaders interviewed, roughly one-quarter fell into each of the four race/gender categories (women of color, men of color, white women, white men). The 10 older leaders were evenly divided by race (half whites, half people of color) and gender. Slightly more of the older leaders of color were female and slightly more of the older whites were male. Among younger leaders, five of the nine were people of color, and five were men. Here, the whites included two men and two women, the people of color three men and two women. Finally, it should be noted that three of the four co-leaders/collective members were women, and three of the four were people of color, so among single leaders the proportions of men and whites were higher than among all leaders.

Of the 19 staff members we interviewed, eleven were ages 21-34, five were slightly older members of the younger generation (36-42), and three were old enough to be considered part of the Baby Boom generation (50-62). All of the staff respondents aged 35 and over had significant responsibility within the organization. Among the youngest respondents, there was more variation, but most did have some autonomy and/or responsibility in their work. In terms of the demographic characteristics of the staff respondents, almost two-thirds were people of color, and the same proportion were women. These proportions did not vary significantly across the age groups within the staff respondents, except for the lower proportion of people of color among the oldest staff members (two of the three were white).

The Generational Leadership Listening Sessions (GLLS) were conceived by Ludovic Blain to probe the study's findings and explore how they resonated with young practitioners in the field. Blain hoped to put the issue of generation change on the nonprofit sector's radar screen, record some of the successes and failures people have had in dealing with the issues, and provide some lessons and directions for future action. The 122 participants, mostly leaders of color between the ages of 25 and 40, were gleaned from a mix of sources that included the Building Movement staff and project team, sponsoring foundations, and referrals from colleagues around the country. They came from nonprofit organizations large and small, spanning service providers and community organizing, as well as consultants, cultural groups, and academic institutions. What united most participants was that social change appeared either in their organizational mission statements or their personal career paths.

The Listening Sessions took place in nine cities—Albuquerque, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Durham, Honolulu, New York, San Francisco, and Washington, DC. The first event was held in December 2003, the last in early September 2004. The smallest group had 5 participants, the largest 21. Sessions were generally four to five hours long and, with some variations, included: a summary of the Generational Changes and Leadership Study findings; a round of introductions that surfaced organizational challenges; a whole group discussion focusing on organizational structure and the future of leaders/leadership; a break-out session that probed structural approaches to these issues, plus report-back; a quick brainstorm on building national and local connections; and an evaluation.[22]

[1] Teegarden, Paige (2005). "Nonprofit Executive Leadership and Transitions Survey 2004: The Annie E. Casey Foundation Grantees." Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Birdsell, David and Douglas Muzzio (2003). *The Next Leaders: UWNYC Grantee Leadership Development and Succession Management Needs.* New York City: United Way, p. 5.

 (2003). "Community Foundation CEO Survey: Transitions and Career Paths." Baltimore, MD: Community Foundation CEO Network, Council on Foundations and the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Adams, Tom, Brown, Catrese, and Thomas-Scott, Melody (2003). *The Executive Transition Initiative: Strengthening Maryland's Nonprofits During Leadership Change.* Baltimore, MD: Maryland Association of Nonprofit Organizations, p. 1.

[2] Teegarden, p.1.

[3] For those interested in a full-length description of our report, please go to www.buildingmovement.org or contact AECF.

[4] The Generational Leadership Listening Sessions were conceived by Ludovic Blain, who was the key contact and facilitated all the meetings. The sessions were held in Albuquerque, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Honolulu, New York, Raleigh, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.

[5] Contact the Building Movement Project for a complete list of references.

[6] Filipczak, B., Raines, C. and Zemke, R. (2000) *Generations At Work.* New York: AMACOM, p. 96.

[7] Halstead, T. (1999, August). A Politics for Generation X. *The Atlantic Monthly.*; Hornblower, M. Great Xpectations. *Time,* Chicago June 9, 1997.

[8] Filipczak, Raines, and Zemke, p. 116; Tulgan, Bruce. (1996) *Managing Generation X.* New York: Norton and Company, p. 53.

[9] Filipczak, Raines, and Zemke, p. 21; Tulgan, p. 11.

[10] Lancaster, Lynne and Stillman, David (2002). *When Generations Collide.* New York: Harper Business, p. 114; Tulgan, pp. 70-71.

[11] Hornblower; Tulgan, p. 11.

[12] Filipczak, Raines, and Zemke, p. 104; Lancaster and Stillman, pp. 84-85.

[13] Filipczak, Raines, and Zemke, pp. 99-100.

[14] Levy, A. (1994). Looking for generation x. *Division and Diversity* 3(3): 24-26. Kaminow, B. (1999). *X, Lies, and Social Signs: Defining Generation X*, in *In Problems and Issues of Diversity in the United States.* Naylor, L.L. (ed.). Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, p. 152.

[15] Birdsell and Muzzio (2003). *The Next Leaders.* United Way of New York City; Hinden, Denise and Paige Hull (2002). Executive Leadership Transition: What We Know. *The Nonprofit Quarterly* 2:4; Joslyn, H. (2002). Employers,

Grant Makers, and Policy Makers Need to Face Shrinking Nonprofit Labor Pool. *Chronicle of Philanthropy.*

[16] Birdsell and Muzzio; Cryer, Shelley (2004). *The Next Generation of Nonprofit Sector Leadership.* The Initiative for Nonprofit Sector Careers, New York.; Fernandopulle, Anushka, Jan Masaoka and Pardis Parsa (2002). *On the Rise: A Profile of Women of Color in Leadership,* CompassPoint, San Francisco; Peters, Jeanne and Timothy Wolfred (2001). *Daring to Lead: Nonprofit Executive Directors and their Work Experience.* San Francisco: CompassPoint.

[17] Kunreuther, Frances (2000). *Report of Proceedings from Reconstructing Society Through Social Change; A Meeting of the Nonprofit Practitioners Project. September 16-19, 1999.* Cambridge: Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations, Harvard University, p. 7. Issues on work and family life of Generation X and Y can be found in a study by Catalyst (2001). *The Next Generation: Today's Professionals, Tomorrow's Leaders.* New York, NY; and the Radcliffe Public Policy Center's (2000) *Life Work: Generational Attitudes toward Work and Life Integration,* Cambridge, MA.

[18] Kunreuther, Frances (January 2002). *Building Movement vs. Building Organization: Summary of Regional Discussion.* Draft report to the Ford Foundation. Cambridge: Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations, Harvard University, pp. 9-10.

[19] Directors were usually the executive director of the organization. In some cases they were one of the co-directors, and in collectives, it was either a founder or someone in the collective chosen to represent the group. Older participants were 45 years or older and younger participants were under 40.

[20] As noted in the introduction, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has supported the refinement of a model of Executive Transition Management that enables nonprofit organizations to address the challenges of and maximize the opportunities associated with a leadership transition. ETM focuses on the organizational dimensions of this transition, but our experience delivering ETM services suggests that powerful personal issues, particularly for founder or long-term executives, are critical parts of the equation, as well. To that end, Casey has sponsored an ongoing series of one-day "Next Steps" workshops for nonprofit leaders. These provide a safe space for executive directors to learn about transitions.

[21] Correspondence Paige Teegarden.

[22] In the two smallest sessions – Raleigh and Albuquerque – there were no break-out groups.

Executive Transitions

Credits
John Beilenson of Strategic Communications & Planning provided editorial support.

Jonathan Wajskol of Wajskol Design provided graphic design services.

Contact Information
For additional copies of this publication, please visit the Annie E. Casey Foundation website at www.aecf.org/initiatives/leadership.