

## **Personal, Institutional, and Communal Leadership: Rethinking Leadership Development for the Jewish Community**

By Dr. Erica Brown

*Managing Director for Education and Leadership, Jewish Federation of  
Greater Washington, Rockville, Maryland*

---

This article maps out the differences between personal and institutional leadership and demonstrates why Jewish leadership development programs need to address both kinds of leadership today. It also presents the challenge of creating communal leadership norms and values that transcend both personal and institutional needs to sustain the health and vibrancy of the Jewish community as a whole.

---

**I**n the new and much-needed leadership book, *Silos, Politics and Turf Wars*, Peter Lencioni argues that the most effective way to minimize territoriality within an organization is to create an overarching goal that every department within an organization can adopt.

To avoid politics and turf battles, executives must establish an unambiguously stated common goal, a single overriding theme that remains the top priority of the entire leadership team for a given period of time. In turn, this thematic goal serves to align employees up and down the organization and provides an objective tool for resetting direction when things get out of sync (Lencioni, 2006, p. 179).

Lencioni encourages this organizational behavior for short-term goal achievement. His observation—employees buying into a common goal will have fewer turf battles—is obvious to those standing outside of organizations. Within organizations, however, it is more thorny. Personal agendas, politics, and conflicting messages about priorities that are fluid and changing compromise an institution's ability to rally around a particular cause or goal.

Moving beyond one organization, the same could be said of a community as a whole. Within the Jewish community, our “single, overriding goal” may be to involve as many people in meaningful Jewish communal activities as possible. We want individuals to participate both in the enjoyable aspects of communal life and to take responsibility for a community's vibrancy and fiscal stability. We want leaders of the Jewish community to see our community holistically while making room for a diverse range of services and institutions. Ideally, all leaders within the Jewish community would sacrifice their own limited institutional loyalty to a small degree to generate greater awareness of overarching communal needs within their constituencies. This is achievable only when members of any particular organization are made aware of universal norms and priorities within a larger collective.

Lencioni's thesis is affirmed in Wheatkey and Kellner-Rogers' “The Paradox and Promise of Community,” which drives home the benefit of an overarching purpose:

Clarity at the core of a community about its purpose changes the entire nature of the relationships within that community. This type of community does not ask people to forfeit their freedom as a condition of belonging. It avoids the magnetic pull of proscribing behaviors and beliefs; it avoids becoming doctrinaire and dictatorial; it stays focused on what its members are trying to create together, and diversity flourishes within it. Belonging together is defined by a shared sense of purpose, not by shared beliefs about specific behaviors. The call of that purpose attracts individuals but does not require them to shed their uniqueness. Staying centered on what the common work is, rather than on single identities, transforms the tension of belonging and individuality into an energetic and resilient community (Wheatkey & Kellner-Rogers, 1998, p. 15).

Communities need both a shared common purpose and respect for the diversity of individuals within any given cluster. The politics and turf wars that beset the Jewish community should be an anomaly because Jewish professional and lay leaders are supposed to have the Jewish community's best interests in mind and be able to capitalize on the talents of individual leaders. Yet, enormous obstacles stand in the way of their doing so.

Territoriality is an often unnamed poison that hampers our community's ability to engage greater Jewish participation. To an outsider or someone on the margins of communal membership, inner turf battles are a compelling reason *not* to join in. Although this perennial problem is not new, the role that Jewish leaders and Jewish leadership development programs play in feeding this problem has rarely been analyzed. This article defines the differences among personal leadership, institutional leadership, and communal leadership and attempts to show why our emphasis on the first two kinds of leadership can generate turf battles and run counter to our ability to achieve the third: communal leadership. The observations that follow are largely my own and have been percolating within me as an educator who has taught and participated in more than a dozen leadership programs, locally and nationally, for more than 10 years. The

reflections that I have drawn from this experience are personal and not limited to any particular leadership program. They arise from a sincere desire to stimulate a necessary, if difficult, conversation about the goals, selection process, and outcomes of such programs at a time when leadership development has become an increasing priority for the Jewish community internationally.

### PERSONAL LEADERSHIP AND ITS PROBLEMS

Personal leadership focuses on an individual's leadership skills, vision, creativity, charisma, and ability to motivate others.

Leadership is always personal. Individuals have different styles of management, different ways of measuring success, and different means of motivating and engaging others. And leadership needs to be personal; leaders need to tell their personal journeys so that they can inspire and mentor successive generations of leadership. Individual leaders also need to separate their own needs from the needs of the institutions that they run. Individuals need to work on their own presentation skills to communicate their messages effectively, and they need to reflect on their time and willingness to get involved in various projects and causes. Leaders create themselves with a learning curve. In the words of Warren Bennis, one of today's prolific writers on leadership, "Leaders *learn* from others, but they are not *made* by others. This is the distinguishing mark of leaders. The paradox itself becomes a dialectic. The self and the other synthesize through self invention" (Bennis, 1994, p. 63).

Strong personal leadership is often characterized by originality, drive, stubborn perseverance, charisma, dominance, impatience, and single-mindedness. These qualities are crucial in the risk taking that leadership so often involves.

To lead is to live dangerously because when leadership counts, when you lead people through difficult change, you challenge what

people hold dear—their daily habits, tools, loyalties, and ways of thinking—with nothing more to offer perhaps than possibility. Moreover, leadership often means exceeding the authority you are given to tackle the challenge at hand. People push back when you disturb the personal and institutional equilibrium they know (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 2).

When we think of leaders who have made some of the most striking accomplishments in history or even of leaders within our local institutions, we find that this breed of leader was or is often responsible for generating ideas, dreaming big, and pushing organizational cultures beyond their natural sphere of activity. Consequently, what makes an individual leader exceptional can often be the bane of institutional leadership; institutions generally value conventional wisdom and the maintenance of an organization's set protocols and hierarchies. Institutions can have a low tolerance for gadflies and eccentrics or overbearing but accomplished "personalities." Individual leaders often like to work outside conventional boundaries, criticizing institutions when they cannot respond either quickly or expansively enough to meet their vision. Moving up the ranks in an institution requires an understanding of organizational cultures and an ability to navigate politics and administrative scaffolding, which may present an insurmountable challenge to personal leadership. Institutional leadership requires patience to work within established structures and the realization that personal goals will take longer to accomplish, but may have a more pervasive or lasting impact because they have traveled through a system and acquired more buy-in than the activities of lone but dynamic leaders.

Training individual leaders with a personal leadership style, therefore, is not the same as training Jewish individuals to take on senior communal responsibilities within any given organization. This distinction has rarely been articulated. Training may consist of helping individuals identify their own leadership styles and strengthen practical

leadership skills like presentation and fundraising. Jewish organizations and leadership development programs today tend to focus on developing personal leadership and not always on training leaders to navigate institutional settings effectively. Through a careful recruitment and selection process, exposure to excellent teaching and materials, and an opportunity to network, the hope is that a group of leaders will emerge who will seed and support community initiatives and be communal visionaries. Although there has been some discussion and debate about the content of these programs (Lewis, 2004, 2005), by and large, the personal leadership orientation of these programs, be they national or local in character, has not been questioned.

And yet, the belief that exposure to Jewish sources, Jewish leaders, and professional business literature will automatically produce institutional leaders is like saying that a liberal arts education will automatically produce scholars. Exposure to information, scholarship, and research must be coupled with active and disciplined forays into leadership decision making and a profound understanding of the institutional culture of Jewish organizations today. In other words, it is not only about who you pick to be in a leadership program and the content of the program—most candidates are wonderfully qualified and the teaching is usually first-rate. Leadership programs today, however, need to stretch themselves a little farther and prepare people with a personal vision of the Jewish future and an understanding of organizational cultures, and they must help them make the transition into actual leadership roles. Coaching people through their first years in senior leadership positions would bring added value when most needed.

Few leadership development programs give participants a task within a community-wide initiative or project, nor do the case studies they work on—if they discuss case studies at all—reflect real and active problems and challenges of the Jewish institutions in their area. In addition, the teaching

foundation or sponsoring institution may lack interest in delving into the multilayered, complex swamp problems facing specific communities. They want to retain their independence and autonomy, functioning in a consultant capacity. The thinking is that if enough of the right people are individually “trained,” communal issues will get resolved by virtue of a new leadership presence and general increased activity. But personal leadership development does not always prepare individuals for the assumption of institutional leadership, and it can often engender disdain for established norms and institutional affiliations or enhance a hunger for power.

Hal Lewis, in his latest book on leadership, emphasizes the importance of Jewish leaders working *with* rather than *over* their communities:

Recognizing how easy it is to become habituated to the trappings of office led Jewish authorities to caution against the abuses of power. In sharp contrast to the conventional stereotyped leader whose very persona exudes dominance, command and control, Judaism condemns those leaders who flaunt their selection and privilege. Such leaders disappoint God, to the point of tears, according to the rabbis. “Over three the Holy One, blessed be He, weeps every day: over him who is able to occupy himself with the Torah and does not, and over him who is unable to occupy himself with the Torah and does and over a leader who domineers over the community” (Lewis, 2006, p. 18).

Leadership programs today should celebrate their successes—which are substantial—but also ask the following difficult questions. How many leadership successes have we produced who would not otherwise have achieved their leadership positions? How instrumental were we to this process of “leadership cooking”? Is there a way to measure outcomes?

Some leaders in such programs will emerge naturally, but a more targeted, deliberative process will no doubt yield a richer impact. A focus, a discipline, and a content-rich course of study are required to take people from the passive learning of a

subject to an active role as a decision maker and shaper within a given institution. It is this shepherding process—moving people from contemplating themselves as leaders to contemplating the growth and health of an institution and a community—that is largely lacking in Jewish leadership development in North America. With all of these cautions, *general* leadership development can be an effective tool in *specific* community building, when the focus changes in the training process from personal development and even institutional development to expansive community building.

### **DO INDIVIDUAL JEWISH LEADERS REPRESENT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY?**

Personal leadership development programs, in addition to the challenges presented above, also need to rethink their selection process if they are to churn out leaders to do the work of community building. Who do we find in these programs? More often than not, we find a group of people with solid financial resources who have been chosen as potential leaders because they have already taken on leadership roles in their communities and also because they can “buy” their way into the system. That is, they qualify financially. Such homogeneous groupings can often compromise a community because they do not reflect its diversity.

In addition, participants in leadership training programs should be made to feel special, but as soon as they begin to feel more special than those in the community they serve, they may lose touch with their constituencies. Being out of touch will ultimately undermine their influence and effectiveness. They can begin to see themselves as distinct from others and from their neighborhood Jewish institutions, which they may view as mediocre. Consequently, their personal allegiances often move from their past local, communal affiliations to the foundations or organizations that have recently supported their studies. It is these

institutions that are lauded as outstanding while their home-grown organizations are labeled poor to middling. Graduates of such programs may feel more bound to the national bodies that took such great interest in them while ironically harboring disappointment with their own institutions—who may have footed the bill for their training in the first place. Exposure to leadership excellence is critical in raising the bar generally in Jewish communal life. But we have to be wary when this exposure produces leaders who have little desire to return to their local communities and work within what may be perceived as institutional confinements and limitations.

A recent graduate of a national leadership program shared her disappointments with me, “In my leadership program, I felt like I was with the best and brightest all the time. Now, I feel stuck with what there is here, and it is not very inspiring.” On the one hand, she touched excellence, and that touch is critical in reframing her personal vision of leadership. She is clearly unsatisfied with mediocrity and has changed her standards over the years. This is a triumph for any leadership program. On the other hand, will she have the patience and drive to work within “less excellent” local institutions to improve them, or will she dismiss them outright and move onto a national agenda or possible move away altogether?

The transition out of such leadership development programs can be trying and a drop-off point for many, despite the heavy communal investment in their training. For example, in a national program that develops leaders in their thirties and forties, a “graduate” of years of conventions and service confessed that he now felt lost:

I knew that this was going to be my last convention, but I guess I was in denial. I thought this would last forever. I’ve made a lot of friends and changed so much over these past years, and now there is nowhere for me to go. Sure, we’ll keep in touch. Some of us, at least. But in terms of a leadership role, I don’t know what’s next. I don’t think I can just go back to my community. I’ve outgrown it. But in this organization, the next leadership roles are

only given to people older and more wealthy than I am. I don’t think I’m going to stick around for another 20 years and a lottery winning to find out.

“Outgrowing” the work of local institutions is a sophisticated way of saying that a leader will not get as much satisfaction working on concrete issues as he or she can get in seminars and social settings that discuss or promote leadership in abstraction. In addition, there may be nowhere for this young leader to go.

The other alarm bell that this observation raises is the role that money plays in Jewish leadership today. Outgrowing leadership may also mean that this leader has served to capacity within an institution at his financial level and will not be able to use his leadership skills elsewhere in the institution. In political terms, it is nearly impossible to run for office today without personal wealth. In Jewish nonprofits, lay leaders are almost always chosen because they have the financial means to offer significant material support to an organization. Words like “power,” “control,” and “influence” are often virtual code words in Jewish nonprofits for financial capacity. I have spoken to many frustrated Jewish men and women with leadership vision and capabilities who have been overlooked because they lack financial access to the top.

Jewish institutions are all clamoring to involve the same people with financial means to enrich the community literally; subsequently, Jewish boards are rarely comprised eclectically. Philanthropic leadership is critical, but when wealth is valued above and not always in tandem with thoughtfulness, Jewish values, creativity, and intelligence, a pattern of institutional “lopsidedness” evolves that hurts the entire Jewish community.

Although the demographic realities of potential volunteer and philanthropies populations have changed, many Jewish organizations are still preoccupied with wealthy, older often Jewishly ignorant *machers*. These organizations, according to their young adult detractors, are still geared toward the “lone wolf”

types . . . providing the biggest rewards for the biggest givers and putting enormous stress on monetary concerns. Such emphases are not a good match with the motivations and contemporary personal goals of younger Jews who are attracted to volunteer leadership (Fishman, 2000, p. 164).

At a recent conference of several hundred Jewish leaders, I looked around the room and noticed that virtually all of the participants were hedge fund managers, property developers, or venture capitalists or were married to one. The standard Jewish doctors, lawyers, and professors had been replaced by people with “real” income possibilities. Jewish artists, poets, educators, and writers were nowhere to be seen. Financial expectations for Jewish board involvements have virtually bought out professionals and other “classes” of creative thinkers. I boldly asked a physician who was financially capable of attending such a conference why he was not interested, and he told me something that should make all Jewish institutions shudder: “I like to talk about ideas. I don’t like to talk about money.” This translates implicitly into an assumption that the Jewish sponsoring institution also values money above ideas.

It is true that Jewish institutions need money and that cultivating individuals with financial capital is an important part of making sure that our institutions are fiscally sound and thriving. No apologies needed. But an apology is needed when an overrepresentation of the financially capable in Jewish leadership roles is making our community woefully unbalanced. We need money, but what we really need are good, innovative ideas matched with financial resources. Issues like membership, tuition, and participation in institutions have been linked so tightly to money that we have sacrificed, in large measure, the visionary magic that emerges when people of all financial, spiritual, and intellectual brackets come together in a meaningful way to consider the needs of a community.

## **INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ITS PROBLEMS**

Nonprofit institutional leadership development is the means by which an organization selects, trains, and oversees its most senior professional and lay leaders to make sure that it is fulfilling its mission. Institutions need leaders to maintain the status quo, strategize about the future, and develop a succession plan so that, in the fullness of time, an institution’s leadership can be self-replicating. Today, it is common to find Jewish institutions parrying the word “vision” around as a mantra of leadership. In actual fact, few established Jewish organizations are really interested in being visionary because real change can undermine institutional stability and the status quo.

Jewish leadership often focuses on the placement of individual leaders within an organizational structure, instead of pushing the limits of those structures. Hierarchies are constructed to fit people within a structure based on set tasks, skills, and an identifiable knowledge base. Leaders in such settings are commonly expected to keep everyone in place and keep structures intact. Leadership is not as much about being visionary as it is about conformity. Who will best conform to the institution’s current mission and structure? This question, although fair on one level, also assumes that leaders are people who keep things in place. This definition of leadership has been rightfully challenged. Consider this statement by a leading theorist on leadership: “Good management brings a degree of order and consistency to key dimensions. . . . Leadership, by contrast, is about coping with change. . . . Major changes are more and more necessary to survive and compete effectively in this new environment” (Kotter, 1998, p. 53).

Managers, not leaders, are generally given the task of keeping structures in place, which, in large measure, describes the majority of board-led activities. Managers—both professional and lay—are crucial to the healthy functioning of an institution,

but they should not be confused with leaders. Although we may balk at the term “lay managers,” it is probably a much better description of what many lay volunteers in leadership positions actually do. Instead, as Kouzes and Posner argue in *The Leadership Challenge*: “Vision statements aren’t job descriptions. They’re not product or service specifications. . . . They should transcend the day-to-day work (voluntary or paid) and find expression in higher-order human needs. Visions should uplift and ennoble” (p. 141). Leaders generate vision to question the effectiveness of existing structures.

The director of Duke University’s Hart Leadership Program, in trying to teach undergraduates about leadership, said of many corporate leaders that “they are rewarded for knowing the answers and not for stirring things up, not making people feel uncomfortable.” Institutional leadership is, for many, about not stirring things up and not making people feel uncomfortable where they are. Leaders may be chosen by Jewish nonprofits because they are familiar with the system and, in deference to established patterns, will not shake up existing norms. This common behavior locks leaders into hierarchical structures, protocols, politics, and institutional loyalties; leaders in such systems are chosen for their ability to conform rather than their commitment to challenge convention.

Institutional leadership can cramp the ability of individual leaders to actualize their personal vision. Individual leaders lose patience with heavy-handed structures and may find that the only way they can “make good” on their leadership visions is through private philanthropy or “vigilante-style” activism. Perhaps the best comparison is to individuals who are self-employed professionally because they find themselves unable to work well in teams or to accomplish their goals in systems. We rarely think of volunteers as being self-employed, but in fact, philanthropy and social justice movements have been moving in this direction for years. “Self-employed volunteers” are useful in any community because they push

the community envelope on ideas, but if Jewish institutions consistently fail to engage such individuals, the institutional ability to maintain relevance will be compromised (to compare this to corporate life, see Clayton Christensen’s *The Innovator’s Dilemma*, 2003). Instead, institutions need to relinquish control over individuals and make room for visionary thinkers. As Stephen Covey writes,

The need for control—for overall integrity, direction, and continuity within the organization—is obvious. But equally obvious is the need—both for the individual and the effectiveness of the organization—for greater individual autonomy and freedom. . . . The core problem is not the conflict, but rather the idea that there is conflict—the paradigm or mental framework of dichotomous thinking that leads to “either/or” management assumptions (Covey, 1991, 211–212).

Individual autonomy and freedom are not conditions easily generated in well-established institutions, but an either/or attitude creates an unnecessary dichotomy between personal and institutional leadership that foment tensions.

### MOVING BEYOND PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Like personal leadership, institutional leadership in a vacuum can blindside us to the overarching mission of a community. Institutional leaders can have difficulty transcending the limited mission of their own organizations to consider what makes the entity called community a more vibrant and responsive Jewish environment.

If the American community aims to reproduce its Jewishly oriented leadership, membership and philanthropic cadres—rather than to increasingly supply leadership for general civic and secular causes—it needs an infusion of traditional Jewish religious, spiritual and communal values to complement the coalesced allies of general voluntarism and communal activism (Fishman, 2000, p. 174).

Jewish nonprofits need to be places that inspire. Within an institutional mentality,

leaders often chose successors who can keep an institution fiscally and programatically sound but not those who can inspire spiritual, intellectual, or emotional growth in tune with or beyond the institutional mission. The institution becomes an end, in and of itself. For this reason, it is wise for up-and-coming leaders to have served on the boards of multiple institutions before assuming a position of broader communal leadership.

It is little wonder that so many young potential leaders are turning to smaller, less established charities to offer their time and resources. Within the Jewish community, no institution can survive without being profoundly connected to the viability and stability of the Jewish community as a whole. Each institution is part of a complex mosaic of needs and services that make up a community. When we fail to show members and nonmembers that our overarching goal is the health of our Jewish community as a whole, we also fail our specific institutions. In the words of Rabbi Nathan Laufer,

It is not enough for leaders to exercise their charismatic capacity and finely honed leadership skills. They must also have a positive destination that is worth the risk and the energy invested in the leadership enterprise, and the more carefully thought through and long term the strategy, the better. In the Bible, the long-term reliability of a thing or a process is equivalent to its being true (Laufer, 2006, p. 23).

Personal leadership development programs are correct in training individuals rather than working with specific institutions because people who serve on one board are most likely to serve on multiple boards during their lifetimes. They may not make their primary leadership contribution in the institution where they currently serve. However, leadership development programs do need to make sure that personal leadership is directed at the overall health of the complete organism called community and not

continuously bias one set of needs over others.<sup>1</sup>

Stephen Trachtenberg, former president of George Washington University, has a fascinating measure of the health of an institution that could serve Jewish nonprofits leaders well.

I believe that the best university presidents feel a genuine admiration for faculty members who are doing important research—and an equal admiration for the university itself. Such a manager ought to be capable of saying with complete sincerity, “If I were not the president of this university, then I would like to be a researcher and a teacher *here*” (Trachtenberg, 2002, pp. 62–63).

For a Jewish professional or lay leader, the question would be a little different: if I were not a leader in this community, would I want to be a member? Would I choose to live here knowing the institutions and services it provides? People move into a city and stay there for many personal and professional reasons. Leaders of Jewish nonprofits have to ask themselves—stepping outside of their institutional boundaries, “Is this a great city to live in from a Jewish point of view, at all life stages and ages?” If the answer is not a resounding “yes,” then the question becomes, “How can I—and the institution I serve—get it to ‘yes’?”

I believe that Jewish institutions are *ultimately* judged by their effectiveness as pieces of a communal entity and not as separate service providers. However, most leaders believe that their tasks lie within the purview of one institution. Most leadership development programs work on the same view. They resist notions of communal teamwork:

---

<sup>1</sup>Jack Wertheimer’s recent study for the Avi Chai foundation, “Linking the Silos: How to Accelerate the Momentum in Jewish Education Today” (December 2005), discusses the importance of broad, developmental thinking across institutions within the discipline of Jewish education. This kind of thinking should be taking place within every Jewish educational and social service realm, but ramped up to push institutions even beyond their field of expertise.

Some people do not believe that teams, except in unusual or exceptional circumstances, really do perform better than individuals. Some think that teams cause more trouble than they are worth because the members waste time in unproductive meetings and discussions, and actually generate more complaints than constructive results. Others think that teams are probably useful from a human relations point of view but are a hindrance when it comes to work, productivity and empowerment (Katzenbach & Smith, 1994).

Jewish nonprofits are team members on the playing field of the Jewish community. Working optimally, they strategize, communicate, play, and compete to be the kind of community in which individuals want to live. Yet, umbrella organizations today are too often the communal “punching bag,” blamed for a variety of institutional failures. If individual leaders devalue umbrella organizations and institutional leaders cannot transcend their institutional walls, they will either become isolated, irrelevant, or ineffective.

Leaders know that great ideas are not limited to one person, one wallet, one board, or one collective organization. It is time to give authentic meaning to the expression, “We are all one people.” If the whole is the sum of its parts, then all of the parts need to uphold, take ownership, and be accountable to a shared vision. It is time that we make distinctions between personal and institutional leadership and train leaders to consider overarching communal goals that are both local and global. To do that, we need to create venues and mechanisms for community-wide conversations of professionals and lay leaders that help us, in Lencioni’s scheme, identify overarching communal dreams and responsibilities. Only then can we transcend individual and institutional agendas and make the well-being of the Jewish community a joint and ultimate mission. Ideally, leadership training programs should emerge out of such conversations so that leadership development does not take place in a vacuum, but within the situational context of local, communal needs and norms.

The dialectic tensions created by individual and institutional needs in relation to each other can generate enormous creativity, if well harnessed. To serve the community in its richness, leadership development programs should select strong, individual leaders with diverse professional and financial backgrounds and help develop their abstract thinking about leadership and their personal leadership styles while matching and challenging them with concrete communal challenges and shared envisioning. At the same time, institutions need to make room for the creativity and diversity of individual leaders so that these emerging leaders can make the transition from abstract thinking into real and meaningful work. For this reason, more leadership training programs are including individual coaching in their curricula.

Just as institutions need to embrace eclectic leadership styles and leadership that is not only philanthropic and financial, individual leaders need to understand the delicate balance between patience and outcomes—when to push and when to wait. Jeffrey Rosen (2007), in a recent book with important observations on the nature of leadership, argues that the American Supreme Court has been occupied by judges with one of two personalities: ideologues and pragmatists. Ideologues are often the more charismatic and idea-driven leaders. Pragmatists, according to Rosen, are generally more successful leaders, however, because they are better positioned to make allies, cut deals, and adjust personal positions to achieve lasting influence. Firebrands often isolate themselves or alienate others, and their long-term influence tends to be minimized as a result. Ideologues can help push institutions, but they can also lose touch with the reality of processes and agendas that are beyond the scope of any one individual. Vigilante leadership may provide impressive short-term gains, but—because institutions usually outlive their members—lasting influence within communities will most often emerge from continued agitation at the center, not the margins.

Leadership development programs have to bring both ideologues and pragmatists to the same table while being aware of the distinctions among personal, institutional, and communal leadership. Only then can such programs determine educational outcomes and match what they are teaching with those they are teaching and the institutions that will be served by this leadership training. In addition, “receiving institutions”—local agencies that can benefit from a new crop of trained leaders—have to prepare themselves and make room for these new leaders. Leadership development programs moving forward should provide the structure to shape and mold personal leadership to serve the broadest and most expansive communal needs, expose leaders to the practical leadership needs of specific institutions, and help move leaders from abstract thought into meaningful and lasting leadership roles. Leadership programs have created an expectation that its graduates will occupy the territory of senior communal roles. This is itself a remarkable achievement, perhaps unimaginable 20 years ago. In the same tradition of excellence, it is time to do the work of visionary leaders and ask some difficult questions and challenge assumptions.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Misha Galperin, Michael Feinstein, and Matt Abrams Gerber for their comments on this article.

### REFERENCES

Bennis, Warren. (1994). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

- Christenson, Clayton. (2003). *The innovator's dilemma*. New York: Collins Business Essentials.
- Covey, Stephen R. (1991). *Principled leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Fishman, Sylvia Barack. (2000). *Jewish life and American culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Heifetz, Ronald, & Linsky, Marty. (2002). *Leadership on the line*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Katzenbach, Jon, & Smith, Douglas. (1994). *The wisdom of teams*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Kotter, John. (1998). *What leaders really do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kouzes, James, & Posner, Barry. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Laufer, Nathan. (2006). *The genesis of leadership*. Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights.
- Lencioni, Patrick. (2006). *Silos, politics and turf wars*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewis, Hal. (2004, Summer/Fall). Making leaders: How the American Jewish community prepares its leaders. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 80(2-3), 151-59.
- Lewis, Hal. (2005). Making inspired leaders: New approaches to Jewish leadership development. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*.
- Lewis, Hal. (2006). *From sanctuary to boardroom: A Jewish approach to leadership*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Rosen, Jeffrey. (2007). *Supreme Court: The personalities and rivalries that defined America*. New York: Times Book.
- Trachtenberg, Stephen. (2002). *Reflections on higher education*. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.
- Wertheimer, Jack. (2005, December). *Linking the silos: How to accelerate the momentum in Jewish education today*. New York: Avi Chai Foundation.
- Wheatkey, Margaret, & Kellner-Rogers, Myron. (1998). The paradox and promise of community. In *The community of the future*. San Francisco: Drucker Foundation Future Series/Jossey-Bass.