# I / We / It :
## Leadership for Social Change

*By Heather McLeod Grant, Chris Block and Lance Fors*

We are living in a time of great challenges and opportunities.

On the one hand, the global problems we now face—from rampant terrorism and escalating religious conflicts, to planet-threatening climate change—are more daunting than ever. Add to this list the many complex systemic problems that we have not been able to solve—persistent poverty, homelessness and income inequality, among many others—and the world's challenges seem intractable.

On the other hand, we are standing in a moment full of possibility and ripe for breakthrough. The internet and mobile technologies are fostering connectivity unlike anything we've known before, enabling new solutions to emerge and spread from anywhere, and for individuals and organizations to work together in unprecedented ways. As a result, there is a rising and persistent sense that even if we don't yet know how to tackle our most complex problems, the right tools may well be at hand.

So what is stopping us from connecting one reality with the other? What stands in the way of harnessing this collective sense of possibility to address—and even solve—our planet's most "wicked" problems?

> Our traditional definitions and expectations of leadership do not map (and cannot scale) to what our modern times demand.

We believe the single most important barrier to making significant societal progress is a lack of adequate leadership. Specifically, our traditional definitions and expectations of leadership do not map (and cannot scale) to what our modern times demand. In the world of social change, many continue to search for a silver bullet: an innovative program model, an individual social entrepreneur, an organization that can scale up. Yet even the most successfully scaled organizations of our time are mere drops in the ocean.[1] Most problems are expanding faster than our organizations, and therein lies the dilemma. How do we create large-scale systems change—bigger, better, and faster?

For leaders focused on creating solutions that benefit everyone, we have to start thinking very differently about leadership and about scale. We need to start thinking about how to transform systems

---

[1] "Since 1970, more than 200,000 nonprofits have opened in the U.S., but only 144 of them have reached $50 million in annual revenue." From "How Nonprofits Get Really Big," by William Foster and Gail Fine, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring 2007.

that are already at scale (e.g., education reform), as well as how to align many fragmented efforts to achieve real transformation, an approach that FSG calls "collective impact."[2]

To create this kind of change, we need *collective problem-solving* mindsets and skills that focus beyond individual gain or institution-building. We need approaches that mobilize large numbers of people, using new tools. We need to embrace 21st century strategies to build the world that we want: one that is more peaceful, just, and sustainable.

Fostering this kind of leadership has increasingly become the focus of our respective work. While all three of us come at the challenge from different backgrounds (see bios), we have nonetheless noticed the same pattern emerging. We call it "I/We/It," a term that draws upon the work of Ken Wilber and "Integral Theory," which is portrayed as a "theory of everything" and seeks "to draw together an already existing number of paradigms into an interrelated network of approaches that are mutually enriching."[3] In our interpretation of this framework:

> At its simplest level, this is a framework for what we need to learn and embrace about leadership for large-scale change and transformation.

- The "I" is about individual leaders: their interior condition, the values they embody, the mindsets they hold, and the skills they possess.

- The "We" is about the collective—the relationships, organizations, and networks that leaders catalyze, build, and lead.

- The "It" is about the larger systems they hope to impact, whether they are issue-based, such as education, or place-based, such as the communities in which we live.

This model also makes it easy to see the ways in which individual leaders, collective groups, and larger systems interrelate, and how each impacts the effectiveness of the others.

At its simplest level, this is a framework for what we need to learn and embrace about leadership for large-scale change and transformation.[4]

---

[2] FSG defines collective impact as what "occurs when organizations from different sectors agree to solve a specific social problem using a common agenda, aligning their efforts and using common measures of success." For more on FSG and collective impact, see: http://www.fsg.org/approach-areas/collective-impact

[3] See Ken Wilber and Integral Theory in Wikipedia and https://integrallife.com/integral-post/overview-integral-theory. His work was brought to our attention by our colleague, Mark Nicolson, and the Academy for the Love of Learning.

[4] Our use of this framework has some interesting parallels to Marshall Ganz's "the story of me, the story of us, the story of now" framework, and other frameworks talking about "from me to we."

# I / We / It: A Framework for Social Change

The good news is that new ways of thinking about leadership—and new tools and approaches for creating large-scale social change—are now emerging. Here, we explore these new mindsets, tools, and skills through the framework of I/We/It.

## "I": Self as Instrument

As Bill O'Brien puts it, "The success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervenor."[5] Leadership is about *who we want to BE* in the world, not just what we do—a belief that echoes Gandhi's imperative to "be the change." This means truly embodying and activating the values and mindsets we say that we hold. But how we think about the "I" must be embedded in a collective, not individual, context; it must be connected to both the "We" and the "It" to result in true transformation. Just working on leadership for our own personal or organizational gain won't result in larger social change.[6]

And yet most leadership programs today focus more on the individual than the "We" or the "It." Our society has historically celebrated the heroic leader who can rally the troops and lead us to victory, whether in the boardroom or on the battlefield. Consequently, most leadership development programs seek to build the individual's skills: via 360° feedback, or personality typing or teaching organizational management.

> Instead of cultivating more heroic individuals capable of leading organizations of the past, we need to develop leaders who are embedded in a group and who are leaders for the future.

This approach is too narrow. It doesn't reflect the reality of today's complex world, or the type of collective leadership (or "system leadership"[7]) that is needed to truly solve large-scale problems. Instead of cultivating more heroic individuals capable of leading organizations of the past, we need to develop leaders who are embedded in a group and who are leaders for the future. These leaders need to be *in relationship* with the "We" and the "It"—and have the skills needed to build not just organizations but networks and movements.

What are some of the attributes that these "new" leaders embody? In our work, we have seen distinct patterns among leaders who operate within the I/We/It framework. First, they are obsessed with social

---

[5] Bill O'Brien, CEO of Hanover Insurance Company, as paraphrased by C. Otto Scharmer in a blog post: http://www.dailygood.org/story/450/uncovering-the-blind-spot-of-leadership-c-otto-scharmer/

[6] One weakness of the human potential, or New Age, movement was that it too often focused on individual perfection and spiritual enlightenment to the exclusion of any external social impact.

[7] Peter Senge, Hal Hamilton, and John Kania, "The Dawn of System Leadership," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2015. http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/the_dawn_of_system_leadership

impact, or achieving change that benefits the many over the few. They seek to transform social, political, or economic institutions for the greater good—not for a small subset of elites or individuals.

These leaders are also bold and courageous. It is a risk to disrupt current systems, and without courage, they wouldn't get far. At the same time, these leaders also embody humility: they are self-aware without being self-centered. They see the role they need to play in creating change, but they can lead from behind, or beside, and don't always have to be out in front. They are not in it for their own ego needs. Rather, they seek to distribute power. They realize they can never achieve "It" (systems change) without a strong "We."

By virtue of the complex work they do, these leaders also must have a high "EQ"—a relational ability, an understanding of interpersonal and group dynamics, and the ability to create trust.[8] And they must have high awareness of their own interior condition—their own essential nature—and how it impacts their work and the people doing that work alongside them. They create networks of people and organizations to achieve collective ends, which requires being transparent, open, and facilitative rather than directive. Again, they are "I" in relation to the "We."

The leaders of the future are boundary-crossers: people who have been influenced by multiple perspectives resulting from political, racial, and other differences. As a result, they are able to create the conditions in which groups can capitalize on the benefits, and work through the challenges of, such diversity. These leaders can translate and bridge the languages and frames of different sectors, such as business, government, and nonprofits.[9] Because they span boundaries, they are also able to manage dynamic tensions: they know when to use a directive style and when to use a facilitative style; when to have their organizational hat on versus their network hat; and how to balance the needs of individuals ("I") with the needs of the collective ("We").

A great example of a leader who embodies many of these attributes is Ellen Moir, the founder and CEO of New Teacher Center.[10] Moir is deeply committed to achieving greater social impact in the education field. She is bold and courageous, but also humble and authentic. She's able to paint a shared vision of the future—a society in which teachers are developed in order to give *all children* a great education—and then mobilize others around that vision. She recognizes that leadership is a team sport and has built a great management team and board, so she is not trying to do it all herself. And she is a boundary-crosser, having worked in education and academia before building a global nonprofit.

## "We": Creating Collectives

If the "I" is about the individual leader's service to a larger cause, the "We" is about the collective: the groups and networks needed to catalyze large-scale social change. Much of the literature in the field

---

[8] Daniel Goleman coined this phrase in his book *Emotional Intelligence.*

[9] See "Triple Strength Leadership" by Nick Lovegrove and Mathew Thomas, *Harvard Business Review*, Sept. 2013. The new Presidio Institute is also dedicated to helping train cross-sector leaders.

[10] Lance has been Ellen Moir's principal advisor since 2005 and board chair since 2008. Heather helped develop NTC's strategic growth plan, and Chris has gotten to know her via ALF's education network.

over the past few years has focused on collaboration and the role of networks in creating collective impact rather than just building and scaling organizations.[11] This is an important and much-needed shift—one that calls out for a corresponding shift in how we think about leadership.

Just as our traditional definition of "I" has focused on the heroic individual, our traditional definition of "We" has focused too often on the organization as the unit of analysis. Historically, organizations were the most efficient way to align individuals around a shared purpose. In the for-profit sector, that purpose was to create or sell products or services that maximize financial value for shareholders. In the nonprofit sector, the purpose was more focused on achieving a larger mission, satisfying basic needs, or even eliminating a need altogether.

But in the last decade, there has been more interest in networks as a form for organizing human activity. (By definition, a social network is a group of people or organizations connected through relationships and interactions, often with a shared purpose.) The rise of social network analysis has helped us to better understand the role that informal and formal social networks play in our lives. Additionally, the internet has enabled all of us to connect much more easily, and to visualize and cultivate our own social networks in ways that were never before possible.

In some ways, networks combine the best elements of markets and organizations. As the authors of *Net Gains* put it: "A network, like a market, is characterized by decentralized, nonhierarchical decision-making and, like an organization, by intentional, activity-based linkages between individuals."[12] Networks are more horizontal than vertical and often more porous and dynamic than organizations, enabling faster scale, better diffusion of information, greater resilience, and more innovation. (On the flip side, they can sometimes lack coordination or quality control.)

In the social sector, there is growing interest in creating social change networks, recognizing that isolated organizations alone can't solve complex systemic problems at scale. Social movements like the Civil Rights Movement have long depended on the efforts of many actors loosely coordinated, and network theory gives us new ways to conceptualize our relationships and structure our collective work. Ultimately *both* organizations and networks are needed, and more social activists are pursuing hybrid forms. Just as the boundaries between for-profits and nonprofits are breaking down—think of social enterprise, B-corps, impact investing, and corporate social responsibility—so too are the boundaries between organizations and networks.

> In the last decade, there has been more interest in networks as a form for organizing human activity.

---

[11] For more on FSG and collective impact, see: http://www.fsg.org/approach-areas/collective-impact

[12] Peter Plastrik and Madeleine Taylor, *Net Gains: A Handbook for Network Builders Seeking Social Change*, Version 1.0, 2006. http://networkimpact.org/downloads/NetGainsHandbookVersion1.pdf

Take, for example, the RE-AMP network, which Heather has studied and written about in detail.[13] It's a classic example of a group of individuals and organizations (in this case, nonprofits and foundations in the Midwest) coming together to create a shared understanding of a problem (climate change), innovate shared solutions, and align their actions. Through this approach, they have achieved far greater impact—in a shorter period of time, and with far fewer resources—than they could by working independently. Other groups—such as Strive Together, for which Lance is an advisor—take a similar approach, pointing to a need for backbone organizations to support the work of decentralized networks of many actors working toward a common goal and using shared strategies to get there.

To take a slightly different example, the New Teacher Center (NTC), mentioned earlier, is an organization that has become much more "networked" in its quest for greater scale. What started as a simple program to train new teachers and help them become better, faster, has grown into a global organization that currently provides high-touch mentoring and professional development to more than 40,000 new teachers, or around 10 percent of all first- and second-year new teachers in the United States. NTC has figured out how to create networks of teachers who learn together, mentor and coach one another, and share their struggles through organized communities of practice. They have also begun using online tools and networks to deploy their training and approach, reaching many more people than they could via their in-person model. NTC represents the new "networked nonprofit,"[14] or a hybrid between a pure network and a pure organization.

> Ultimately, leaders working in today's context need the ability to build and run organizations AND to catalyze and facilitate networks that are self-organizing.

Ultimately, leaders working in today's context need the ability to build and run organizations AND to catalyze and facilitate networks that are self-organizing. When you think of the greatest social change leaders of the last century, many of whom were ahead of their time—Martin Luther King, Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, Gloria Steinem, Cesar Chavez—they are all characterized by their ability to lead social change on a massive scale by engaging others in their causes and movements. One could argue that networks and movements are the only way to achieve large-scale systems change, especially in the complexity of today's world.

In *The Power of Habit*, Charles Duhigg examines Rosa Parks' individual act of defiance and how it became a tipping point in the Civil Rights Movement. Duhigg explains why Parks' action was pivotal, while others' similar deeds did not have the same galvanizing effect. His explanation is an intriguing example of the I/We/It framework. "Movements don't emerge because everyone suddenly decides to face the same direction at once," Duhigg explains. "They rely on social patterns that begin as the habit

---

[13] Heather McLeod Grant, "Transformer: How to Build a Network to Change a System: A Case Study of the RE-AMP Energy Network," Fall 2010. http://www.reamp.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Monitor-Institute-RE-AMP-Case-Study.pdf

[14] Our colleague Beth Kanter coined this term in her book *The Networked Nonprofit*.

of friendship, grow through the habits of communities, and are sustained by new habits that change participants' sense of self." [15]

Duhigg's analysis of the chain reaction of the bus boycott shows that the effect of Parks' individual act of leadership ("I") was multiplied because it caused immediate response among the many people in her network with whom she had strong ties of friendship ("We"). Subsequently, those friends used their influence within their own networks, causing a significantly more widespread response to her action. These supporters had what are called "weak ties" to Parks: they did not know her personally but were incited to action by those who did. This cascading reaction took place within the larger ecosystem of the Civil Rights Movement and ultimately resulted in significant social transformation ("It").

## "It": Changing Systems

The last part of the framework focuses on the "It"—or the object rather than the subject of change. The "It" can be any complex social, political, economic, or other system with many dynamic moving parts.

As noted above, the Civil Rights Movement is the classic example of a network and movement that resulted in larger systemic change. The combination of charismatic individual leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr., and collective networks such as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Freedom Summer, and black churches combined to begin to change a seemingly intractable system. The "system" under attack was structural racism: discriminatory U.S. laws, social and cultural mindsets, and unfair economic practices. While the movement achieved many significant victories, arguably it has taken the last 40 years to achieve even deeper impact—and there is still much more to be achieved.

A more recent example of system-level change is marriage equality and the dramatic changes it has created in mindsets and state laws over the past decade. The movement to win equal marriage rights did not have a single individual leader but rather a number of leaders ("I") working via a network of organizations ("We") to change the hearts and minds of the average American, and ultimately the law ("It"). By taking a state-by-state, bottom-up approach, rather than a top-down federal approach, and employing social networks including the media to influence people's opinions, the Gay Rights Movement has achieved impact even more quickly than the Civil Rights Movement did in its day.

Recent successes in reducing obesity rates in young children aged two to five may also point to how networked efforts can change complex systems. As Bill Frist, MD, a former U.S. senator and trustee of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF), writes about the effort: "How did we begin to alter a movement that once seemed impossible to stop? I like to think of it as a good old-fashioned American mix of families, educators, policymakers, and businesses pulling together to bring about change. Parents are getting out and doing things with their kids…. Schools are offering healthy lunch choices…. Cities and states are requiring fast-food outlets to post nutrition information. Large retail chains are building fresh-food grocery stores that represent oases of healthy nutrition in 'food deserts.' Hospitals and clinics are emphasizing preventive care programs. Foundations such as RWJF, with its

---

[15] Charles Duhigg, *The Power of Habit* (New York: Random House Publishing Group: 2012).

efforts to build a Culture of Health, are promoting innovative pilot programs and partnerships. All these efforts, taken together, are truly making a difference."

Numerous systems thinkers and theorists have explored the ways in which complex systems operate and how we might drive larger systems change by building networks and movements. Donella Meadows focused on finding "leverage points"—places to intervene in a system that will maximize the outputs for limited inputs (i.e., generate a greater social return on investment).[16] Peter Senge has spent his career creating learning organizations that adapt to changing circumstances. More recently he has turned his attention to system leadership focused on social impact.[17] In a recent article in *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Senge and his colleagues write about the "Dawn of System Leadership" and the need for more leaders like Nelson Mandela who can mobilize populations and change large-scale structures, such as South African Apartheid. They talk about the need for these leaders to use new tools in their work—tools that help them see the larger system, "integrate the different mental models of multiple stakeholders," reflect and foster "generative conversations," and co-create the future.

Others are starting to write and talk about system leadership, though some use different language for it. The Leadership Learning Community has been writing about what they call "leadership for a new era" and exploring the connections between leadership and networks, and networks and systems change.[18] Ron Heifitz and Cambridge Leadership Associates have been writing about "adaptive leadership" for years and have built models to help leaders develop these skills. Other ideas are coming from the "design thinking" and innovation movements—from leaders at the d.school at Stanford and Ideo.org. These practitioners focus on innovative leaders (or "innovators before innovation") who can bring different groups together, get them to reflect on their problems, and innovate new solutions to prototype and then scale up.

## Developing System Leaders

In thinking about the new toolkit for social impact that is required today, we too have been trying to articulate the new competencies that leaders must embrace, as well as identify various exercises for helping them develop new mindsets and skills. What our framework and these other frameworks have in common is a shared set of fundamental assumptions:

- Individual heroic leadership is not sufficient. We must start thinking of leadership more collectively and cultivate leaders for the whole system.

- Programs and organizations alone can't create systemic change, so we need to *also* build networks and movements. We need to engage the people in these systems to be part of the change.

---

[16] See *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*, by Donella Meadows.

[17] Peter Senge, Hal Hamilton, and John Kania, "The Dawn of System Leadership," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2015. http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/the_dawn_of_system_leadership

[18] See Leadership Learning Community's website for their multiple publications.

- We need new collective tools and processes to bring people with diverse backgrounds together to create shared understanding of a problem, ideate new solutions, and then try them out. This also means allowing some experiments to fail.

- We need to design these networks or groups to be resilient, adaptive, and able to scale or diffuse what works while also transforming the larger system around them.

In the summer of 2014, we convened a small group of practitioners running "transformative leadership" programs, including the Living Cities' Integration Initiative, the Omidyar Fellows in Hawaii, Rockwood Leadership, BALLE's leadership program, and the programs with which we personally have been deeply involved—the Irvine New Leadership Network, American Leadership Forum Silicon Valley, Social Venture Partners International, and Strive Together. We spent three days sharing our models, our frameworks, and our "toolkits," and learning from one another about what's working in this emerging field.

> We have learned a few things about what the critical success factors are for helping others develop the skills they need to lead in the future.

While three days wasn't nearly enough time to deeply understand all the nuances of one another's work, it did feel like we were landing on something important. We're all experimenting with ways of teaching an integrated toolkit that maps to the I/We/It framework. We're all trying to figure out how to teach leaders the skills, tools, and mindsets of the future. And we're all committed to sharing what we're learning along the way.

As Senge et al recently wrote in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*: "The variety of helpful tools and approaches available today is large and growing, and system leaders should be knowledgeable about what is available."[19] Through our work, we have started to experiment with our own list of the mindsets and skills that new leaders need, including exercises, frameworks, and critical knowledge— and we've found that the I/We/It framework is a useful way of organizing these diverse competencies.

## Early Lessons

Our thinking and our tools have been particularly informed by the programs we've led over the past few years. Chris was, until recently, the CEO of the American Leadership Forum-Silicon Valley (ALF-SV), one of the oldest cross-sector leadership programs in the country, founded more than 30 years ago. Heather has led the Irvine Foundation's New Leadership Network in Fresno, CA, a cross-sector leadership program launched in 2013, grounded in new ideas related to system leadership. Lance has engaged with each of these networks as a participant, teacher and advisor, in addition to advising other leadership programs like the New Teacher Center, and FSG's Collective Impact Forum.

ALF-SV has long believed that the opportunity for established leaders to form deep relationships across sectors is *essential* to community change. A core tenant of its approach is giving leaders time to

---

[19] Peter Senge, Hal Hamilton, and John Kania, "The Dawn of System Leadership," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2015. http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/the_dawn_of_system_leadership

dialogue with each other, and experience how they "show up." Recently, ALF began emphasizing the "I" of leadership, teaching mindfulness as a tool to help leaders slow down and develop a keener awareness of their interior condition. Yet, while there are many examples of ALF leaders forming deep relationships and spinning off important programs, this impact has not yet translated into the transformation that is ultimately needed. As a result, ALF is now turning its focus more intently to the "It" of creating systemic change.

The Irvine Foundation's New Leadership Network (NLN) created its program design by borrowing elements from ALF and others. However, early in the network's formation, NLN chose to focus more on the "It" of systems change, and less on the "I" aspect of leadership. Program participants move though highly-interactive peer-learning experiences over a period of six months, which expose them to a number of social change tools such as network mapping, design thinking, systems dynamics, and relationship-building. Because NLN's focus has been on community-wide impact from its inception, by the close of 2015, NLN had launched more than 80 collaborations in Fresno, CA alone—half of which are already producing measurable outputs. ALF-SV has learned a great deal from NLN's work, and has subsequently calibrated its approaches toward the "It" goals of community transformation.

Through our experiments with these and other leadership programs, we have learned a few things about the critical success factors necessary for helping others develop the skills they need to lead in the future. First, the training must be highly interdisciplinary in nature, and the content must be curated from a number of fields. This is not about a single tool or silver bullet, but rather about combining multiple tools to respond skillfully to changing contexts. It's about developing and practicing with a whole toolkit.

Second, any kind of training for adult learners must be highly experiential and hands-on. It must draw on participants' own learning and experiences, not just offer talking heads or "expert" lectures. It must incorporate elements of peer learning and support, real-time case studies, and reflection on one's own leadership journey. Adults learn best when they can combine action and reflection in dialogue with their peers.

Lastly, any kind of training or developmental program must seek the simplicity on the other side of complexity—reducing sometimes complicated theories and frameworks to simple concepts and tools that are easy to understand and retain. This means taking many different bodies of work and boiling them down to the most essential concepts that can be transferred or taught. It's not an academic approach—it's an approach centered on practitioners, the ultimate end users who will benefit most from these new tools.

Regardless, one thing is certain: the leadership mindsets and skills that got us here today will not help us solve the problems of tomorrow. If we truly hope to achieve large-scale social change, then we need to start thinking—and leading—our way into a new way of being.

###

## About the Authors

**Heather McLeod Grant** is the founder and principal of McLeod-Grant Advisors and a published author, speaker/trainer, and consultant with more than 25 years of experience in the social sector. Her current work focuses on creating transformative leadership and building networks and multi-stakeholder collaborations for social change. She has prior expertise in scaling social impact, social innovation/entrepreneurship, nonprofit management, and organizational development. She is the co-author of the bestselling *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits*, named a Top Ten Book of 2007 by *The Economist* (second edition 2012), and numerous articles. She worked at Monitor Institute for nearly five years, where she helped lead their nonprofit practice. Prior to that, she worked at McKinsey & Company and co-founded *Who Cares*, a national magazine for young social entrepreneurs published from 1993 to 1999. Heather currently serves on the board of Fuse Corp, and is a Venture Partner with Draper-Richards-Kaplan; she also serves as the Managing Director of the Irvine New Leadership Network. She holds an MBA from Stanford University and an AB from Harvard University. For additional information, publications, and speaking engagements, visit www.mcleodgrant.com and www.forcesforgood.net.

**Chris Block** is the recent CEO of American Leadership Forum Silicon Valley (ALF), a network of 500+ regional leaders committed to serving the common good in Silicon Valley. Through its Fellows program, ALF brings together demonstrated leaders to explore the process of collaborative leadership, which can strengthen their capacity to address difficult issues. Graduates of the program, called Senior Fellows, develop a common understanding of, dedication to, and capacity for acting as networked servant leaders. ALF's impact on the community springs from this engaged, vibrant, evolving, and active network of leaders who, through the course of their life and work, inspire their colleagues to community action. Prior to ALF, Chris spent 25 years as an affordable housing developer and nonprofit executive director. He is also a writer, teacher, and system leader.

**Lance Fors** focuses on system leadership for social change. He has served as the long-time board chair of the global network of Social Venture Partnerships (SVPs), Silicon Valley Social Venture Fund (SV2), New Teacher Center, Reading Partners, Silicon Valley Children's Fund, and on the advisory board of Strive Together. Lance has helped each of these organizations and networks transition from a startup to the leader in its field. Previously, Lance was the founder and CEO of Third Wave Technologies, a maker of products that enabled the early detection and treatment of cancer, which he built into a leading biotechnology company. Lance received his BA from UC Berkeley and his PhD in molecular biology from the California Institute of Technology. He is an inventor on dozens of patents, received an Ernst and Young entrepreneur of the year award, and lectures on the potential of individuals, teams, organizations, and networks to provide generative and transformative system leadership.