Overview of Organization Development

with Case Studies

E. Christopher Mare

Fielding Graduate University

KA-717

April 2010

Background Note

At the Spring 2008 RaP Session in Anaheim, I participated in Bob Silverman's "KA-717 Organization Development" Seminar. In this Seminar, Bob introduced a well-rounded selection of theories and schools-of-thought in the field of Organization Development. After the Seminar, I *could* have written an Overview paper summarizing the findings and going deeper into a theory or school-of-thought that I found particularly relevant to my own work. Unfortunately – or as the case may be, more-inclusively? – the notebook I used at the Seminar, the one that contained all the material we covered, was in a computer bag that was stolen from me while in Albuquerque – so I never got around to writing the assigned Overview paper.

This present Overview paper, then ~ now ~ two years later, will be a little more free form than what was originally intended – and that's what makes it "more-inclusively," because in the ensuing couple of years I've had a chance to ruminate about the scope and potential of an "Organization Development" more fully. In these days, I have some real issues that will make writing the paper more than just an academic exercise, as it would have been back in 2008. I guess that makes this all applied practice in the Art of Trusting the Life Process.

Overview

I must admit, I started out a bit wary of the title "Organization Development," preferring to keep a safe distance you might say. Like "Economics," I've seen how the inherent power-potential in these disciplines is and has been abused by practitioners of lower consciousness seeking gain for themselves at others' expense. I am referring here to applications such as Norbert Weiner's "The Human Use of Human Beings." More subjectively, my own experience in the Navy and later in Corporate America revealed to me how "organizations" can be turned into insidious power-consolidating structures that are used to exploit people at the base. I even had cause for concern at a Fielding seminar as the discussion rotated around the subject in one of the readings: how 'managers' can manipulate circumstances to get more productivity out of their 'managees.' I think I became a bit unpopular when I leveled a sharp critique at that genre of article: "What justification can there ever be for manipulating people for someone else's gain? Those are real people you're talking about, people with feelings, and families." It is that thoroughly *dehumanizing* aspect of Organization Development (OD) that I find so objectionable.

And yet, like Economics, the more I explored the field the more I discovered opportunities for prospective enlightened application of the inherent power-potential in these disciplines – maybe even in ways that could become thoroughly *humanizing?* In order to make these possibilities visible, however, it is necessary to be selective and discriminating when drawing from the OD literature. There is still plenty of discussion going on in that lifeless 'mechanistic mindset' – the whole idea of turning organizations into well-oiled machines with the people as replaceable parts. Gareth Morgan, in the first OD book I ever read, had this to say:

> Organizations that are designed and operated as if they were machines are now usually called bureaucracies. But most organizations are bureaucratized in some degree, for the mechanistic mode of thought has shaped our most basic conception of what organization is all about (1986, p. 22).

This is still accurate today. Charles Seashore (2010) says that Organization Development, what he terms a subset of Organization Theory, arose out of the 'systems thinking' of the late 50s and early 60s. Since systems thinking was first applied to the cybernetics of *mechanical* systems, it is only natural that this mental framework persists. Keywords like 'efficiency,' 'effectiveness,' and especially 'control' – *control, control, control* – are indications that you are stepping into the mechanistic metaphor.

Morgan went on to say, "[t]he mechanistic approach to organization tends to limit rather than mobilize the development of human capacities, molding human beings to fit the requirements of mechanical organization rather than building the organization around their strengths and potentials" (p. 38). I would think this is inevitable as organizations move beyond a *human* scale – what I refer to in my work as a *village* scale – and into the realm of faceless unaccountability at the grand scales of 'cities,' 'transnational corporations,' 'nation states,' etc. An important and recurring theme in my writing has been how the un-sustainability of the current world situation is in large part a consequence of the permeation of this mechanistic metaphor into all aspects of modern life – from city planning to food production to waste management, etc. – so there is a larger problem we are dealing with, and it really is a problem of scale. What is the optimum scale for an organization to be able to tap, realize, and utilize the very best potentials of its members?

Fortunately, systems thinking moved beyond the general machine cybernetics of its early days, branching off into Living Systems Theory, Chaos Theory, Non-linear Dynamics, Network and Field theories, Biomimicry, etc.; and the OD literature has responded accordingly. There are now, if you can remain selective and discriminating, many exciting ways to conceive and practice Organization Development that have the very real prospect of being used as tools for positive change – and even, perhaps, as strategies for conscious evolution.

As I move into the "In-depth" and "Applied" components of this KA-717 study, I will be investigating the following OD approaches more thoroughly:

- The whole idea of *designing* organizations I find particularly intriguing. With a self-designed BA entitled "Village Design" and an MA in "Whole Systems Design" – and with many years experience now implementing the meta-practice of designing 'design courses' – I am especially keen to the relatively untapped magic inherent in sophisticated and well-informed design; so it makes good sense: Why not *design* the organization you want from its very inception? I had a chance to try some of this, before I was exposed to OD, when I set up my non-profit. I would like to share briefly my design strategy later in this Overview paper, as it highlights some of the points I've been reflecting on since Bob's Seminar. When I think of resources for this 'design' approach, the name Jay Galbraith comes first to mind, with books like his early influential *Designing Complex Organizations* (1973) and his more recent collaboration *Designing Dynamic Organizations* (2002). Gerardine DeSanctis has introduced some sound thinking into this field; her 2006 collaboration *Organizational Design* will be an important resource. Of course, like Charlie Seashore says, the books are always about three years behind the journals, so it will be important also to scour *The Academy of Management Journal* and *The Academy of Management Review,* as well as the respected journal *Organization Science.*

- The "organic" approach to Organization Development could be a remedy for the over-mechanization of the world – after all, "organization" comes from the same root as "organism," so why wouldn't there be a symbiosis? In particular, I am thinking about the concept of 'autopoietic living systems.' Applied, that would mean designing an organization that eventually could assume a life of its own, that could, in fact, become *self*-organizing. Once again, this goal can be achieved by conscious intention through sophisticated and well-informed design. Important sub-themes in this approach are the notions of "organizations evolving," "planned change," and the attention given to multiple criteria for organizations operating in particular "environments."
- Since I am currently involved intimately with three educational organizations, I am also interested in exploring the notion of the "learning organization," perhaps first brought to widespread attention by Peter Senge in his *The Fifth Discipline,* and complemented over the years by names like Argyris, Choo, and Cohen.

Putting the above three approaches together, is it possible to design a self-organizing learning organization? That is exactly what I want to do. In order to become better informed, to gain an understanding of the larger picture, I intend to go straight to the source, as it were, and find out the secrets behind the organization of Plato's Academy. I consider the founding of this Academy to be the seed moment for the entire Western intellectual tradition, so there must be something to learn from the precedent. Further, the Age in which the Academy appeared could be considered the nascence for the feeling (or perhaps intuition) of *Humanism* – a feeling that could be important to instill in organizations of the future. I will conduct this investigation for my "In-depth" study and then follow up in the "Applied" phase, after a thorough survey of the relevant OD literature, with an actual proposal for the organizational design of an "Academy" for our day and age. I know this word Academy gets a lot of usage but what does it actually mean? What was the first Academy really like? What was its purpose? Answering these questions will be the focus of my Organization Development study.

I have assembled and enclosed at the end of this Overview paper a Bibliography to reference during my extended investigation of KA 717 – Organization Development. This Bibliography will no doubt grow as the study proceeds.

Now, to provide more substance for this Overview paper, I wish to present next the design strategy I used for setting up my non-profit, Village Design Institute. It may become apparent that I already was considering many of the contingencies of an innovative Organization Development before becoming formally introduced to the field. I think it will be interesting, upon completing this KA-717 study, after having acquired a more thorough understanding of the concepts and theories, to return to the design of my non-profit. Perhaps I will be able to give it a big qualitative boost forward from my more well-informed perspective? At least I

should be able to charter the next stage of development for this particularly intimately-reflective organization.

After reviewing the design strategy of my non-profit, I would like to follow-up with a critical analysis of another educational organization I've been closely involved with – an international group called Gaia Education. This is an organization with fairly high visibility; yet it never experienced a design process and now, in my opinion, appears to be growing increasingly dysfunctional. I will present my critical analysis of the organization development (or lack of it) here, up front in this Overview paper, and then as my KA-717 study draws to a close will anticipate an opportunity to offer insightful constructive suggestions to assist the organization in a consultative capacity. At one point, during my Portfolio Review, it was presented as a possibility that I could make Organization Development research for Gaia Education the focus of my dissertation, but now that seems less likely.

<u>The Design of the Village Design Institute: A Case Study in Organization Development</u>

I determined through the course of my BA degree that the world needed more "ecovillages" – in the form of "research, training, and demonstration sites" for highlighting integrated sustainable systems. I further determined that I wanted to start a new ecovillage myself and that the best way to do this would be to set up an educational non-profit first. The reasoning was that at some point, at some time in the future, someone would be willing to donate land to the nonprofit for the purpose of establishing the proposed ecovillage. The land would then go into a Trust; thus, the most difficult problem in establishing an ecovillage – securing land with security of tenure – would be solved.

I wrote a couple of documents supporting my theory for the organization development of the nonprofit. In one paper, I described the development as an organic growth process, and likened it to the fertilization and growth of an egg. Initially there is One, embodying the seed idea. Once the One meets a significant other and fertilization occurs, then the One divides into Two through the process of mitosis. This is the initial stage of the Core Group. Two again divides into Four and by that time there is enough work to begin forming Committees within the now expanded Core Group. The Board would continue to grow in this way, in measured steps, finally stopping at the magic number Twelve; yet growth would occur only when it was needed, that is, when the Project was far enough along to require the additional differentiation. I added this process to the organization design because I wanted to prevent the Board from growing faster than the Project itself, thus becoming over-weighted or unwieldy.

The sort of process mentioned above, of course, requires a potent seed idea to begin with. Since it is carrying the genetic inheritance, the final form of the plant – or in this case the ecovillage – will be determined in no small way by the potency of this seed idea. Then care must be taken to ensure that the seed idea is planted in fertile soil.

In the paper, I further described the sort of skills that would be needed on the Board for different stages of growth – for example, at the four-person stage, it would be beneficial to have a President-organizer, a Secretary-documenter, an attorney, and a public relations person. It may not be crucial that this is exactly how it turns out, that these are exactly the positions that are filled – especially if one is open to self-organizing processes – yet this *is* an example of *designing an organization* – conscious and deliberate conceptualization and pre-planning with the intended purpose of producing a desired effect or outcome.

Later in the paper, I began to describe the processes by which the ecovillage could grow and support itself – once again, highlighting the organic strategy of beginning with a well-

defined center and then radiating out from there in measured, punctuated, seasonal steps. This is classic permaculture: the whole idea that the emerging ecovillage could come to support itself through the diverse, concentrated, value-added productivity of the land, augmented by the ever-expanding and experience-refining skills of the inhabitants.

A key feature of my conceptualization is that at the very center of the ecovillage would be situated 'the school.' I described – or designed – in detail the nature of this school in another paper, a paper that turned out to be the final Senior Project for my BA degree. I described the curriculum and its unfoldment over consecutive seasons; I described the relationships the school would nurture with associated entities locally, regionally, and globally; I described how students coming through the school would crank out designs, at multiple scales, as the ecovillage expanded; I described how the students would begin to get contract work by interacting with the surrounding communities. Here, then, was another document intended as initial or preliminary organizational design.

Once again, keeping with the potent core idea of organic growth proceeding from a well-defined nucleus housing the genetic material, it was essential that 'the school' be centrally situated – physically as well as conceptually. The school would be partnered with, in intimate relation with, an adjacent institution – an ashram of sorts, a healing center, a spiritual workshop focusing on meditation, yoga, and holistic health disciplines. In this configuration, the design school would be conceived as the 'yang' and the healing center as the 'yin' of the total integrated tai chi of the ecovillage center.

I still think this is a good replicable plan for setting up emerging ecovillages. Perhaps it won't be too long before I am able to translate this design into the form of a business plan capable of being presented to potential land donors?

In 2003, it came time to convert the non-profit 'idea' into an official legal 'entity.' The occasion for reification was the Graduate Design Project for my MA degree. For this Project, I was designing in detail, complete with referenced documentation, the presentation of an Ecovillage Design Course. For fulfillment of the Project, I was going to be seeking real students and actually conducting a real course on a real property with real clients. Under these conditions, it wouldn't have worked for me to simply put up flyers or send out invitations with just my homely name on there – no, I would need an Institute to make this initiative look appropriately professional. So began another 'organization design' exercise: This time I did research after which I drew up a Vision Statement, a Mission Statement, Articles of Incorporation, and Bylaws.

I even scanned my ephemeris some months ahead to discern when the planets might be in the most auspicious configuration for setting up a school. I noticed that on 12 December 2003 the Sun would be just past Pluto in Sagittarius, with Jupiter at 17 degrees Leo making an exact trine to this conjunction. That was excellent core symbology; and it synergized well with my natal chart. I then tested various birth chart times to discover when would be the best time

of day to initiate the new entity. When I sent off my application to the Secretary of State, I enclosed a little note requesting if someone might record the exact time that this non-profit becomes an official legal entity, and requesting that this action occur toward late afternoon on the twelfth. To my delight, when I received back the incorporation documents, someone had taken the time to respond to my requests: the time of day of incorporation, just like the birth in a hospital, was duly noted. That means I have an accurate birth chart of the Institute – and yes, I can and do use it for assistance in decision making.

Anyway, the first 5-day residential Ecovillage Design Course (EDC) presented by the Village Design Institute was a big success: 16 students attended. We held a follow-up course in 2005 and 24 students responded. Two years later we were planning to do another EDC – this time in Canada – but my Associate Faculty, Tyrone LaFay, had trouble getting across the border, so we had to cancel. Since then there's not been much interest around organizing another EDC. The biggest reason is probably because Gaia Education (see next section) has emerged on the scene, and much of my energy has been going there. Another good reason, however, is that the first two courses were held at "host" locations: we came in with all the gear and food and students and guests, set up a Design Studio, conducted the course, and when it was all over we packed up everything and left. I think that next time Village Design Institute presents an EDC, I want to have it held on land secured by the non-profit – *our* land – with sustainable systems and a community already in place.

There, then, is a summary of the design of an organization called Village Design Institute – an example of organic principles applied to organizational design. Everything seems to be moving right on organic growth-cycle schedule:

In 2008 Village Design Institute was asked to co-sponsor the first Gaia Education presentation in North America, a 4-week course held in Albuquerque. In order to provide a container for managing the money moving through the course, Village Design Institute used its legal status to set up a non-profit account at the local educational credit union – so there is now a branch office in Albuquerque. The Secretary of the corporation – and the only other Board member at this point besides the President – is a resident of Albuquerque, was the main organizer of the Gaia Education course, and is active stirring up interest in Brazil, her native home. The President and the Secretary, in conformance with the Bylaws, hold tele-conferencing Board meetings four times a year.

At the time of this writing, it looks like Village Design Institute may be ready to sprout another branch: A recent trip through Cambodia yielded lots of unexpected opportunity. Apparently there is a lot of NGO money being funneled through Cambodia directed toward village-scale, grassroots, community and economic development – just the kind of stuff we've been preparing for. I have an associate in Phnom Penh and I've already asked her to look into the possibility of setting up a bank account and opening an "office" – which at this point means merely establishing a presence with a website and an address to receive mail. A proposal has

already been written by a third party for the purpose of securing land to set up a "research, training, and demonstration site" – what we could call the core or nucleus of an emerging ecovillage. This kind of work is best approached step by careful organic step.

An analysis of the corporate birth chart, a study of currently transiting planets in relation to the natal configuration, reveals opportunities for growth and expansion over the next few years. It may be the right time to become more visible, perform an act of mitosis, and expand to the four-member Board stage…

Gaia Education: A Case Study of the Un-Designed Organization

(NOTE: My purpose here is to convey an objective analysis; however, since I have been closely involved with this organization, my tone may occasionally be tinged with emotion. I've read through and adjusted several times with the intention of focusing on organization development – structure and process – scrupulously attempting to avoid judgment of any personalities involved.)

Gaia Education is the educational arm of the Global Ecovillage Network (GEN). In about 1998, GEN started seriously considering formalizing an educational approach to encompass the emerging theme "Ecovillage Design." Most of the ecovillages comprising the Network already were instituting various educations, depending on their strengths or predilection; the purpose of Gaia Education would be to set a standard for them all. In May of 2004, a group of 22 ecovillage educators from around the world were gathered at the ecovillage of Findhorn, in Scotland, for the purpose of laying the groundwork for this new international educational initiative.

The Newbold House meeting was a joy to experience. The meeting was well-conceived and well-facilitated. Great care was taken to ensure a dynamic group process that would not only bring out the very best of the collective intelligence, but also would produce results that could be owned and shared by all. There was a palpable sense of excitement and exhilaration by those who were gathered, as we believed ourselves fortunate to be present at the birth of an initiative that would have an uplifting positive impact on the world – a sort of impregnation of the global noosphere with vitalizing, life-affirming memes.

The productive task of the meeting was to create the foundation and structure of a comprehensive curriculum that would be called the Ecovillage Design Education (EDE). Amidst games and meditations, garden walks and earth-songs, some serious work got done by the group mind. A framework was established for the curriculum consisting of 4 Dimensions with 5 Modules each. Tentative titles were agreed upon for the Dimensions and Modules with a preliminary understanding of format and content. As the meeting came to a close, working groups were formed and next-steps were decided. The Newbold House meeting adjourned with a satisfying sense of accomplishment and, perhaps more importantly, strong feelings of identification with the initiative and with each other.

At the time of creation of the working groups, I was asked to assume the responsibility of Curriculum Coordinator. I gave conscientious attention to this position and this task. I was

able to frame the work within the context of a Fielding study: KA-708 – Human Learning and Motivation. I studied theories of adult learning: Transformative Learning, Experiential Learning, Action Learning. I fielded draft Modules from contributors all around the globe – many of which were written with English as a second language. I began to assemble and mold all these contributions into a coherent whole, with consistent format and languaging. I consolidated and gave substance to a Preamble, a Purpose, and Overviews for each of the Dimensions. In short, after considerable careful attention in a different kind of group process, for I had a small editing team reading my drafts, I gradually achieved the task of coordinating the curriculum.

By June of 2005, a Version 3 was ready. The number of ecovillage educators actively working on producing the curriculum had self-selected down to twelve: this was the core group. The core group was gathered at an ecovillage in Hungary called Galgafarm for the purpose of giving the curriculum a test run – to practice delivering the curriculum on each other so that we could get a feel for the whole and work out any inconsistencies. This was an amazing event, full of love and goodwill and well-earned mutual respect. I felt a strong sense of bonding with this group, a strong sense of collective purpose, a heightened appreciation for the individuals involved. Once again, these feelings of lofty community were, I believe, more important than any technical results that were achieved.

Finally, in October 2005, a Version 4 of the curriculum was ready to be officially launched to the world. This happened at a conference held at Findhorn commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Global Ecovillage Network. By this time, the greater community of ecovillage educators working with the EDE had a group name: the GEESE – Global Ecovillage Educators for a Sustainable Earth. Also by this time, the name Gaia Education was being used in an official organizational capacity. Looking back in retrospect, I can say that this was Gaia Education's finest moment, a peak experience. Before an international assembly of some 200 people, the curriculum and the greater vision were unveiled before the world. There was much fanfare and congratulations as the international community graciously acknowledged a big step forward in our collective endeavors.

Since that time – and now we get into the organizational analysis – I have perceived a steady erosion of the collective purpose that characterized the initiative in its start-up days, before it settled into mundane existence as an "organization." I wish to propose here that it is precisely because of the absence of an organizational design that this erosion has persisted. Without 'design' – what I have defined previously as "conscious and deliberate conceptualization and pre-planning with the intended purpose of producing a desired effect or outcome" – Gaia Education – and any such organization – has seemed to move along randomly, as if by chance. More accurately, in the case of Gaia Education, the organization seems to proceed by the capricious will of the single person who has been given organizational authority. A more detailed description of the structure of the organization will be necessary to comprehend what I mean and thus support this claim.

After the peak experience of the GEN conference (or perhaps earlier) a Program Director position was established to guide, direct, and oversee the running of the organization. For the longest time, until an Administrative Assistant *to* the Director was established, this was the only paid position in the organization – so, significantly, there was an inherent concentration of power built into the system. There are limitations to such an organizational structure as everything is riding on the strengths and weaknesses of the single person in the Program Director role. The original vision was to rotate people into and out of this position on a regular basis, providing a sense of democratic power-sharing. That's why the name GEESE was chosen, for it represented an ideal within the group: in the same way that geese in flight will take turns in the lead position, with the draft wind of the leading geese supporting the flight of those behind, so the GEESE in Gaia Education would take turns in the lead position supporting and being supported by those downwind. Yet, after five years running, there has been only one person holding the central paid Program Director position. In such a situation, with no process designed for succession, great care must be taken to ensure that power entrenchment does not slip into autocracy.

And what has progressed, from an organization development perspective, over the last five years? An objective evaluation, based solely on observable events, reveals that the Program Director has consistently taken steps to consolidate and centralize the power of the position even further.

As an example, there is no transparent decision-making process. There has never been established an inter-organizational framework for discussion about important matters that affect the group as a whole, collective strategic concerns like direction, priorities, or developments and opportunities within the organization. Instead, the Program Director reveals these vital clues piecemeal, usually by sending out a group email beginning with an authoritative tone, something to the effect "It has been decided that…." Yet the emails never state *who* decided or by *what criteria*. My own personal opinion, which is not based on observable facts, is that the Program Director enjoys privileged access to the funders and it is within this special relationship that decisions are made. Within such a recondite decision-making process, other members of the organization are pushed further and further to the periphery: power stays firmly centralized. From time to time there appear from the periphery thoughtful emails, letters, or even entire papers attempting to stir some discussion concerning important collective matters like direction and priorities; but these are never responded to by the Program Director, and only rarely by the funders. The unfortunate result is that those on the periphery begin to lose interest; their voice is not heard; they have no influence; and so attempts at communication become more and more infrequent.

The remedy for such a situation, from an organizational design perspective, is to institute transparent decision-making structures and processes right from the start – structures and processes wherein everyone who is active within the organization can feel that they have

some say or influence concerning important matters that affect the whole. This is exactly the recommendations that are made in our curriculum to those who would start an ecovillage; yet, in ironic contradiction, these recommendations are not heeded by those who profess to be the teachers.

Another example of the consistent consolidation and concentration of power can be found in the extended organizational structure, as it has come to be established. The Program Director has two residences: one at Findhorn and the other in Brazil. Gaia Education was set up as a Charitable Trust based in Scotland and housed at Findhorn. (The incorporation documents, including the vital description of the purpose of the organization, as I found out later, were written not by committee but solely by the Program Director). Of the three Board members, two are residents of Findhorn and the third is the principal funder. In such an arrangement, it starts to appear that Gaia Education has been turned into a program of the Findhorn Foundation. Actually, it does extend a bit further: There has been an amazing proliferation of Gaia Education courses in Brazil. At these courses, *teachers are flown in from Findhorn*. Of course, on one level, the proliferation of courses must be a reflection of the disposition and interests of the Brazilian people; yet, a real issue is raised concerning where the concentration of *funding* has been going, for, like decision-making, the allocation of funding is not made transparent. With so much energy going back and forth between Findhorn and Brazil, huge potential markets like North America, Australia, and to some extent Asia lay dormant, virtually neglected.

In another incident involving the consolidation and concentration of power, the Program Director recently got permission from the Board to upgrade the EDE curriculum to Version 5, and was given a substantial budget to carry out this task. The ostensible purpose of the upgrade was to add 'urban' material – content relevant to urban situations. A Symposium was planned at a host site in Sao Paulo, Brazil, ostensibly, once again, because the Brazilians have the most experience delivering the curriculum in urban milieu. Yet, when it came time for the Symposium, no urban material was presented; instead, the participants were asked to get in small groups and work creatively on coming up with new names for Modules! The Program Director is now attempting to push through a lopsided Brazilian version of the curriculum, bypassing and circumventing all the careful, thoughtful group process that went into the production of all previous versions of the curriculum.

They say that absolute power corrupts absolutely; and I'm afraid that aphorism is demonstrating its veracity in the lack of organizational design at Gaia Education. In the absence of pre-planned structure and process, and with all power and authority concentrated in just one position, the direction and priorities of the organization are left, as I claimed at the beginning, to the capricious will of the person filling that position. It would take a special sort of character not to be tempted to use that power and authority for self-serving ends. From this

case study, it becomes apparent that one of the fundamentals of good organizational design is to purposefully and co-creatively distribute power and authority.

If I were hired as an Organization Development consultant by Gaia Education, I would make the following recommendations:

1) Initiate an organizational design process from the very beginning, from the very first steps. Reconvene the core group and give as much care and attention to the design of the organization as went into the design of the curriculum.
2) Establish committees to draw up a Vision Statement and a Mission Statement that can be approved by all.
3) Re-incorporate the organization. Use committees to transcribe Articles of Incorporation and a careful set of Bylaws, once again approved by all.
4) If it is decided in the group design process that a Program Director position is still desirable, then provide this position with a clear enunciation of responsibilities and expectations.
5) Radically de-centralize the organization, for this is its greatest strength – to be part of an international network. Institute a 'distributed network' form of organization, where power and authority are equitably dispersed and re-constituted into multiple, active, inter-relating and cross-referencing nodes.
6) Establish an inter-organizational forum – more than just a group email – where ideas and opinions can be shared by all. This forum should have a moderator, where ideas and suggestions are carefully evaluated to influence an ongoing organizational evolution. Important feedback also could come from questionnaires and surveys.
7) Institute 1-, 5-, and 10-year plans.
8) Employ a full-time fund-raiser who gets paid out of commissions from the funding secured.
9) Utilize a Participatory Action Research process to carefully evaluate the results and findings, the lessons learned, from the first five years, and the desired direction for the future.

Gaia Education is in a unique position to influence current global trends. A creative organizational design will help ensure that the organization remains active and vital long beyond the life-spans of its current members – and that is the whole point of an organization after all.

If an astrological interpretation were permitted, the symbolism of transits reveals that a powerful rebirth is possible toward the end of 2012, early 2013. Until that time, current dynamics will probably need to play themselves out; however, beginning a design process soon

will provide needed shape and form for this rebirth – a bright new face that Gaia Education can wear before the world.

Bibliography

- Aldrich, H. E. (1999) *Organizations Evolving.* SAGE Publications, Ltd.; London
- Anderson, P. (1999) "Complexity Theory and Organization Science." *Organization Science,* 10: 216–32
- Argyris, C. (1982) *Reasoning, Learning and Action: Individual and Organizational.* Jossey-Bass; San Francisco
- Argyris, C. (1996) *Organizational Learning II.* Addison-Wesley; Reading, MA
- Barnard, C. I. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive.* Harvard University Press; Cambridge, MA
- Blau, P. M. (1974) *On the Nature of Organizations.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; New York
- Bourgeois, L.J. (1980) "Strategy and Environment: A Conceptual Integration." *Academy of Management Review,* 5, pp. 25–39
- Brown, J.S. and P. Duguid (1991) "Organizational Learning and Communities of Practice: Towards a Unified View of Working, Learning, and Innovation." *Organization Science,* 2: 40–57
- Burke, W. W. (1994) *Organization Development: A Process of Learning and Changing, 2nd Edition.* Wipf and Stock Publishers; Eugene, OR
- Burns, T. and G.M. Stalker (1961) *The Management of Innovation.* Tavistok; London
- Burton, R.M., DeSanctis, G. and B. Obel (2006) *Organizational Design: A Step-by- Step Approach.* Cambridge University Press; UK
- Castells, M. (2000) "Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society." *British Journal of Sociology,* 51: 5–24
- Choo, C. (1998) *The Knowing Organization.* Oxford University Press; New York
- Cohen, M.D. and L.S. Sproull, editors (1996) *Organizational Learning.* SAGE Publications; Thousand Oaks, CA

⊞ Czarniawska, B. (1998) *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies.* Qualitative Research Methods Series; SAGE Publications; Thousand Oaks, CA

⊞ DeSanctis, G. and J. Fulk, editors (1999) *Shaping Organization Form: Communication, Connection, and Community.* SAGE Publications; Newbury Park, CA

⊞ Duncan, R.B. (1972) "Characteristics of Organizational Environments and Perceived Environmental Uncertainty." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 17(3), pp. 313–27

⊞ Etzioni, A. (1964) *Modern Organizations.* Prentice-Hall; Englewood Cliffs, NJ

⊞ French, W.L. and C.H. Bell, Jr. (2007) *Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement: Sixth Edition.* Prentice-Hall of India; New Delhi

⊞ Frost, P. J., et al., editors (1991) *Reframing Organizational Culture.* SAGE Publications; Newbury Park, CA

⊞ Galbraith, J. (1973) *Designing Complex Organizations.* Addison-Wesley Publishing Company; Reading, MA

⊞ Galbraith, J., Lawler, E. E. and Associates (1993) *Organizing for the Future.* Jossey-Bass Publishers; San Francisco

⊞ Galbraith, J., Downey, D. and A. Kates (2002) *Designing Dynamic Organizations.* American Management Association; New York

⊞ Gresov, C. and R. Drazin (1997) "Equifinality: Functional Equivalence in Organization Design." *Academy of Management Review,* 22(2), pp. 403–28

⊞ Gulati, R., Nohria, N. and A. Zaheer (2000) "Strategic Networks." *Strategic Management Journal,* 21: 203–15

⊞ Hall, R. H. (1999) *Organizations: Structures, Processes, Outcomes: Seventh Edition.* Prentice-Hall, Inc.; Upper Saddle River, NJ

⊞ Hassard, J. (1991) "Multiple Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: A Case Study." *Organization Studies,* 12/2: 275–99

⊞ Hofstede, G. (1991) *Cultures and Organizations.* HarperCollins; London

⊞ Kimberley, J. R., Miles, R. A. and Associates, editors (1980) *The Organizational Life Cycle.* Jossey-Bass; San Francisco

⊞ Lawrence, P.R, and J.W. Lorsch (1967) *Organization and Environment.* Harvard Business Press; Boston

⊞ Lewin, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science.* HarperCollins; New York

⊞ March, J.G. (1981) "Decision-Making Perspective," in A.H. Van de Ven and W.F. Joyce, editors, *Perspectives on Organizational Design and Behavior.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; New York

⊞ Marshak, R. J. (2009) *Organizational Change: Views from the Edge.* The Lewin Center; Bethel, ME

- Martin, J. (1992) *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives.* Oxford University Press; New York
- McGregor, D. (2006) *The Human Side of Enterprise: Annotated Edition.* McGraw-Hill; New York
- Meyers, P.S., editor (1996) *Knowledge Management and Organizational Design.* Butterworth-Heinemann; Boston
- Miles, R.E. and C.C. Snow (1986) "Network Organizations: New Concepts for New Forms." *California Management Review,* 28, pp. 62–75
- Miles, R., E. and C.C. Snow (2003) *Organizational Strategy, Structure and Process.* Stanford Business Classics; Stanford, CA
- Miller, D. (1992) "Environmental Fit Versus Internal Fit." *Organizational Science,* 3(2), pp. 159–78
- Moldoveanu, M.C. and J.A.C. Baum (2002) "Contemporary Debates in Organizational Epistemology," in J.A.C. Baum, editor, *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations.* Blackwell; Oxford, UK
- Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of Organization.* SAGE Publications; Beverly Hills, CA
- Morril, C. and G. Fine (1997) "Ethnographic Contributions to Organizational Sociology." *Sociological Methods and Research,* 25: 424–51
- Nadler, D. A., Gersten, M. S., Shaw, R. B. and Associates (1992) *Organizational Architecture.* Jossey-Bass Publishers; San Francisco
- Orlikowski, W.J. (1996) "Improvising Organizational Transformation over Time: A Situated Change Perspective." *Information Systems Research,* 7: 63–92
- Pfeffer, J. (1981) *Power in Organizations.* Pitman Press; Marshfield, MA
- Polanyi, M. (1996) *The Tacit Dimension.* Routledge & Kegan Paul; London
- Porter, M.E. (1991) "Towards a Dynamic Theory of Strategy." *Strategic Management Journal,* 12: 95–117
- Reed, J. (2000) "A Practitioner's View of Management." *Academy of Management Executive,* 14/1: 56–62
- Rivkin, J. and L. Fleming (2004) "Complexity, Networks, and Knowledge Flow." *Research Policy,* 33(10), pp. 1615–34
- Robbins, S.P. (1990) *Organization Theory: Structure, Design and Applications.* Prentice-Hall; Englewood Cliffs, NJ
- Robertson, B.J. (2009) "Organization Evolved: Introducing Holacracy." HolacracyOne, LLC, Introductory Document
- Rousseau, D. (1990) "Assessing Organizational Culture: The Case for Multiple Methods," in B. Schneider, editor, *Frontiers of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3.* Jossey-Bass; San Francisco
- Sanders, P. (1982) "Phenomenology: A New Way of Viewing Organizational Research." *Academy of Management Review,* 7(3), 353–60

- Schein, E. (1985) *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* Jossey-Bass; San Francisco

- Schon, D. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner.* Jossey-Bass; San Francisco

- Scott, W.R. (1964) "Theory of Organizations," in *Handbook of Modern Sociology,* edited by Robert E.L. Farris, Rand McNally; Chicago

- Scott, W.R. (1987) *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems.* Prentice-Hall International; Englewood Cliffs, NJ

- Senge, P. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization.* Doubleday Currency; New York

- Silverman, D. (1970) *The Theory of Organizations.* Basic Books; New York

- Smircich, L. (1983) "Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 28: 339-58

- Stablein, R. and W. Nord (1985) "Practical and Emancipatory Interests in Organizational Symbolism: A Review and Evaluation." *Journal of Management,* 11: 13-28

- Stevenson, W. B. (1990) "Formal Structure and Networks of Interaction within Organizations." *Social Science Research,* 19: 112-31

- Taylor, J.R. and E.J. Van Every (2000) *The Emergent Organization.* Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates; Mahwah, NJ

- Tenbrunsel, A.E., et al. (1996) "Cognition in Organization," in S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W.R. Nord, editors, *Handbook of Organization Studies.* SAGE Publications; London

- Thachankary, T. (1992) "Organizations as "Texts:" Hermeneutics as a Model for Understanding Organizational Change." *Research in Organizational Change and Development,* 6: 197-233

- Tsoukas, H. (1996) "The Firm as a Distributed Knowledge System: A Constructionist Approach." *Strategic Management Journal,* 17/Special Winter Issue: 11-26

- Tsoukas, H. (1998) "Forms of Knowledge and Forms of Life in Organized Contexts," in R. Chia, editor, *In the Realm of Organization.* Routledge; London

- Tsoukas, H. and C. Knudsen, editors (2005) *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory: Meta-Theoretical Perspectives.* Oxford University Press; UK

- Weber, M., translated by A.M. Parsons and T. Parsons (1947) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* Free Press; New York

- Weick, K.E. (1979) *The Social Psychology of Organizing.* McGraw-Hill; New York

⊞ Weick, K.E. (1987) "Theorizing about Organizational Communication," in L.M. Porter, et al., editors, *Handbook of Organizational Communication.* SAGE Publications; Beverly Hills, CA

⊞ Wheatley, M. J. (1999) *Leadership and the New Science.* Berrett-Koehler Publishers; San Francisco

⊞ Whetten, D, and P. Godfrey, editors (1998) *Identity in Organizations.* SAGE Publications; Thousand Oaks, CA

⊞ Whyte, W.F. (1991) *Social Theory for Action: How Individuals and Organizations Learn to Change.* SAGE Publications; Newbury Park, CA