



Australian  
Institute of  
Management



# final report

Project Code: AIM.001

Prepared by: Graham Firth  
Australian Institute of Management

Date published: September 2009

ISBN: 74036 043 5

PUBLISHED BY  
Meat and Livestock Australia Limited  
Locked Bag 991  
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

## Lamb and Sheep Meat Industry Leadership Project

Meat & Livestock Australia acknowledges the matching funds provided by the Australian Government to support the research and development detailed in this publication.

This publication is published by Meat & Livestock Australia Limited ABN 39 081 678 364 (MLA). Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However MLA cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in the publication. You should make your own enquiries before making decisions concerning your interests. Reproduction in whole or in part of this publication is prohibited without prior written consent of MLA.

## **Contents**

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
1.2 Objectives and Methodology	4
1.3 Key Findings	4
1.4 Conclusions	6
1.5 Recommendations	7
<b>2. Background to the Research</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Objectives and Methodology</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Objectives	9
3.2 Methodology	9
<b>4. Key Findings – Industry Participants</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 Towards a Model of Industry Leadership	10
4.2 The Challenges	12
4.3 Obstacles	13
<b>5. Key Findings – Leadership Development</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1 Determining the Need	14
5.2 Post-Course Evaluation	15
5.3 Curricula	15
5.4 Program Extensions – The Use of Projects	17
5.5 Alumni Groups	17
5.6 Participation by the Industry	19
5.7 Mentoring	20
<b>6. Key Findings – Desk Research</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 Leadership – A Process	21
6.2 Leadership – A Systems Approach	21
6.3 Leadership – A New Philosophy	22
6.4 Leadership – Competencies	23
<b>7. Conclusions</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1 A Leadership Model for the Lamb and Sheep Meat Industry in the Twenty-first Century	23
7.2 Implementation	24
7.3 Leadership Development	24
7.4 Mentoring/Coaching	25
7.5 Ownership of the New Model of Leadership	25
<b>8. Recommended Actions</b>	<b>25</b>
8.1 Agree the Development and Implementation of the Model	25
8.2 Launch the Model at the SCA November Workshop	25
8.3 Agree a Pilot Implementation	25
8.4 Identify Funding to Support the Pilot Program and its Eventual Roll-Out	26
8.5 Negotiate and Secure Leadership Development Support	26
8.6 Structure an “Industry Career Path” for all Levels of Participants	26
8.7 Local Implementation	26
8.8 State and National Level Participation	26
8.9 Agree and Monitor Required Outcomes	27
8.10 Communicate	27

<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>31</b>
Implementing the New Leadership Model	31
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>36</b>
Proposal to Meat & Livestock Australia on Leadership in the Lamb & Sheepmeat Industry in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	36
<b>Appendix C1</b>	<b>41</b>
Structured Interview Formats - Industry Knowledge Chain Participants	41
<b>Appendix C2</b>	<b>43</b>
Structured Interview Formats - Leadership Development Providers	43
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>45</b>
Demographic Summary of Interviewees	45
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b>46</b>
The Next Step – A General Review	46
<b>Appendix F</b>	<b>50</b>
Emotional Intelligence (EQ) Domains and Associated Competencies	50
<b>Appendix G</b>	<b>52</b>
Building the Leadership Capacity of the Australian Dairy Industry	52

## **1. Executive Summary**

“Leadership is the capacity of a human community to shape its future and specifically to sustain the significant processes of change required to do so.” Senge, P. et al, (1999) The Challenges of Sustaining Momentum in Learning Organisations

### **1.1 Background**

As the Lamb and Sheepmeat Industry has matured over the last ten years, the model of leadership it has utilised has served its emergence as an industry in its own right. In recent years, some disquiet has been expressed at all levels about the industry leadership of the future. The ability to implement initiatives throughout the industry, to harness the talent of younger industry participants and the overall development of the industry to achieve its current goal of preferred supplier of lamb and sheepmeat products to the global food market are seen to be constrained by the lack of a model of leadership specific to the industry and its present state of development.

Meat & Livestock Australia commissioned the Australian Institute of Management NSW to undertake a research project into the views and needs of the industry participants and those who provide services, particularly in the area of leadership development, to the industry.

### **1.2 Objectives and Methodology**

The objectives of the research were to review current leadership development opportunities available to the industry, the level of participation in these, the needs of industry participants to develop and support leadership in the industry and make recommendations as to activities that need to be undertaken to support the development of industry leadership. The objectives are more fully detailed in Appendix B.

The methodology employed in the project consisted of structured interviews with industry participants and with leadership development providers. Concurrently, a significant literature search and further desk research was also undertaken, to identify leadership models that may be appropriate to the industry in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

A number of challenges were identified in the research. Specifically, these were around the lack of a representative cross-section of the industry participating in the interview phase. The sample contacted tended to be representative of the more active, involved and educated industry participants. Additionally, they tended to be from Victoria and South Australia. The researchers do not feel that these challenges in any way diminish or negate the value of the contribution of these participants to addressing the objectives of the research.

### **1.3 Key Findings**

#### ***1.3.1 Industry Participant Interviewees***

The overall attitude expressed by the interviewees was positive and optimistic. There was an evident pride in the emergence and achievement of the industry. Some participants expressed a wish for the industry to develop a stronger, “better” image to attract more participants. At least two people used the term “more sexy” in reference to the desired image. A number of positive leadership behaviours were mentioned, including the work of some “cutting edge producers in alliance with marketing/processor groups”, the impact of LAMBPLAN, specific lamb development groups and the leading role of some processors through supply groups.

Along with this optimism came a significant number of comments about what is not working in the industry's leadership. There were references made to "talk-fests", vested interest and competitiveness of some established leaders of the industry, the lack of younger industry participants stepping up to leadership roles and the reluctance or inability of some innovative producers to have a wider impact on the industry.

When mentioning what is missing in the industry leadership, respondents mentioned the lack of direction for the industry, poor overall leadership skills in the industry, the dominance of state-based and other ineffectual organisations and the negative impact on younger people who do step forward to involve themselves in leadership of the present culture of the "older leaders".

The interviewees also identified significant challenges for industry leadership, including the shrinking group of people available for leadership in the next 5 – 10 years, the overall level of "non-participation" by industry members, the conflict of demands on time, especially on younger industry members and the entrenched attitude of the older industry participants towards the younger ones. This last issue tended to focus on the fact that the contributions of younger people on committees, development teams and the like were dismissed by the older members. This discouraged the younger people from participating, further exacerbating the issue of the shrinking numbers of possible leadership participants.

### **1.3.2 Leadership Development**

A number of leadership development providers were interviewed and a number of programs reviewed. Some of the reviews were of published material only, some involved discussions with the course providers and some included interviews with graduates of the program.

Overall, the value and benefit of most of the offerings to the future industry leadership model was small. Many of the courses currently available lacked the rigours of detailed training needs analyses, a statement of targeted outcomes of the program in terms of leadership development, ongoing evaluation of participants against any goals or outcomes and any follow-up validation of the impact of the programs on the individual, their community and their industry. Some programs, such as the QDPI Building Rural Leaders program and the package of initiatives delivered under Progress Rural WA, have had extensive follow-up research into the value they have delivered. These are, however, the exceptions to the norm.

Another identified problem with many of the development opportunities available is the curriculum content. Most programs currently available have, as part of their curriculum, a fairly traditional approach to "leadership". The traditional model of leadership delivered by most of these programs is the "hero-leader" model, focussed on skills such as negotiating, influencing and media management at a national level and meeting management, minute-taking and decision-making processes at a local level. The programs are slanted to develop leaders, not leadership. The focus is internal, on the individual and not external, on the community within which the "leader" will interact.

A beneficial aspect of many of the current development offerings is the inclusion of some form of self-diagnostic instrument. The use of these tools contributes to an understanding of individual differences and the benefit of understanding and capitalising on these differences. In some ways, this aspect of curricula contributes to a more collaborative style of leadership, acknowledging the benefit of differences between people.

The research identified a number of programs, which are incorporating aspects of a newer approach to leadership and to the development of social, community or industry leadership. These programs typically use external involvement in projects as part of the curriculum, employ coaches and mentors to support the participants' involvement in community and have some form of post-program evaluation, which assesses the impact of the individual's participation on the program, in terms of their impact on their community. Some of the more "senior" programs, such as the Australian Rural Leadership Program (ARLP) and the Sydney Leadership Program of the Benevolent Society of NSW have alumni groups as the focus and vehicle for post-course activity and contribution to the community.

Finally, this part of the research showed a low participation rate by lamb and sheepmeat industry members in programs ranging from the ARLP, through the Marcus Oldham Rural Leadership program, to FarmBis One, covering the period of 1998 to 2001.

### **1.3.3 Desk Research**

The literature and desk research highlighted the extensive availability of material relevant to leadership in general and as may be relevant to the industry.

Key researchers/writers on leadership in the 1990s presented a continuum of thought from leadership as a process, through leadership as a systems approach, to a concept of leadership as a collaborative activity carried out by all levels of the “community of commitment”. In the mid-90s and years since, a “new philosophy” of leadership has emerged. It defines leadership as directing “the work of the group”, happening in relationships within social structures and harnessing the work, social and belief systems of the group or organisation. This concept of leadership as part of the system or culture of the organisation was first espoused by the sociologist Max Weber over one hundred years ago and has been recently supported by publications such as Collins & Porras (1994) *Built to Last*. In this book, the authors maintain that successful companies that survive and thrive do so because leadership development is part of the organisation’s systems and culture. Johnson & Johnson (J & J) has been the subject of much research because of their focus on leadership development. Their current Chairman and CEO, Ralph Larsen, states that “Leadership is the biggest single constraint to growth at J & J and it’s the most critical business issue we face.” The company therefore invests heavily in leadership development as a critical contributor to change and innovation.

The literature search also identified a set of competencies that are likely to support the desired model of leadership for the industry in the future. The concept of Emotional Intelligence and its competencies has a demonstrable contribution to the development and implementation of the industry’s leadership of the future.

## **1.4 Conclusions**

The research concluded that there is a need for the development and implementation of a new leadership model for the industry. It should be based around the ideas of shared leadership, leadership as relationship and leadership in community. In combination with the competencies of the Emotional Intelligence model, this new leadership model addresses most of the concerns of the interviewees about problems with current leadership activity and the desire for the emergence of a new leadership model for the future. The new model provides the platform to harness and leverage the leadership capabilities of a much wider range of industry participants than is presently engaged.

The challenge of leadership development to support this new model has been investigated and addressed. There are a number of current initiatives that suggest that some organisations and providers have adopted many of the concepts underpinning the proposed leadership model for the industry. Examples are the use of mentors for program participants, who are involved in community leadership activity as part of the program curriculum, between formal “classroom-type” development sessions. These types of development in the curricula of leadership programs, in conjunction with an espousing of collaborative leadership, suggest that the necessary support for leadership development in the new model can be sourced.

## **1.5 Recommendations**

- 1.5.1 *Accept and agree the development and implementation of the New Leadership Model for the industry.***
- 1.5.2 *launch the model in an appropriate manner, perhaps in co-sponsorship with the SCA.***
- 1.5.3 *Agree a Pilot Implementation group or region for 2003.***
- 1.5.4 *Identify funding to support the Pilot Program and its eventual roll-out beyond 2003.***
- 1.5.5 *Negotiate and secure Leadership Development support from an appropriate provider. This support should be structured so as to be eligible for FarmBi\$ funding.***
- 1.5.6 *Structure an “Industry Career Path” for all levels of industry participants, whereby each development opportunity can build on previous ones and contribute to a feeling of moving progression towards an “industry” qualification.***
- 1.5.7 *Plan the roll-out to provide local implementation as the first experience of the leadership model, building on this to regional, state, national implementation.***
- 1.5.8 *Ensure initial state and national level participation in the pilot program and subsequent local roll-out of the model.***
- 1.5.9 *Agree and monitor required outcomes for the industry from the implementation of the new model.***
- 1.5.10 *Communicate extensively within and outside the industry about the model and its objectives and contribution to the industry. Secure support for its implementation from all possible sources within and beyond the industry and leverage from the experience of other rural industries.***

## **2. Background to the Research**

Over the last ten years, the lamb and sheep meat industry, particularly the prime lamb segment, is seen to have emerged and matured as an industry in its own right, separate from the wool industry and the provision of mutton as a by-product of wool growing. What seems not to have occurred is the emergence of a strong identity and image for the lamb and sheep meat sector, nor the evolution of a strong industry leadership model which has application at all levels of the industry, from local communities, through regions, states and at national and international levels.

Concern about the lack of an effective and individual leadership model for the industry is common among a number of key contributors to this industry. Many local, even regional initiatives have been undertaken and are continuing. The inability to spread these, including even LAMBPLAN, in a consistent, not necessarily uniform, manner throughout the industry has given rise to need to identify a unique operational model of leadership. Additionally, the industry, like many others, faces the challenge of rapid and discontinuous change, resulting from the impact of forces such as globalisation and technology change.

The work of the Sheepmeat Council of Australia (SCA) in developing a strategy for the industry some years back – “One Billion by 2000” – is now in need of a next step. The ability to implement an industry strategy for the immediate future, to position the Australian industry as “the leading global food market provider of lamb and sheep meat products”, will require a leadership model which will engage and coordinate the activities and efforts of players at all levels of the supply chain and in all regions of the nation. Similarly, many initiatives such as the Sustainable Grain and Grazing System, now called Grain and Graze, or the MLA’s Supply Chain Management project require local and community leadership for their successes and for the desired return on the investment in these and other programs and initiatives.

As one response to this need for a leadership paradigm that meets the needs of the lamb and sheep meat industry in 2002 and beyond, MLA commissioned the Australian Institute of Management NSW to undertake a research project in to the views and attitudes of industry participants and those who provide services, particularly in the area of leadership development programs, to the industry.



### **3. Objectives and Methodology**

#### **3.1 Objectives**

The objectives of this project are:

To review and identify activities needed to enable achievement of the Sheep Industry Strategic Plan goal of “Australia as the leading global food market provider of lamb and sheepmeat products” by:

- 1) Reviewing current leadership development activities and courses available to the lamb and sheepmeat industry participants to identify who is participating, what s the impact, what are the gaps.
- 2) Identifying clearly the needs of lamb and sheepmeat industry participants to develop and support leadership skills.
- 3) Recommending actions or activities that need to be undertaken to achieve the project objective.
- 4) Providing an implementation plan to deliver on recommendations.

#### **3.2 Methodology**

The methodology employed to meet these objectives consisted of two activities – structured interviews and desk research.

##### ***3.2.1 Structured Interviews***

Two structured interview formats were developed to enable the collection of data about leadership behaviours and about available leadership development initiatives. Both interview formats were approved by the MLA client representatives prior to their use. The interview formats are attached at Appendix C.

A cross-section of industry participants was identified as representing the “industry knowledge chain” and classified in to one of four categories – producers, processors, industry body members and leadership development providers. These people were contacted either in person or by telephone and were asked to contribute through the structured interview format. As a number of the interview participants requested confidentiality or anonymity, a table of only the demographics of the interviewees is attached at Appendix D.

##### ***3.2.2 Literature Search and other Desk Research***

Concurrently, a literature search was conducted using select “key words” to identify current journal articles, books and other publications of relevance to leadership in the rural sector. These publications were reviewed for significant content. An additional Internet search was conducted of established centres of excellence for leadership, such as Harvard University, the Centre for Creative Leadership in North Carolina USA and the Leadership Victoria Williamson Community Leadership Program, established in 1990. Further Internet searches of government departments and leadership development providers were also conducted.

In a number of instances, reports of the evaluation of existing development activities were obtained and reviewed. Some course providers also made available their curricula and course content details.

### **3.3 Methodology Challenges**

An issue in the research is the limited cross-section of industry participants that were contacted for interview. The manner in which target interviewees were identified meant that they are not representative of the lamb and sheep meat industry. It was the observation of the researchers that most of the “producer” interviewees were computer literate, participating in LAMPLAN or a local lamb development team or were alumni of one of the major leadership development programs available to the rural sector. It could be said, then, that the people interviewed represent only the top 20% or so of industry participants, in terms of level of activity in the industry.

Similarly, there was not a representative distribution of participants across the country (see Appendix D). Neither of these challenges diminishes the relevance and impact of the data obtained during the structured interviews.

## **4. Key Findings – Industry Participants**

The interview responses highlighted a large number of things that have worked and are working for the industry. Overall, the attitude of the survey participants as expressed in their comments is optimistic. There is a degree of pride in the industry becoming more than a by-product of the wool industry. There is a yearning for the industry to become more attractive, especially to younger people – to be more “sexy” (used by two different respondents). Some of these concerns were mirrored in the issues raised by young producers/agents at a recent South Australian Lamb Development Team forum held at Coonawarra, so they are evident across many levels and regions of the industry.

In considering a leadership model, the responses of interview participants gave the good and the bad (and even the ugly) of the present leadership behaviour evidenced in the industry. These are detailed in the next two sections.

### **4.1 Towards a Model of Industry Leadership**

#### ***4.1.1 “What leadership behaviour is presently seen or experienced in the industry?”***

The strongest single comment received from producer and processor participants was that the present leadership behaviour they observed as being effective tended to be based around local groups and/or teams:

“Cutting-edge producers in alliance with marketing/processor groups”;

“LAMBPLAN”;

“Local lamb groups bringing motivated producers together”;

“Lamb development groups in South Australia are dynamic”;

“South Australian lamb development teams”;

“Processors through their marketing groups, their control of the supply chain and their access to the marketplace”;

“The local and regional leaders who can sell an idea and get others on board – *industry stalwarts*”.

There was a strong sense of respect for the more traditional style of “hero-leaders” who have led the establishment of the industry to date and who, through their efforts and investment of time, have shaped the basis for future development.

The negative comments on leadership behaviour that was currently being exhibited in the industry tended to focus on the proliferation of boards and committees which became “talk-fests”, the lack of coordination among a diversified and often self-interested groups, the small number of individual leaders who invariably get “burned out” running their own business as well as off-farm activities and the traditional (“wool industry”) model of leader who is too inwardly focussed and not responsive to the changes that the development of the industry have wrought. A final and insightful comment from a national body member highlighted that leadership from innovative producers tended to stay local unless there was an opportunity for political or other connections to allow the expansion of the influence of that innovator.

Overall, comments about current effective leadership behaviour showed a definite inclination to a community-based, team-based model.

### ***4.1.2 “What forms or type of leadership behaviour is missing in the industry?”***

The comments about what is missing in the industry in the way of leadership focussed most significantly on the lack of a strategic plan for the industry, problems of inter-state competition and the dominance of state-based systems and other ineffectual organisations and the lack of leadership skills in general and particularly amongst the younger industry participants (18 – 35 year age group). Specific responses included:

“There is no current strategic plan for the industry”;

“The industry is now a little direction-less (*after the year 2000 goal to be the leading supplier of sheep meat to the world*)”

“The industry has a hangover of the wool culture – a strong agri-political/political model”;

“Overall leadership skills in the industry are poor”;

“There is a dominance of state-based systems and other ineffectual organisations”;

“The present culture of older ‘leaders’ inhibits the development of new, younger entrepreneurial leaders”;

“There is insufficient participation by producers – they’re not standing up to be counted and participate”;

“Among the ‘new faces’ there is a poor understanding of politics and processes and how things work, so they are likely to get stonewalled and become disillusioned”;

“Needs to be an identification and development of late 20s to late 30s people as the prospective future leaders”;

“Target the bright Ag Science graduates and pay them to take leadership roles in the industry, through research, as development and extension officers and as professional committee participants to facilitate the spread of different initiatives”.

More specific responses to what is missing in leadership in the industry brought the following “one-off” type remarks:

“Market focus and responsiveness”;

“Leadership that doesn’t have vested self-interest or an axe to grind”;

“The impact of leaders brought in from outside the industry”;

“A leverage of the balance between domestic and export markets to influence and resist the push of the bigger processors, especially Woolworths and Coles”;

“Innovation and change in all areas of production and distribution”.

## **4.2 The Challenges**

Emerging from the comments made in response to the structured interview questions and to the general discussions that inevitably followed, a number of challenges were identified by participants.

### **4.2.1 Demographics, the Age Gap and “Generation X”**

A significant number of comments noted above and observations made in further discussions focussed on the problem of the age of the current “industry leaders” (the “stalwarts” to quote one senior industry person) and the gap to the post-baby boomer industry participants. Australian census data shows that the population bulge of the baby boomers is not followed by a similar size (as a percentage of the overall population) of those born in the 1970s – the “Generation Xers”. A similar problem of numbers of people exists for the next generation – those born in the 1980s and now approaching adulthood and their entry in to whatever industry they might choose to follow. The lamb and sheep meat industry therefore has fewer people to attract to it among Generation X and they have a wider variety of choice than was the case for the baby boomer generation and its antecedents.

In addition to this problem of overall numbers of people and increased options for them is the problem of the difference between the generations in attitudes towards community participation and volunteering for things. In his book *Generations*, Hugh Mackay speaks of the “options generation” (Chapter 4) in referring to those born in the 1970s. What typifies these people, according to Mackay’s research, is their *individuality*. They have learned “to keep their options open, to wait and see what will happen next, to postpone long-term commitments in favour of short-term goals and temporary solutions” (p137.). They also have a significant expectation of change as a constant in their lives, particularly in their employment.

Mackay’s summary of the Generation X values and attitudes suggests that they are less likely than their parents to voluntarily participate in community activities – including such things as local pastoral committees and development teams. If and when they do participate, what they are looking to get out of their participation is likely to be more self-focussed than community- or industry-focussed. Research by Volunteering Australia and *communitybuilders.nsw* (see *References and Bibliography*) on why younger people do volunteer suggests that the typical and traditional committees and boards do not offer the necessary appeal of fixed and clear goals that are attainable in the short-term. Generation X volunteers seek to achieve significant outcomes in a short time frame, to gain skills and knowledge through their participation and to see, as a result of their participation, something in it for them, not just something that contributes to “the greater good”. The objectives of the organisations that will attract the Generation X volunteers must be targeting outcomes that are of meaning and value to them.

#### **4.2.2 The Non-Participants**

Already mentioned above is the problem of non-participation. This research contacted people who are representative of perhaps only 20%, at best, of lamb and sheep meat industry participants. Many of those interviewed expressed concern about the identification, encouragement and development of the future leadership for the industry. The *pool* of future leadership capability is scarce, at present.

In addressing the challenge of a leadership model for the industry's future, it must look at strategies to attract and engage a greater percentage of industry people than is represented in this research. To meet the needs of the industry in achieving the objective of "the leading global food market provider of lamb and sheepmeat products", a focus on building and expanding the industry as a whole will require a broader leadership base than has been active in the past. This leadership base will be more effective in enabling the implementation of any advances in the industry, whether genetic, market-based or around things related to industry standards. The size of the impact to be gained by taking along the "already converted" will be far less than if the greater proportion of industry members can also be enticed to participate. Thus, in a consideration of "return on effort", future leadership models and strategies must also target the so-called "non participants" in expanding the learning base of the industry, by building the industry's social capital through the interaction of networks with other networks.

Thus the challenge for the leadership of the industry in the medium term of 5 to 10 years identified by interviewees will require a focus on attracting this broader base of industry participants, with a particular emphasis on the Generation Xers.

The research identified by Dr. Jennifer Andrew (2002) of Resource Policy & Management Pty Ltd identifies issues that surround both the concept of non-participation and some suggestions for overcoming the phenomenon. In particular, two papers cited by Andrew are of relevance:

Kilpatrick, S., Bell, R. & Falk, I. (1998) Groups of Groups: the Role of group Learning in Building Social Capital, paper presented at AVERTA 1998 Conference, the University of Technology, Sydney, February 16 – 17. (available at University of Tasmania's Centre for Research and Learning in Regional Australia: <http://www.crlra.utas.edu.au>)

Kelly, D., (2001) Community Participation in Rangeland Management – a report for the Rural industries research and development Corporation, RIRDC Publication No 01/019, RIRDC Project No QDL-2A

### **4.3 Obstacles**

Discussion with interviewees from both the industry knowledge chain and training service providers suggested that an obstacle to any initiative to increase the participation in industry leadership by younger people would encounter a number of obstacles. These obstacles are likely to be different to those preventing greater participation by older generations in the industry, who might need to be involved through other strategies than those applicable to the 18 – 35 year age group.

#### **4.3.1 Time Demands**

The first potential obstacle identified is that of conflicting demands on the time of younger industry members. Many are only fairly recently established in their business and have a strong priority commitment of their time to their business. Many are also parents in young families, with time demands by their children for school committees, sports participation and the like.

Positioning a role in industry leadership as a priority for these busy people will be a challenge which can only be met through providing some of the features mentioned in Section 4.2.1 above. Some of these attractors may be more readily available to the younger people at a local, community level, but the research did not detect that there is necessarily a sufficient depth of talent and interested people at this level, as opposed to the state and national levels.

### **4.3.2 Entrenched Attitudes**

A number of interviewees recounted anecdotal stories of boards or committees at which they had been present and at which they observed another obstacle to the increased involvement of younger industry people. The stories told by these people highlighted the entrenched attitudes of the older leaders of the board or committee – the “stalwarts”. Their response to suggestions or initiatives from younger people tended to be dismissive, giving those younger people the feelings of not being listened to. This engendered an attitude in them of “why bother?” A sufficient repetition of this type of situation will totally discourage participation in industry leadership by the desired younger generation.

## **5. Key Findings – Leadership Development**

This research looked at a range of leadership development initiatives and programs at national, state, regional, local and industry-specific levels including:

- \* Australian Rural Leadership Program, Rabobank Executive Development Program for Primary Producers, AFFA Young Rural Leaders’ Course, Marcus Oldham Rural Leadership Program - **national**;
- \* QDPI Building Rural Leaders program, Progress Rural Western Australia programs, Benevolent Society NSW Rural Communities Leadership 2002/2003 program, Williamson Community Leadership Program - **state**;
- \* Western Division Rural Leadership Program (West 2000 Plus, NSW) and Loddon Murray Community Leadership Program - **regional**;
- \* Activities delivered under the banners and funding of EDGENetwork, Working in Groups (WIGS) and FarmBiz - **local**;
- \* Women in Dairy, National Seafood Industry Leadership Development, BeefPlan<sup>^</sup>, LAMBPLAN<sup>^</sup> – **industry**.

(<sup>^</sup> - these programs have been listed as leadership development programs on the basis that they deliver many of the outcomes that are specified objectives of traditional leadership development initiatives – see comments in section 5.2)

### **5.1 Determining the Need**

Formal training needs analyses (TNAs) are uncommon as instigators of most of the leadership development initiatives reviewed. Notable exceptions to this situation are research conducted by AFFA and reported as “Young People as Clients Strategy”, a report prepared by Donovan Research, Marketing and Communications Research Consultants in April 2001 and the report Building the Leadership Capacity of the Australian Dairy Industry, prepared for the Dairy Research and Development Corporation in December 2001 by Cheryl Phillips and Martin Smallridge (see Appendix G). Many other programs and initiatives seek feedback from past participants as data for program and curriculum development. Some of the initiatives that were reviewed had as their TNA anecdotal and local evidence of need which prompted the sourcing and delivery of the initiative. Others, such as a proposed Marcus Oldham College initiative with the Grain Research Development Corporation and Southern Farming Systems are specific responses to the needs identified by the client and based on research with that client.

## **5.2 Post-Course Evaluation**

As is the case for TNAs, the situation with post-course evaluation of the efficacy and relevance of the programs is diverse. The most detailed and significant evaluation reviewed in this research is An Evaluation of Progress Rural Western Australia Programs, prepared by Fiona Haslem McKenzie as an Edith Cowan University – Office of the Minister for Primary Industries, Fisheries (WA) collaborative research project in June 2001. This project reviewed the community and individual impact of participation by over 1,600 people in courses, seminars and study tours facilitated by *Progress Rural WA*, a state government initiative. The review was conducted as both “end of activity” evaluation (level 1) and follow-up at least twelve months after completion (level 2). In some instances, a third level of evaluation was conducted through focus group participation of non-participants who were significant persons in their local areas. These focus groups sought evidence of the impact on the communities of locals’ participation in the *Progress Rural WA* initiatives.

QDPI commissioned a detailed research evaluation of the Building Rural Leaders project after its first ten programs, representing 250 participants. This report was compiled by Ian Plowman in January 1998 and included fourteen detailed case study reviews of the community and individual benefit delivered by participation on the program. A similar form of evaluation of BeefPlan was delivered in September 2002 for MLA by URS Consultants. Although BeefPlan may not be seen as “mainstream” leadership development, it can be considered as such. The program delivers increased personal confidence among the participants, increases and improves their networks and has a “curriculum” around learning and development that is based on the participating producers developing their own model for their participation. In these ways, it parallels a number of other recent initiatives in leadership development, such as the Rural Communities Leadership 2002/2003 program of the Benevolent Society NSW.

At the other extreme, some initiatives such as the Western Division Rural Leadership Program have only anecdotal feedback from past participants about increased involvement in development teams, committees and the like.

A more detailed review of twenty-six leadership development programs has been conducted as part of the Leadership in the Murray-Darling Basin Scoping Study of August 2001 (Russel, D., 2001). This study states that a “serious negative criticism, applicable to all programs, is that there is a near total lack of any close monitoring of each participant’s progress against pre-established and agreed upon criteria. Any evaluation of programs is typically based on anecdotal reports from participants, sponsors and the program coordinators.”

## **5.3 Curricula**

For most of the leadership development programs reviewed in this study, a common shortcoming identified in the curriculum has been the dependence and focus on a more traditional model of leadership. This model assumes that, at a national level, leadership requires negotiating and influencing techniques and media-handling skills and, at a local level, skills around meeting management, minute taking and decision-making processes (an oversimplified statement of curriculum content, perhaps, but illustrative nonetheless). This model does not focus on developing leadership, but rather developing leaders, an issue further discussed in the Section 7 Conclusions, below.

As suggested in the beginning of this Section, the available programs can almost be tiered or organised in a hierarchy, in terms of the audience they seek to attract and the outcomes they strive to deliver. ARLP and the Rabobank program include meetings with Federal Ministers of State and overseas fact-finding missions. These appear to position the desired outcomes of the programs as producing the national industry leaders of the rural sector of tomorrow. At the other end of the spectrum, some of the locally-delivered, FarmBis-sponsored programs appear to focus on skilling up the local participants to work as committee chairpersons or secretaries. Again, this “positioning” of the particular programs seems focussed on the more traditional models of leadership. A major difficulty in evaluating the application of these programs to a future industry model of leadership for the lamb and sheepmeat industry is the absence of statements of specific outcomes with reference to leadership development. Examples of the types of statements of objectives are:

“The program is designed to:

- Develop and refine particular skills;
- Improve conceptual abilities;
- Tap into participants’ personal needs, interests and self esteem;
- Help individuals see and move beyond their interpersonal blocks;
- Empower participants through experiences that teach them to take responsibility for their own lives and situations, rather than blame problems on outside influences”

(ARLF Annual report, 2001, p3)

“It (the Program) enables leading edge agricultural producers to further invest in their business skills, to network with producers from all areas of agriculture and to gain valuable insights from highly regarded national and international experts.”

(Rabobank EDPPP website)

“This five-day program aims to develop the leadership qualities of young Australians involved in agriculture. Participants will concentrate on developing leadership skills, self-confidence and personal effectiveness, to equip them with the attributes necessary to be a future leading force in Australian agriculture.”

(Marcus Oldham Rural Leadership Development Program)

A beneficial common aspect of the curricula of many programs is the inclusion of some form of self-diagnostic instrument, such as the Disc Leadership tool or the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The use of these instruments is usually to position and reinforce the concept of individual differences and the benefit of understanding and capitalising on these. As such, this common element of curriculum can contribute to the development of a more collaborative style of leadership, as is espoused by some recently-developed programs.



A few, newer leadership programs have been developed on a model of collaborative or community leadership skills and behaviours. The Sydney Leadership 2002 and the Rural Communities Leadership 2002/2003 programs coordinated by the Benevolent Society of NSW and the tailored program proposed by Marcus Oldham College to Southern Farming Systems. In these programs, the participants determine the relevance of leadership models and skills to their concepts of and need for leadership behaviour. The stated objectives of these types of programs are not so much about those things mentioned in the extracts (above) from the ARLP, Rabobank and similar programs as about increasing leadership capabilities through a “more thorough grasp of the intricacy, complexity and interdependence of all parts of society; greater capacity for cross-sector collaboration; improving ability to synthesise conflicting information, understand opposing viewpoints, identify common goals and balance competing interests; more flexible skills for working in teams and with a greater diversity of people” (Rural Communities Leadership Prospectus 2002/2003, Program Outcomes).

## **5.4 Program Extensions – The Use of Projects**

In a number of the more recently developed leadership programs, the use of community-based projects, which occur between formal sessions of the program, has been introduced to serve a number of purposes. Among these purposes are the opportunity to continue networking and working together outside the structured learning environment, the opportunity to focus on these projects as a vehicle for applying new skills and knowledge and, finally, as an opportunity to allow the establishment and development of relationships of coaching and mentoring for the core participants. The Marcus Oldham College proposal to Southern Farming Systems and the Benevolent Society-sponsored programs are two such programs, aiming to improve their effectiveness through the use of these techniques.

## **5.5 Alumni Groups**

Many of the programs reviewed for this research have established alumni groups whose aims, among others, include the reinforcement of the learning and development which occurs on the programs, the maintenance of the networks developed through participation on the programs and the harnessing and channelling of the talent of the alumni members to community-based projects. In these projects, the application of skills and knowledge acquired on the program, in conjunction with the leverage of the multiple talents of the alumni members involved, is seen to deliver substantial results in something of interest and relevance to the participants. Overall, initiating, managing and delivering major social or industry-related change is the objective of these alumni groups. Some programs with established and successful alumni include ARLP, the Sydney Leadership Program and the Williamson Community Leadership Program.

A summary of the above and other identified “best practice” criteria for leadership development initiatives is contained in Table 1.

**Criteria**

Leadership Development Program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Australian Rural Leadership Program	X	X	v	v	v	X	v	X	v
Rabobank EDPPP	X	?	v	v	v	X	X	X	X
AFFA Young Rural Leaders' Course	v	?	v	v	v	v	v	v	X
QDPI Building Rural Leaders Program	X	?	v	v	X	v	X	v	X
Rural Communities Leadership 2002/2003	v	?	v	v	v	v	v	v	v
Western Division (NSW) Rural L'ship Program	X	X	v	v	X	?	X	v	X
Loddon-Murray Community Leadership Program	X	?	v	v	v	v	X	v	X
Marcus Oldham Proposed SFS Program	v	?	v	v	v	v	v	v	v

**Key To Table**

1. Contains a mentor / coach component.
2. Continual evaluations.
3. Develop and maintain excitement and professionalism.
4. A coherent framework/theme.
5. Focuses on results.
6. Systematic development of the community, group and individual.
7. Is externally focused.
8. Curriculum developed to suit community and participants - not generic.
9. Has an alumni group or other form of follow-through.

***TABLE 1.***

## **5.6 Participation by the Industry**

The few available data bases of course participants for the programs reviewed for this report show only a minimal participation by people identifying their primary industry category as lamb and sheep meat. Most of the programs did not have this level of detail of participants available when asked. For the ones that could provide the information, the following rates were relevant:

AFFA Young Rural Leaders Course

Round 1 (2000) – 40 participants

Two were from the lamb and sheep meat sector, one aged 30 and one 26.

Round 2 (2001) – 40 participants

Three were from the industry, aged 30, 23 and 21.

ARLP Courses

Course 3 (04/96 – 10/97) – 31 participants;

None stated that they were involved in the lamb and/or sheep meat sector.

Course 4 (04/97 – 09/98) – 30 participants;

Five were involved in lamb and/or sheep meat and of these, only one was under 40 years of age.

Course 5 (04/98 – 09/99) – 33 participants;

None was from the lamb and/or sheep meat industry.

Course 6 (04/99 – 09/00) – 32 participants;

One participant was involved in the prime lamb industry.

Course 7 (04/00 – 09/01) – 30 participants;

Two were from the lamb and sheep meat industry.

Course 8 (05/01 – 09/02) – 30 participants;

None is from the lamb and sheep meat industry.

Course 9 (04/02 – 09/03) – 32 participants;

One participant is from the industry.

FarmBis One (1998 – June 2001)

Leadership, Human Resources Management, Development and Change Management program participants – 2,197 participants.

378 or 17% identified their industry as “Grain – sheep – beef; sheep – beef; sheep”. Of the 72 participants (3.3%) who identified their industry as “sheep” only, 16 only were under 35 years of age.

Marcus Oldham Rural Leadership Program (1995 – 2002)

In total, 19 of potentially 288 participants (6.6%) were identified as from the sheep/lamb industry.

### **5.7 Mentoring**

As mentioned in Section 5.4, above, a number of programs are introducing activities which allow the implementation of mentoring as a tool in the development of leadership through participation in the program. In the previously-mentioned proposal from Marcus Oldham College to Southern Farming Systems, the overall development program is of over twelve months duration, consisting of participation in a five-day program, followed by the completion of a leadership project over six months, a two-day refresher program and, finally, an invitation to contribute as part of a grain growers’ management team, utilising a mentoring system developed during the leadership project to guide and encourage their participation.

In a free-standing exercise of leadership development, not related to any specific course, a pilot project initiated by the South Australian and Western Victorian Sustainable Grazing Systems regional committee has initiated “*the next step*”. This project links new producers within the grazing industry with mentors, more experienced, professional producers, to assist the new players to reach identified business goals. During the discussion with two coordinators/facilitators of this program, a suggestion was made that the development of the “mentees” as future mentors should be added to the objectives of the program. This pilot also reflects the learning from developments in the tertiary sector where companies are utilising as a Human Resources allocation tool the spread of more experienced leaders over large number of emerging leaders to mentor them, rather than look to experienced people to actually lead the work or do it themselves.

The Sheepmeat Council of Australia, in addressing the need for the development of a further vision for the industry, is planning a conference of identified industry leaders (“stalwarts”) in November 2002 to address the issue of becoming the leading supplier to world markets of lamb and sheep meat products. A strategy to be deployed for this conference is the attendance, under the mentorship of the “stalwarts”, of younger industry participants a means of encouraging their contribution to and ownership of the future vision.

## **6. Key Findings – Desk Research**

The range of potential sources for this research was daunting in its size. Data was recommended and made available through sources including MLA, AIM's research library, interviewees and government departments. Additionally, major centres of excellence in leadership were accessed for current research and literature. Finally, web searches using appropriate key-word strings produced further data for evaluation.

### **6.1 Leadership – A Process**

Two key writers/researchers in leadership have both defined it as a process. John Kotter ([A Force for Change](#) 1990, p3) defines leadership as a process that helps direct and mobilise people and/or their ideas. He outlines three sub-processes of:

- i) Establishing direction – a vision for the future and strategies for producing the change needed to achieve that vision;
- ii) Aligning people – communicating the direction of change and
- iii) Motivating and inspiring – keeping people moving in the right direction.

The outcome of this process is that it produces change, often to a dramatic degree and it has the potential of producing extremely useful change.

Elliott Jacques (Jacques E. & Clements S. D., 1991. [Executive Leadership: A Practical Guide to Managing Complexity](#) Ch.1, p3.) defines leadership as “that process in which one person sets the purpose or direction for one or more other persons and gets them to move along with him or her and with each other in that direction, with competence and full commitment.” Jacques goes on to note that there is no such thing as “a detached, free-standing leader-follower relationship”, that leadership takes place “not in a vacuum, but in relationships between people...within a social structure.”

### **6.2 Leadership – A Systems Approach**

Some of the work coming out of the Centre for Creative Leadership in North Carolina overlays a systems approach in identifying and tapping an organisation's leadership reserve. Patricia O'Connor and David Day (“Tapping your Organisation's Leadership Reserve”, [Leadership in Action](#), Vol 22, No 1, March/April 2002) outline the three basic systems in an organisation which influence the gap between the leadership needs and the leadership potential of an organisation. These systems are:

- i) Work system – things that need to be done or achieved;
- ii) Social systems – who will directly or indirectly influence the leadership tasks to be undertaken (and they note that it's not always the “formal leaders”) and
- iii) Belief systems – determining how leadership objectives will be defined and why certain leadership tasks will be prioritised, why tasks are pursued in a certain manner and why certain individuals, groups, roles, expertise or perspectives are included or excluded from the tasks.

In many ways, this systems overlay further develops and informs the “relationships between people...within a social structure” identified by Elliott Jacques. The sociologist Max Weber argued over a century ago that institutions that endure thrive not because of one leader’s charisma, but because they cultivate leadership throughout the system. This observation is further supported by the research of James Collins and Jerry Poras, described in their book Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies (1994). Robert M. Fulmer’s article on Johnson & Johnson (“Johnson & Johnson: Frameworks for Leadership”, Organisational Dynamics, Vol 29, no 3, 2001, pp 211 – 220) details how this successful company developed a framework for innovation over the last sixty years. The company understands the vital contribution to its growth and success that is made by innovation and the critical need, therefore, to continue to develop leaders in the mould of partnership and cooperation. The challenge is to balance the fierce independence of J&J’s companies around the globe with the need to partner with each other. The current Chairman and CEO, Ralph Larsen, states that “Leadership is the biggest single constraint to growth at J&J and it’s the most critical business issue we face.” The company therefore invests heavily in leadership development as a critical contributor to change and innovation.

### **6.3 Leadership – A New Philosophy**

Since 1994, various scholars and authors have sponsored a “post-heroic” leadership model. “It is not leadership from any one person that is required; it is an aspect of leadership each of us summons from within. In this respect, the same qualities we have sought in one person can be found distributed among many people who learn, in community, to exercise their ‘leadership’ at appropriate moments. This occurs when people are vitally concerned about issues or when executing their responsibilities. Leadership thus becomes a rather fluid concept focussing on those behaviours which propel the work of the group forward.” (Nirenberg, J. 1993, p198).

This quote points to a confluence of the thoughts of Kotter, Jacques & Clements and O’Connor & Day outlined above. Leadership is about directing “the work of the group”, happening in relationships within social structures and harnessing the work, social and belief systems of the group (organisation).

Sandman & Vandenberg (1995) detail the three common themes in the changes required by the new leadership philosophy as “shared leadership”, “leadership as relationship” and “leadership in community”. Their article goes on to draw the distinction between having leaders and leadership and proposes the concept of describing organisations as “leaderful”. This concept would fit comfortably with the strategies of Johnson & Johnson as they approach the challenge of leadership development. It is also a strongly supported approach as outlined in the Phillips and Smallridge (2001) report to the dairy industry. In this paper, the authors highlight “the need to promote leadership that enhances all sectors of the whole system rather than simply replace or retrain existing leaders.” (p.3). They go on to espouse an approach that “is underpinned by a belief that the (dairy) industry requires leadership rather than leaders and that this could best be brought about by involving all members of the industry in a leadership process. This process must be multi-dimensional and requires all participants to be team players and contribute whatever is needed.” (p.3).

Thus, the new leadership model for the lamb and sheepmeat industry needs to be one based on the concept of becoming a “leaderful” industry. The model should be built on the themes of shared leadership, leadership as relationship and leadership in community. This model of group-centred leadership has the “community” of the lamb and sheepmeat industry as its constituent, strives to develop communities of commitment with a shared vision and understanding of the work of the group, at local, regional state or national levels. The vision and the work of the group will be tailored to the needs of the community in question. The three themes encourage the involvement of all members of the “community of commitment” and allow or the contribution of all. The model also represents a shift from the issues of competition and self-centredness mentioned as significant problems by the interviewees for this project.

Sandman & Vandenberg highlight that an assumption underlying this philosophy of leadership is “that all of us have leadership qualities that can be pooled and drawn upon as needed, when working with others on vital common issues.” They mention the concepts of empowerment, participation, partnership and service as foundations for a leaderful organisation and the values of trust, commitment, sharing and ownership as fundamental to “communities of commitment” or “leadership in community”.

## **6.4 Leadership – Competencies**

The final piece of relevant literature considered for this research is the current work of Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) in Primal Leadership. This book, subtitled “Realising the Power of Emotional Intelligence” is a further development of Goleman’s initial writings on Emotional Intelligence (EQ). In Chapter 3, the authors outline the refined list of Emotional Intelligence Domains and Related Competencies (see Appendix F). The domains are Personal Competence and Social Competence and the associated competencies are, for Personal Competence, self-awareness and self-management and for Social Competence, social awareness and relationship management. Their research has shown that these competencies are not innate talents, but learned abilities and they correlate extremely highly with successful leadership in the types of environments proposed for the new philosophy of leadership (above).

## **7. Conclusions**

### **7.1 A Leadership Model for the Lamb and Sheep Meat Industry in the Twenty-first Century**

The key findings from the interviews for this research described a need for leadership renewal in the industry. There was dissatisfaction expressed about the “hero” model, the role of the industry “stalwarts” and the lack of younger participants in the leadership of the industry at all levels. Lack of coordination among diversified and often self-interested groups, an inward-looking focus and a reliance on a small number of individual leaders who invariably get “burned out” were also mentioned as problems. The lack of overall leadership skills in the industry, a lack of participation by producers and the development of new, younger, entrepreneurial leaders were among the things identified as presently missing in the industry.

At the same time, there are a number of initiatives underway which are already addressing some of the issues identified here. The work of AFFA (Donovan, 2001) in identifying the needs of the younger industry participants as input to the development of their Young Rural Leaders Course is one example. The trialing by the South Australian and Western Victorian SGS regional Committee of a mentoring program is another. In August, a South Australian Lamb Development Team held a workshop to elicit the needs and the contributions of the younger industry participants. This activity identified a number of specific and actionable ideas.

The “new philosophy of leadership” outlined in Section 6.3, above, provides a substantial opportunity to address and resolve many of the identified problems and issues with leadership in the Lamb and Sheep Meat industry detailed in this report. Adopting an approach of shared leadership, leadership as relationship and leadership in community provides the platform to harness and leverage the leadership capabilities of a much wider range of industry participants than is presently the case. Co-opting industry members at all levels – local, regional, state and national – in a collaborative leadership model allows the greatest degree of input to the challenge of change facing the industry now and in the future and facilitates an “up and down” system of contribution to the vision and direction of the industry. It also allows for the focus of effort on whatever vision is of greatest relevance to the “community” in question at any point in time. The model will also expedite the implementation, at all levels, of initiatives and changes needed to take the industry forward to the successful achievement of the goal of pre-eminence as the lamb and sheep meat provider to the world food market.

The current challenges identified by interviewees of the demographic issue, the Generation X members and the non-participants can be addressed and managed in the environment of a collaborative leadership model. Similarly, the problem of the bulk of the leadership work falling on the shoulders of the willing few is resolved. An acknowledgement of the value of the contribution of all industry members, “pooled and drawn upon as needed” and in the context of “working with others on vital common issues” can also resolve the identified obstacles of conflicting time demands for the younger industry members and the entrenched attitudes of the older ones.

## **7.2 Implementation**

For a change such as is suggested by the conclusions herein to be implemented and effective, the ownership of it, in the spirit of the proposed model, will need to be broadly-based and strongly championed at all levels of the industry. The comments made by interviewees and reported above suggest a strong predisposition to a change in the leadership model for the industry. The successful implementation of the collaborative model will require the detailed development of how the model will look in its application, communication of the implications of the model for all existing industry activities (which must continue to be supported by the model and not negated by it) and a significant amount of activity and input from local groups and teams to ensure “grass roots” benefits and contribution under the new model.

In its application, the proposed model of leadership will require vision, initiative and action at a local level. These local “communities of commitment” (not necessarily geographically local) will contribute to the development of the vision for the regional and state, as well as national industry levels. They will, at the same time, be the learning and implementation base for the roll-out of industry and other initiatives designed to develop the industry a whole. This framework allows all levels of industry participants – producers, processors, distributors and customers – to be involved in the building and execution of the strategy and tactics to achieve the goals of the industry.

## **7.3 Leadership Development**

As is suggested in Section 5, many existing leadership development initiatives will not be appropriate to support the new leadership model for the industry. Most will not prove counter-productive and a small number of those reviewed are already structured in a manner which will be supportive. The curriculum of the Benevolent Society of NSW Rural Communities Leadership 2002/2003 program aligns with the direction and operation of the proposed leadership model. The proposal from the Marcus Oldham College to Southern Farming Systems shows a number of program content items that support the implementation of the proposed model and the paper by Phillips and Smallridge for the Dairy Industry has a proposed five-tier leadership development program which appears to strongly support the proposed leadership model.

Leadership development becomes a perspective, a set of ideas, a way of thinking. Sandmann and Vandenberg propose seven “action values” for leadership development under this model:

- Visioning together
- Leading together
- Learning together
- Building community
- Developing energy
- Acting together and
- Communicating (pp 5 & 6).

With sufficient interest and progress in the Lamb and Sheep Meat industry towards this proposed model, other leadership development providers will offer supporting programs and initiatives. A suggested priority would be programs incorporating the Emotional Intelligence competencies outlined by Goleman et. al., as these have both the empirical support as contributing to successful leadership and are totally complementary to the proposed model.



## **7.4 Mentoring/Coaching**

An integral contribution to the success of the proposed model of leadership is that of mentoring and coaching within the industry. The work reported in Danielle England's *the next step* paper of June 2002 (Appendix E) would strongly support the objectives of the proposed leadership model. A possible challenge in leveraging this work is the availability of suitable industry participants who have the Emotional Intelligence competencies and who would be early adopters of the principles of collaborative leadership.

Mentoring and coaching are already appearing as part of some of the current leadership development initiatives and this practice would need to continue in all programs undertaken to support the implementation and expansion of the proposed new model of leadership for the industry. In this manner, behaviour and structures used to support leadership development will be exemplary of some of the basic leadership competencies of the model.

## **7.5 Ownership of the New Model of Leadership**

As MLA commissioned and funded this research, it is appropriate that the organisation consider the issues of the adoption and promulgation of this leadership model for the lamb and sheep meat industry. As mentioned in Section 7.2, above, there are a number of critical considerations in the implementation of the model which require resourcing and coordination.

It is a recommendation of this report that the executive of MLA support the implementation of this new model of leadership for the industry and that they give due consideration to championing the coordination of its adoption and promulgation on a national basis.

# **8. Recommended Actions**

## **8.1 Agree the Development and Implementation of the Model**

Based on this paper and supporting presentations by the researcher, MLA needs to accept, and agree to the refinement and development of the proposed model so as to fit the specific needs of all stakeholders in the industry. The project's research indicated that this is an expected role of MLA and that they will also have a key role to play in the leadership of the industry of the future. Within MLA, the model and its implementation needs to have an advocate, patron and sponsor.

## **8.2 Launch the Model at the SCA November Workshop**

With the buy-in of the Sheepmeat Council of Australia, their proposed November workshop is an ideal opportunity to "launch" the model and the plan for its implementation. SCA also needs to nominate an advocate, patron and sponsor of the industry leadership model.

## **8.3 Agree a Pilot Implementation**

As an initial step, it is recommended that a "pilot" implementation be undertaken. Participation in this research from the states of South Australian and Victorian, combined with already-identified access to leadership development resources in those states, strongly suggests a region in either of the states as an appropriate place to pilot the new model. The pilot implementation also needs to have a defined set of assessable outcomes and a timeframe in which to achieve these. The suggested timeframe is by the end of 2003.

## **8.4 Identify Funding to Support the Pilot Program and its Eventual Roll-Out**

The financial support to be provided by MLA and any other sources of funding should be identified prior to the commencement of the pilot program. Through 2003, budget planning for the wider roll-out should be completed. As funding may be limited, a suggestion that was common from the interviewees in this research was that fewer dollars might be spent on the very expensive programs such as ARLP scholarships and the same amount be spread over more people at a lesser cost to achieve more local impact.

## **8.5 Negotiate and Secure Leadership Development Support**

A number of potential leadership development providers have been identified in this report. Negotiations should commence to secure appropriate development support in a manner consistent with the philosophy of the model. This will also involve trained facilitators working at local community levels. There may also be a need to financially compensate industry participants whose support as mentors is required for the implementation of the model and on an ongoing basis.

## **8.6 Structure an “Industry Career Path” for all Levels of Participants**

As part of the concept of a learning community that the new model of industry leadership requires, a “career path” for industry participants should be developed. This “career path” (taking the concept from tertiary industry) would position the various development opportunities available to industry participants in a type of sequence or progression. In this sequence, each new activity would build on and link to previous ones undertaken. Opportunities for technical, business or personal development would be positioned within the sequence. As new industry initiatives occur, as was the case with Grain and Graze, the development opportunities necessary for the full understanding and successful adoption of these types of programs would be built on to the sequence, with the suitable links to other related development opportunities identified and highlighted.

## **8.7 Local Implementation**

It is a recommendation of this report that significant effort be invested in determining how existing programs, councils, boards and committees can be used for the local implementation of the new industry leadership model. Current infrastructure such as LAMBPLAN, lamb development groups, processor groups and alumni groups from existing leadership development programs can be used to define and develop “communities of commitment”, either in a geographical or a needs/interest basis. These communities can then be used as the vehicle for the local level implementation of the model. Appropriate support can be provided to the communities through the above-mentioned facilitators and other resource personnel.

## **8.8 State and National Level Participation**

As the model applies to all levels of the industry, relevant state and national government departments have a significant role to play. They need to be engaged and involved from an early stage, so that the activities of department employees, especially Extension Officers, may be incorporated in support of and involvement in the communities of commitment.

## **8.9 Agree and Monitor Required Outcomes**

Almost as in a financial calculation of “return on investment”, MLA and SCA need to identify desired outcomes from the industry leadership model over the next few years and monitor whether or not they are achieved. The continuous evaluation of the industry and its leadership activity will identify any fine-tuning that may be required for the ongoing expansion of cooperative industry leadership.

## **8.10 Communicate**

A detailed communication strategy needs to be developed and put in place for the implementation of the industry leadership model and as an integral part of its ongoing success. War stories, successes and quick wins need to be widely communicated. A forum needs to exist for the communities of commitment to share their ideas, their outcomes and their lessons learned. A medium of communication should be established as one of the platforms on which the leadership of the industry will succeed and thrive.

## **References and Bibliography**

- Andrew J. & Aslin, H. (2002). Selected Literature and Other Sources of Information and Quotations to Inform the joint Cooperative Venture Project: Fostering Involvement in Rural Industry and Government extension, unpublished paper prepared for AFFA.
- Australian Rural Leadership Foundation (1998, 1999, 2000, 2001). Annual Report, New Millennium Print; Canberra.
- Benevolent Society of NSW (2002). Rural Communities Leadership 2002/2003: Information and Application Form, Benevolent Society of NSW; Sydney.
- Collins, J. & Porras, J. (1994). Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies, *communitybuilders.nsw*, website at [www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au](http://www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au)
- Donovan Research (2001). Young People as Clients Strategy, unpublished report prepared for AFFA.
- England, D. (2002). *the next step*, unpublished report prepared for the South Australian and Western Victorian SGS Regional Committee.
- Fulmer, R. (2001). "Johnson & Johnson: A Framework for Leadership", *Organisational Dynamics*, Vol 29, No 3.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership*, Harvard Business School Press; Boston, Mass.
- Haslam McKenzie, F. (2001). An Evaluation of Progress Rural Western Australia, Edith Cowan University – Office of the minister for Primary industry, Fisheries (WA), Collaborative Research Project Report.
- Jacques, E. & Clements, S. D. (1991). *Executive Leadership: A Practical Guide to Managing Complexity*, Blackwell; Cambridge, Mass.
- Kotter, J. (1990). *A Force for Change*, The Free Press; New York, NY.
- Loddon Murray Community Leadership Program (1999, 2000). Annual Report.
- Mckay, H. (1997). *Generations*, Pan Macmillan; Sydney.
- Nirenberg, J. (1993). *The Living Organisation: Transforming Teams into Workplace Communities*, Business One Irwin; Homewood, IL.
- O'Connor, P. & Day, D. (2002). "Tapping into Your Organisation's Leadership Reserve", *Leadership in Action*, Vol 22, No 1. Mar/Apr 2002. (Journal of the Centre for Creative Leadership)
- Phillips, C. & Smallridge, M. (2001). Building the Leadership Capacity of the Australian Dairy Industry, unpublished paper prepared for the Dairy Research & Development Corporation.
- Plowman, I. (1998). Building Rural Leaders' Program – An Evaluation, Queensland Department of Primary industry; Brisbane.
- Rabobank Executive Development Program for Primary Producers, website at [www.rabobank.com.au/ag\\_info\\_index](http://www.rabobank.com.au/ag_info_index)

Russell, D. (2001). Excerpts from Leadership in the Murray-Darling Basin Scoping Study (Project MP 2007), unpublished paper prepared for the Murray-Darling Basin Commission Strategic Investigation and education Program.

Sandmann, L. R. & Vandenberg, L. (1995). "A Framework for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Leadership", Journal of Extension, Vol 33, No 6, Dec 1995.

Senge, P. et al (1999). The Challenge of Sustaining Momentum in Learning Organisations,

South Australian Lamb Development Team Youth Forum (2002). Summary of the Findings of the Forum of August 2002.

Volunteering Australia, conversation with a Melbourne-based research officer of the organisation on 13 September 2002..

## **Appendices**

- Appendix A     Implementing the New Leadership Model
- Appendix B     AIM Proposal of April 8, 2002.
- Appendix C     Structured Interview Formats:
- 1 - Industry Knowledge Chain Participants;
- A2 - Leadership Development Providers.
- Appendix D     Demographic Summary of Interviewees.
- Appendix E     England, D. (2002). the next step.
- Appendix F     Goleman et. al. (2002) p 39. – Details of the Emotional Intelligence Domains and Associated Competencies.
- Appendix G     Phillips, C. & Smallridge, M. (2001). Building the Leadership Capacity of the Australian Dairy Industry, unpublished paper prepared for the Dairy Research & Development Corporation

## **Appendix A**

### **Implementing the New Leadership Model**

#### **Overview**

The proposed new model of leadership for the Lamb and Sheep Meat Industry is a broad-based, participative, community-oriented one, in contrast to the more traditional “hero-leader” model. The new model does not seek to replace, but rather to build on and complement the older model of leadership in the industry. Over the last ten years, this older model has successfully taken the industry from its fledgling status to its current robust position in the Australian and overseas markets. There is a great deal to learn from and leverage from this ten years of experienced leadership. In the recommended implementation of the new model, a substantial contribution is planned from the existing industry leadership.

The new model has, as its underlying principles, three key concepts:

\* *shared leadership*: in which the contribution of a broader group of industry participants than has been the case in the past is drawn on for the development and growth of the industry;

\* *leadership as relationship*: revolves around the idea of a network of fluid relationships and is built on the concepts of empowerment, participation, partnership and service;

\* *leadership in community*: whereby the community (local, regional, state, national, industry) provides the conceptual setting in which the leadership relationship takes place.

The implementation of this model of leadership addresses and overcomes many of the challenges and obstacles that the research identified for the industry’s future leadership (see Section 4). The new model of leadership has the potential to:

- \* Increase the overall leadership skills of the industry – to make the industry “leaderful”;
- \* Involve younger people in a manner that is likely to motivate them by initially delivering local, immediate and short –term results and doing this through participation and networking;
- \* Increase the participation rate of industry members in the leadership activities it requires;
- \* Leverage the achievements and contributions of the established industry leaders as coaches/mentors of the leadership activity;
- \* Introduce appropriate skills for leadership in the twenty-first century, based on models such as Emotional Intelligence (see Appendix F);
- \* Provide the opportunity for leadership development activities to have an external, community/industry focus, rather than an internal (personal skills development) focus;
- \* Incorporate the leadership model into the industry’s values and culture over the next five years.

The introduction of a similar model of leadership has proved successful in recent years in the dairy and fishing industries (see Appendix G).

## **The Implementation Plan**

### **1. Agree a Pilot Program**

The introduction of the new leadership model requires a pilot project in which participants will be given the opportunity to take part in a structured leadership development program. The sponsors of this program should be Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA) and the Sheepmeat Council of Australia (SCA), in order to give it status and reach within the industry.

### **2. Appoint a Project Advisory Group**

A project oversight group needs to be established with nominated representatives from the sponsoring organisations and selected subject-matter experts. The role, objectives and operation of this group should be agreed by the sponsoring organisations. Responsibilities may include the selection of the pilot project target and participants, the issuing of a tender for the supply of leadership development support for the pilot and the ongoing review and evaluation of the project during its life and on completion.

### **3. Identify the Target Group**

The Project Advisory Group needs to choose a target group or region with which to run the pilot program in 2003. The research participation and findings from the south east region of South Australia and Western Victoria recommend this as a potentially suitable region in which to carry out the pilot. There are already a number of activities underway in this region which would support the pilot program. These include a project recently initiated by the South Australian and Western Victorian Sustainable Grazing Systems (SGS) regional committee. The project – *the next step* – links mentees (new producers within the grazing industry) with mentors (experienced, professional producers) to help them reach identified business goals. This type of activity is proposed for inclusion in the leadership development program to support the new leadership model.

A target group of 20 program participants should be selected on a proportional basis from a cross-section of the industry's supply chain. This would require representation from, for example, producers, processors, development officers, extension officers and other government employees and retail distributors and exporters. The selection of final participants will be determined by the Project Advisory Group who will consider all possible nominees for the program.

### **4. Agree the Program Objectives, Format, Process and Timetable**

The pilot program should be based on a curriculum which includes the competencies identified as necessary to drive the successful adoption of shared, community-based leadership and which is delivered in a format which reinforces the principles of the new leadership model. It is recommended that the program has three components – an initial residential period of possibly five days, community-based project participation over the period of a few months and a final residential period of two to three days. The participants will have access to and the support of a coach/mentor during the period of the community project and the support they provide will reinforce the concepts and competencies introduced in the residential portion of the program. The coaches/mentors will be experienced leaders in the industry whose knowledge and skills will transfer to the program participants through the mentor relationship.



5. Select the Leadership Development Provider

The Project Advisory Group develops and issues a tender for submissions from potential leadership development providers. The leadership development provider will be required to develop and deliver all classroom-based sessions and will provide some input to the community projects, including a briefing to the mentors about their role and the reinforcement of the material covered in the residential stage. The curriculum development will include material specifically designed to support and reinforce the community basis of the leadership model. Relevant competencies, such as those detailed in the Emotional Intelligence model, will form the basis of the initial residential period, with reinforcement of these given by the mentors and again in the final residential period.

Marcus Oldham College in Geelong has already established itself as a successful provider of leadership development activities to the rural sector. This has been demonstrated by both its regular Rural Leadership Development Program and its delivery of tailored programs, such as the one developed for Southern Farming Systems as an initiative of the Grain Research Development Corporation. The college would be a most likely candidate for the delivery of the leadership development program in the pilot.

6. Identify Possible Community Projects and Possible Volunteer Mentors

A number of projects need to be identified through the resources of the MLA, SCA and the leadership development provider for the pilot participants to undertake. These should preferably be in a suitable geographic area for the participants. Additionally, volunteers from the industry leadership group need to be identified to provide the mentoring/coaching to support the program participants throughout the projects.

7. Program Evaluation

The scope and methodology of the program evaluation needs to be agreed by the sponsoring organisations. The suggested level of evaluation is one that encompasses both the participants' response to their experience of the program and the social/community impact over time of the development of the participants and the completion of the community-based projects.

8. Roll-Out of the Model

Over the period 2004 – 2007, the successful model will be further introduced to the industry in a manner similar to that used in the pilot program. Depending on available funding, different regions and local and national levels might be targeted concurrently, using interaction between these to enhance the “community” basis of the projects undertaken and the networks that will be developed.

It is recommended that an industry strategy, developed in 2002-2003, forms the basis of the determination of the projects used by different groups over this time to contribute to the industry's development and growth. Increasing the level of participation over time will deliver a significant increase in the impact of the industry strategy to move the industry to the premier position as the provider of lamb and sheep meat products to the world market.

## ***Timetable***

The table below outlines a proposed timetable for the implementation activities.

<b>Proposed Timetable for Implementation Activities</b>
<b>NOVEMBER 2002</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Present model and implementation phase to SCA for co-sponsorship</li> <li>* Agree Project Advisory Group membership</li> </ul>
<b>DECEMBER 2002</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Agree overall implementation program format, process and timetable</li> <li>* Agree a target pilot site</li> <li>* Scope and detail the role of the Project Advisory Group and brief its members</li> <li>* Agree selection criteria for the program participants</li> <li>* Agree selection criteria for leadership development provider</li> <li>* Negotiate with and confirm leadership development provider</li> <li>* Develop evaluation criteria and methodology for pilot program</li> </ul>
<b>JANUARY 2003</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Publicise program to likely sources of possible participants</li> <li>* Agree program objectives and commence curriculum design</li> <li>* Identify possible community projects</li> <li>* Identify possible volunteer mentors/coaches (for use from April to July)</li> </ul>
<b>FEBRUARY 2003</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Selection of participants</li> </ul>
<b>MARCH 2003</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Initial residential program held at provider facilities</li> <li>* First stage of evaluation</li> </ul>

<b>APRIL 2003</b>  * Commencement of community programs
<b>MAY 2003</b>  * Ongoing community projects
<b>JUNE 2003</b>  * Ongoing community projects  * Mid-program review and evaluation
<b>JULY 2003</b>  * Ongoing community projects
<b>AUGUST 2003</b>  * Final residential program  * Initial program follow-up and evaluation (may spread into September)
<b>SEPTEMBER 2003</b>
<b>OCTOBER 2003</b>
<b>NOVEMBER 2003</b>  * Three-month follow-up, evaluation and report

## **Appendix B**



### **Proposal to Meat & Livestock Australia on Leadership in the Lamb & Sheepmeat Industry in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

Prepared for John McKenzie & Alison McIntosh, Meat & Livestock Australia

Prepared by Don Perlmut, Client Relationship Manager, Australian Institute of Management

***VERSION 2: REVISED 8 April 2002***

### **Introduction**

Thank you for your interest in the Australian Institute of Management (AIM). We welcome the opportunity to work with Meat & Livestock Australia (M&LA) on your leadership research and identification requirements for the sheepmeat industry.

The Australian Institute of Management is a peak professional body that has existed to provide excellence in management training and development for 60 years. We have an enviable reputation for the quality and practical focus of our organisational development experience and the learning experiences and solutions that we offer to both individuals and organisations. Our response is based on competitive pricing and the AIM guarantee of quality learning opportunities and quality customer service at all levels.

AIM has a national and international reputation for delivering organisational development solutions, practical management training and executive training in integrated ways – often in strategic partnership with other stakeholders.

### **Methodology**

In response to the brief provided by M&LA, this consulting proposal is for an engagement to deliver:

- A detailed analysis and definition of "leadership" as it is relevant to the Sheep Industry Strategic Plan objectives;
- The impact and relevance of leadership development initiatives available to those in the "lamb and sheepmeat knowledge chain", including usage data and a participant feedback summary;
- A summary of any gaps that exist between currently-available offerings in leadership development and identified needs for the lamb and sheepmeat industry;
- Detailed recommendations to address the development of a suitable leadership culture "at the local level, the level of community builders as well as the executive level" of the lamb and sheepmeat industry for the future.

### **Engagement Methodology**

The philosophy underlying the proposed methodology is one of consultation. There will be four major threads to the engagement:

- Detailed discussions and interviews with MLA personnel and review of MLA data;
- Interviews with and possibly surveys of "people from the lamb and sheepmeat knowledge chain";
- Desktop research into twenty-first century leadership concepts and models, especially those relevant to the lamb and sheepmeat industry;
- Data collection and analysis from organisations providing information, knowledge and skills to the industry at present, such as government agencies, training and service providers and other input suppliers.

The engagement will require access to and the cooperation of M&LA personnel in the early stages, to help determine both the scope of the consultation to be undertaken and the appropriate people to involve in that consultation. Once this is established, the consultant will develop suitable tools to aid the consultation, including structured interview formats and possible questionnaires for wider distribution.

## **Proposed Engagement Timetable**

(The days listed below refer to the days of the Lead Consultant only)

- Day 1 Confirmation of the engagement outcomes; initial discussions with M&LA key personnel; comprehension of M&LA strategies and programs including the Sustainable Grain and Grazing Systems initiative and the value-based marketing project.
- Day 2 Confirmation of engagement critical path; briefing of AIM Library personnel on key elements for desktop research on leadership.
- Days 2-5 Specification of key data to be obtained from M&LA and their service providers; development of interview structure and other suitable data gathering tools (surveys, etc); agreement as to the scope of consultation to be undertaken.
- Days 6 – 16 Main activities around data gathering and analysis; continuous consultation with M&LA personnel and key stakeholders; analysis of desktop research. Approximately Day 12 conduct a formal project management meeting with ML&A to discuss findings to date and review methodology.
- Days 17 – 20 Final preparation of report of findings and recommendations, including an iterative process of review and feedback from key M&LA personnel.

If required, the final stage of the engagement can include presentations to and discussions with key stakeholders of the engagement outcomes and recommendations. Relevant project management meetings will be held as needed.

In the absence of specification from M&LA as to the scope of consultation that should be undertaken, details of the methodology to be used or of any travel that may be required can not be given here. These will be developed and incorporated in the Engagement Timetable after the second day, in discussion with ML&A.

## **Lead Consultant: - Graham Firth**

**Graham Firth** has developed a breadth of skills and knowledge over more than twenty years' experience in management consulting and human resources management (HRM). He has worked in management consulting in his own company, ProMES Management Consulting, in The Workforce Management Group and as a Consulting Principal with IBM Consulting; and in HRM for a number of major international companies including Unilever, LaPorte Chemicals Group, British Oxygen Corporation and P&O.

Graham's last three years have been spent in a "start-up" environment, establishing the HR function and practices for an emerging telecommunications company. Graham did a similar thing for P&O Stevedoring in the early 90s. Through the mid-90s, Graham's worked as a management consultant - firstly in his own practice, which grew to be a partnership that was later acquired by IBM as the core of their Organisational Change competency in Australia. Graham spent three years in the employ of IBM as a Principal in the IBM Consulting Group.

His consulting experience covers a range of industries, including consumer goods manufacturing, chemicals, IT and primary industry-based business. He has worked with all levels within organisations from the support, production and shop floor areas to middle, senior and executive level management. Graham's experience gained over his consulting career includes the design, development and delivery of training and development programs in leadership and management, the scoping of organisational development initiatives for Dairy Farmers in NSW with the approach of deregulation of the milk industry, organisational design, change management and operational and strategic human resource management in a range of primary, secondary and tertiary industry companies and organisations.

Additionally, Graham has off-shore experience in the Middle-East, the Asia Pacific region and North America, having worked on consulting engagements in countries including Kuwait, Dubai, Bangladesh, Singapore, Thailand, Hong Kong and the USA.

Graham holds a BA (Psychology) from Macquarie University and a Master of Arts Degree in Psychology from the University of Sydney. He has also completed studies in Taxation Law at UTS and Labour Relations and Industrial Law through the Law Faculty of the University of Sydney. He is a past Member of the Australian Psychological Society (MAPsS), including past Chairmanship of the College of Organisational Psychology, a past Associate Fellow of the Australian Human Resources Institute (CMAHRI), a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Company Directors and is a Registered Psychologist in NSW.

In addition, Graham has served as an officer in the Royal Australian Naval reserve for 11 years, holding posting such as Recruiting Officer, Training Officer, Senior Psychologist NSW and Visiting Lecturer in Leadership and Management at the Australian Defence Force Academy. He was also admitted as a Justice of the Peace in NSW in 1982.

## **Project Management - Don Perlgut**

Project management for this research consultancy will be undertaken by **Don Perlgut**, Client Relationship Manager, Australian Institute of Management. Don has supervised a number of survey and research consultancies for AIM. Prior to commencing with AIM, he developed an extensive background in consulting, project management and research. This includes lecturing positions at the Universities of New England (UNE) and South Australia, and Project Manager for a national rural local government finance project for the Rural Development Centre at UNE. He has also been the Head of ABC TV Policy and Projects, where he supplied in-house organisational development services to the corporation. For a number of years, he was a director of an independent social planning consultancy specialising in rural community development, and Publisher of Impacts Press - which specialised in practical books for local government and community services.

Most recently, Don worked as the Executive Director of a non-profit membership-based fundraising organisation. He holds a B.A. (Cornell University) and a Master of City & Regional Planning (University of California, Berkeley).

## **Project Director: Harrold Burman**

**Harrold Burman** is the Manager, Organisational Development with the Australian Institute of Management, and will provide project overview and quality assurance for this consultancy. He has provided organisational development consulting and training services to a wide range of organisations which have experienced significant change. These include: Black mores, Glaxo SmithKline, Aristocrat Leisure Industries, Cable & Wireless Optus, Smorgon Steel, John Swire & Sons, New South Wales State Transit Authority, a number of Area Health Services, New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority, NCR, Northern Territory Power and Water, SOCOG and Star City Casino.

Harrold's recent projects have included designing and implementing a competency based management development framework integrating the performance planning and review process. The framework included VETAB accredited diplomas and certificates. Successful graduates have gained credit towards a number of post-graduate courses including Masters programs. Other projects include developing, implementing and evaluating workplace competency learning systems and reviewing workplace leadership, training and assessment programs.

## **Harrold holds a Master of Commerce (UNSW), a Bachelor of Business (UTS) and a**

Graduate Diploma of Education (Wollongong), and is an accredited Myers-Briggs Type Indicator programs (MBTI) assessor.

## ***Future Proceedings***

For further information, please contact:

Don Perlgut

Client Relationship Manager, Organisational Learning

Australian Institute of Management

215 Pacific Highway, North Sydney NSW 2060

Tel. (02) 9956-3087

Fax (02) 9956-3587

[donpe@aimnsw.com.au](mailto:donpe@aimnsw.com.au)



## **Appendix C1**

### ***Meat & Livestock Australia***

### ***Lamb & Sheep Meat Industry Sector Leadership Review***

## **Structured Interview Formats - Industry Knowledge Chain Participants**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Location: \_\_\_\_\_

What role do you play in the Lamb & Sheep Meat Industry (classify as local/ regional/ national)?

\_\_\_\_\_

How long have you been involved like this?

\_\_\_\_\_

What was your background before/previously in this industry?

\_\_\_\_\_

### **Leadership**

What forms or type of leadership behaviour do you see or experience in the industry at present?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Who provides this leadership?

\_\_\_\_\_

What forms or type of leadership behaviour is missing in the industry at present?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Who should be providing this?

\_\_\_\_\_

**Leadership Development**

What opportunities are you aware of for the development of leadership behaviours and skills relevant to the industry?

---

---

---

Have you participated in any? If so, which?

---

---

---

What outcomes/benefits did this deliver for you (or have you seen delivered for others)?

---

---

---

What other development opportunities should be provided? By whom?

---

---

---

**General Comments**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## **Appendix C2**

### ***Meat & Livestock Australia***

### ***Lamb & Sheep Meat Industry Sector Leadership Review***

## **Structured Interview Formats - Leadership Development Providers**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_

Location: \_\_\_\_\_

What services do you provide to the Lamb & Sheep Meat Industry?

\_\_\_\_\_

At what level are these provided – local, regional, national?

\_\_\_\_\_

How long have you been involved in working with the industry?

\_\_\_\_\_

What was your background prior to your involvement with this industry?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### **Leadership Development Initiatives**

What formed the basis or provided the impetus for the development/delivery of the services/programs you run for the industry?

\_\_\_\_\_

Who is/was your target market?

\_\_\_\_\_

What behavioural/skills outcomes were the programs designed to deliver?

\_\_\_\_\_

How many participants have completed the program?

\_\_\_\_\_

What evaluation has been done on whether or not these outcomes are being achieved?

What links, if any, does your program(s) have to any other initiative in the rural sector and particularly in the Lamb & Sheep Meat industry?

What other development opportunities should be provided? By whom?

**General Comments**

## **Appendix D**

### **Demographic Summary of Interviewees**

#### **\* *Industry Knowledge Chain Participants***

<b>Producers</b>	NSW	3
	SA	7
	VIC	6
	WA	1

<b>Processors</b>	NSW	2
	SA	2
	VIC	1
	WA	1

<b>Retailers</b>	NSW	1
	VIC	1

<b>National/Peak Body Members</b>	7
-----------------------------------	---

#### **\* *Leadership Development Providers* - 11**

#### **\* *Other Information Sources***

Beef Industry Producers	2
Government Department Employees	3
Non-Industry Development Course Participants	2

## **Appendix E**



### **The Next Step – A General Review**

**June 2002**

#### **Summary**

Experience has blended with enthusiasm in a pilot project initiated by the South Australian and Western Victorian Sustainable Grazing Systems (SGS) regional committee. The project – *the next step* – links mentees (new producers within the grazing industry) with mentors (experienced, professional producers) to help them reach identified business goals.

Nine mentees from across South Australia and Western Victoria have teamed with five mentors from within their districts. They began with planning days (where they selected their mentor), and throughout the year they will participate in four one-on-one walks with their mentor, attend a formal pasture/grazing management workshop, and undertake financial and business benchmarking.

Continual evaluation has enabled the project to be modified to meet the mentee and mentor needs, and has been financially supported by Meat and Livestock Australia (both the SGS and EDGENetwork programs) and FarmBis (Victoria and South Australia).

The management committee believes that the future of *the next step* is positive. It has mentees within the region interested in participating in next year, and groups of producers in New South Wales and Victoria keen to adopt the program in their area.

#### **Background**

*The next step* was a concept of the South Australian and Western Victorian Sustainable Grazing Systems (SGS) regional committee. Many members of the committee firmly believed that in order to adopt a more intensive and profitable livestock system, producers needed an extra hand – a more individual approach than the PROGRAZE and PPP groups had provided.

To make these business changes many members had employed various consultants (either private or public, full-time consultants or part-time producers), and felt that a mentoring program could provide the initial support.

### Pilot Program

SGS (through Meat and Livestock Australia) funded the regional committee \$15,000 and 15 days (of the regional facilitator's time) to design and implement a pilot program. A management committee of four regional committee members, and the regional facilitator, was established to ensure the pilot program met its aims, and was evaluated from a producer's perspective.

The pilot program began in December 2001 when 18 mentors were trained in facilitation and change management skills at a two-day workshop in Naracoorte (South Australia).

In February and April 2002, nine mentees (participants) attended two introductory workshops held in Balmoral (Victoria) and Mount Gambier (South Australia). At these workshops the mentees were given an opportunity to set some business goals for the next 12 months, and to select a mentor who would coach/lead/encourage them towards their destination. These nine mentees teamed up with six mentors.

The mentors meet the mentees on their property, four times throughout the production season, in one-on-one sessions funded through FarmBis Victoria. Most mentor/mentee teams have opted to visit seasonally, but the timing, and dates have been left for them to determine. Most teams have already met once, and are preparing for their second (winter) visit. Mentor farm walks are being organized for late winter/early spring to give the mentees an opportunity to "look" at the mentors' properties (and hopefully take home a swag full of ideas).

The Balmoral group participated in a two-day PROGRAZE Update, with the Mount Gambier group choosing a one-day PROGRAZE revision instead. Both groups will meet in August and September to benchmark their businesses against each other and the South West Monitor Group. A graduation day is planned for late January 2003.

### Mentors

The mentors involved in *the next step* are all full-time, professional producers. The regional committee identified the current mentors as all had implemented a high input, intensive grazing system on their property (and into their business). The committee also felt that these mentors had the industry experience to pass the necessary skills onto mentees through a formal relationship.

The role of a mentor is seen by SGS as a coaching and encouraging role. They are encouraged to question the decision making process of a mentee, and to provide the support and encouragement needed for them to adopt a more intensive grazing system. Mentors are not considered to be consultants, and for that reason they should not give advice to their mentee. Instead they are to provide them with a list of consultants (and their contact details) to find out more information.

There have been three Victorian and three South Australian mentors selected by mentees in *the next step* pilot program. Most are mentoring one mentee, however one mentor has three mentees, and another two mentees. So the management committee is watching these relationships with interest.

The management committee, regional facilitator and other mentors provide support for the mentors. The mentors have combined forces to form a "Mentors Club" which will meet twice during the program to encourage open communication between the mentors and the management committee.

Insurance (both public liability and professional indemnity) is being provided by Meat and Livestock Australia.

### Mentees

Advertisements in the Stock and Land and the Stock Journal in late January 2002 attracted about 30% of the mentees. The remainder heard about the program through rural email lists and personal contact with either a mentor or management committee member.

Whilst the SGS regional committee believed they would be attracting the middle 50% of producers to the program, it appears that those involved are some of the top 20% of producers (or will be). This will be verified further in the financial benchmarking workshops.

The regional committee also believed that all mentees would have completed PROGRAZE, however only 60% of those enrolled have. It has been recommended to those who have not completed PROGRAZE, do so as soon as possible.

It was also envisaged that the mentees would be just starting implementation of a more intensive grazing system. However 60% have already adopted such a system, and are looking to increase stocking rates further, or to lift other areas of production or business sustainability through the program.

Enrolled are six Victorian and three South Australian mentees. These consist of one husband and wife team, and one farm business owner and manager team. The remaining are male business owners, mostly managing family businesses. The age structure varies from mid 50s to late 20s. All have been full-time livestock producers and/or business managers for less than five years.

### Evaluation

Each part of the next step has been evaluated both written and orally – from the mentor training through to the group workshops and one-on-one paddock walks. This feedback is immediately introduced into the program, and a formal evaluation will be produced in February 2003 of the pilot program.

To aid this evaluation, each mentee was asked to complete an enrolment form outlining measurable production parameters. It is anticipated this will be used as an evaluation tool to measure their adoption of a more intensive, and profitable, livestock system.

### The future

The SGS regional committee firmly believes that one of the keys to the long-term future of Australia's livestock industry is its next generation. The next generation should adopt a professional view of the industry in order to provide a suitable level of profitability to support lifestyle and family choices. The adoption of a more intensive grazing system will provide this level of profitability, and a mentoring program like *the next step* provides the support and encouragement necessary to ensure this system is adopted.

*The next step* appears not only to be providing the future generation of producers with leadership, guidance and support from respected mentors, but also a network of professional, successful and like-minded people involved in the grazing industry. We believe that this network will continue to grow and encourage producers to adopt a professional and profitable outlook towards their livestock businesses.

The management committee has already had expressions of interest from six future mentees within the SGS region for the next intake, and from coordinators in Victoria and New South Wales.

It is planned that in 2003 another three groups will be initiated across Australia. Because of careful planning, training and management in the pilot project, the management committee firmly believes that *the next step* can be adopted in any locality and/or commodity, with success. This is where we hope the future of *the next step* will be.



## **More information**

If you would like more information about the next step please contact one of the management committee:

Danielle England	Coordinator	(08) 87676077	<a href="mailto:castlecarrock@bigpond.com">castlecarrock@bigpond.com</a>
Natascha Hryckow		(03) 5575 0290	<a href="mailto:mawnshss@bigpond.com">mawnshss@bigpond.com</a>
Michael Pocock		(08) 8757 8287	<a href="mailto:mrsheepy@lm.net.au">mrsheepy@lm.net.au</a>
Bill Stock		(08) 8766 2158	<a href="mailto:wstock@bigpond.com">wstock@bigpond.com</a>
Jack Speirs		(03) 5579 8558	<a href="mailto:sms1@bigpond.com">sms1@bigpond.com</a>

## Appendix F

### Emotional Intelligence (EQ) Domains and Associated Competencies

**Personal Competence:** These capabilities determine how we manage ourselves.

#### Self-Awareness

- *Emotional self-awareness:* Reading one's own emotions and recognising their impact; using "gut sense" to guide decisions.
- *Accurate self-assessment:* Knowing one's strengths and limits.
- *Self-confidence:* A sound sense of one's self-worth and capabilities.

#### Self-Management

- *Emotional self-control:* Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses under control.
- *Transparency:* Displaying honesty and integrity; trustworthiness.
- *Adaptability:* Flexibility in adapting to changing situations or overcoming obstacles.
- *Achievement:* The drive to improve performance to meet inner standards of excellence.
- *Initiative:* Readiness to act and seize opportunities.
- *Optimism:* Seeing the upside in events.

**Social Competence:** These capabilities determine how we manage relationships.

#### Social Awareness

- *Empathy:* Sensing others' emotions, understanding their perspective and taking active interest in their concerns.
- *Organisational awareness:* Reading the currents, decision networks and politics at the organisational level.
- *Service:* Recognising and meeting follower, client and customer needs.

## **Relationship Management**

- *Inspirational leadership*: Guiding and motivating with a compelling vision.
- *Influence*: Wielding a range of tactics for persuasion.
- *Developing others*: Bolstering others' abilities through feedback and guidance.
- *Change catalyst*: Initiating, managing and leading in a new direction.
- *Conflict management*: Resolving disagreements.
- *Building bonds*: Cultivating and maintaining a web of relationships.
- *Teamwork and collaboration*: Cooperation and team building.

From: Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A., (2002). Primal Leadership, p39.

## **Appendix G**

**Building the Leadership  
Capacity of the Australian  
Dairy Industry.**

*December 2001*

*Paper prepared for the Dairy Research and Development Corporation by:*

*Cheryl Phillips of Changing Industries Pty.Ltd.*

*and*

*Martin Smallridge of Complete Marketing and Management*

**Building the Leadership Capacity of the Australian Dairy Industry**

### **Abstract**

Traditional Leadership theory has changed many times during recent decades through behavioural traits to charismatic, transformational and visionary leadership models. Each of these has focused on the leader and explaining leadership in terms of defining the leader. Our work in rural Australia has lead us to question this approach to leadership and to develop a more holistic model of “industry leadership” rather than “individual leadership”. Industries, which have greater leadership capacity are those that develop general awareness among their members, have skilled, knowledgeable and networked stakeholders at all levels and members who can represent them at a local, state and national level. Those industries which value the passing on of information through mentoring and which are prepared to review their own practices in order to encourage development through organisational support structures will enhance their sustainability. This paper presents the concept, experience to date and the potential if applied broadly to the Dairy Industry.

### **Background**

Currently, leadership in Australia’s rural primary industries is predominantly based around the traditional “hero-leader” model. One person, usually an older male, has the leadership role in the community, organisation or industry. They are involved in many aspects of policy and management, and the more involved they become, the less involvement there is from other members. In some situations this ‘leader’ takes on an almost mythical persona amongst grass roots members with them supporting this person without question and having no sense that they could ever do the job. Conversely, the ‘hero leader’ is a dominant, control driven individual who has no desire, nor skills to include, let alone empower others. This situation often results in people choosing not to continue their involvement. The ‘hero leader’ in this situation often describes the ‘grass roots’ members as apathetic and unwilling to participate, as a way of justifying the need to maintain their own power, position and control. These models often result in a culture of blame rather than responsibility and of control rather than inclusiveness.

The Australian Dairy Industry has gone through a time of unprecedented change, which has also had a multiplier effect on associated communities. The dairy industry is operating in a newly deregulated market, which has exposed farmers to market forces, a factor which was previously managed artificially through price and quota regulation. The traditional processing co-operative is now forming new alliances and accessing product from different sources. Multi-national companies have become major players in the manufacturing sector. The industry, at all levels, is having to operate in a totally new environment.

The impact of these changes has been a time of major economic and social review and uncertainty to both industry stakeholders and their associated communities.

While industry leaders have been the prime movers of many of these associated changes, the traditional leadership model has not been effective at bringing the industry through the crisis and leaving it stronger and more clearly focused.

It is in this environment that a new model of leadership development has been formulated.

## **Theory**

Research identified the need to promote leadership that enhances all sectors of the whole system rather than simply replace or retrain existing leaders. The industry needs to increase both the depth and breadth of its leadership capacity to deal with the situation. The 'hero' model of leadership, where the focus is often on personal rewards and tradition does not contribute to the industry's leadership capacity. Whereas, a collaborative approach to achieving shared goals has the potential to do so.

The philosophy of the proposed approach is underpinned by a belief that the industry requires leadership rather than leaders and that this could best be brought about by involving all members of the industry in a leadership process. This process must be multi-dimensional and requires all participants to be team players and contribute whatever is needed.

The aim is to build an environment of respect and an acknowledgment that all people have a contribution to make. However, it requires an intentional investment in the future leadership capacity of the industry through the provision of skills, contacts and knowledge to all members, together with a willingness to create pathways for involvement, even if this results in others stepping aside. Potential members of leadership teams also need the opportunity to learn from those currently taking a leadership role through a mentoring process.

A key component of this philosophy is the development of knowledge, skills and processes involved in creating effective teams. It recognises that the decision making process of the industry are in fact built around groups, committees and councils which require issues to have significant support before being addressed. Hence, individuals need to be able to build coalitions of stakeholders, articulate their view and move it through the system. There is limited scope for individuals, particularly young people to operate outside the system.

Leadership in this context can be equated with effective teams and the provision of service. This requires a commitment to, and an ability to remain focused on the 'big picture'; together with a preparedness to respond to whatever is needed, with tasks being matched to the person rather than the position.

## **Leadership Program**

The research team has developed a leadership development program for the industry based on the above model. It focuses on an integrated program to provide for industry outcomes rather than a training program focusing on training outcomes for individuals.

Our model equates leadership with cultural change, it is about being dynamic as an industry and being able to respond to issues as they arise and the ability to capitalise on opportunities. It is about ensuring that there are:

1. People who are committed to continuous improvement and prepared to contribute their skills, knowledge and networks for the good of the industry,
2. Structures which offer pathways for involvement and support to industry stakeholders, and
3. An enhanced leadership capacity in order to create a sustainable, progressive and professional industry.

Thus, this program is concerned with leadership development, not the training of leaders.

While it is believed that stakeholders from all sectors can develop leadership skills, two strategies need to be implemented to ensure this is achieved. Firstly, the training needs to be targeted appropriately and provided in a safe, yet challenging environment. Secondly, the training needs to be conducted within a context of cultural change, with industry organisations developing strategic plans, which include succession policies in a parallel process.

In developing the program an investigation of available programs was undertaken. It was found that traditional leadership training was focused on individuals without providing them with a context or creating pathways to ensure their integration into industry. Additionally, few of the programs focused on skill development, instead providing networking opportunities and programs dominated by the provision of information with little interactive or experiential learning.

This program has been developed from the ground up based on the following principles:

1. Create a safe environment in which to learn prior to supporting participants to further develop their skills, knowledge, networks and confidence in the context of their industry.
2. Gain a commitment from industry organisations and 'champions' to resource the program and expose participants to models of best practice.
3. Build understanding across all sectors so that teams can be formed and present a whole-of-industry position to progress the industry's best interests.

This approach requires a commitment from industry organisations to review their policies and practices to ensure they are creating an environment which both models and encourages continuous improvement, best practice and collaborative decision making.

## Methods

A five-tier leadership development program is proposed and could be adapted for use in other commodities and communities. The components are:

1. Development of **awareness** among individual members of the industry and the formal decision making processes.,
2. Training of individuals to enable their effective **participation** in these structures and processes,
3. Investment in individuals who are committed to a team approach and able to **represent** the industry at the local, state or national level,
4. Establishment of a culture of continual improvement by linking existing leaders with industry members through a **mentoring** program, and
5. **Organisational review and change** within the formal structures and processes to ensure resourcing and support of training program graduates.

Fundamental to each level of the program is a commitment to experiential learning by the individuals involved. The selection process is integral to the success of the program as it links participants of training programs and industry decision-making bodies from the outset. Individuals are required to gain the support of industry in the form of sponsorship and a mentor, together with opportunities to observe and participate in industry decision making processes. In some cases the industry organisations may choose to take the initiative to encourage and support participation by members.

Mentoring has played an important role in expanding the networks, skills and confidence of participants within the Dairy Industry programs. The program has taken the approach that mentoring is a two way learning process, with a balance being struck between learning the corporate or traditional wisdom and being open to new and innovative ideas that have the potential, when refined, to make a difference in the future. Participants are briefed prior to the commencement of the program that they will be required to select a person as a mentor to work with them for the duration of the program. They are encouraged to identify someone with whom they don't have a relationship which could restrict the learning opportunities due the expectations of the existing relationship, for example an employer or family member, and they are also encouraged to consider a mentor from outside of their own industry.

Furthermore, each training course requires participants to undertake an industry-related project over the duration of the course. Firstly these projects give participants the mandate to become actively involved in the industry; secondly, it enables them to put their newly acquired skills and knowledge into practice and thirdly, it provides an opportunity for participants to contribute to their industry.

The training programs which focus on enhanced participation and representation are conducted over two and three residential sessions respectively. This format offers participants the opportunity to focus totally on the learning opportunity, develop lasting relationships with peers, meet with current industry leaders at formal dinners to discuss issues of significance, actively expand their network and learn the art of strategically preparing for an event in order to access information and gain insights into the 'big picture'.

## Results

The program has been developed and piloted through the Women in Dairy program from 1996 - 2001, this concept was adapted for a leadership development program conducted for young dairy farmers across Victoria during 2000, with the integrated whole of industry program being implemented for the National Seafood Industry during 2001. During this time the program has been provided to in excess of 500 people and has gone through a process of continual review and refinement.



Results are focused on actual outcomes rather than simply additional numbers of people on committees. The results so far can be categorised into one of four areas:

1. Wider involvement in the industry/community,
2. Higher quality participation at all levels of industry decision making,
3. Provision of a broader mandate to develop the industry, and
4. Increased opportunities/pathways for industry members.

Our results are presented in each of these areas.

### ***1. Wider involvement in the industry***

In each of the instances where one or more elements of the program have been delivered, there is a demonstrable increase in the level of participation on industry issues. This is typified by the development and utilisation of a national email discussion group with two hundred participants, through the Women in Dairy Project. This forum was particularly useful during the transition to deregulation, as factual information was readily available from all states and manufacturers, whereas many forums were hearing a biased view of the issue from a state or processor's perspective. This forum also offers support for participant initiatives, provides an effective mechanism to consult a large number of industry members on an issue, encourages participation in industry forums and broadens the debate on issues of significance. On most industry issues, the formal industry structures can now rely on input from a much wider industry perspective than was the case previously.

### ***2. Higher levels and more knowledgeable participation***

While delivery of the "Awareness" program has resulted in wider involvement in industry issues it does not necessarily mean more or different people are on formal structures such as boards or committees.

In this regard, many of the "Participation" and "Representation" programs which have been delivered have resulted in a range of new people taking on formal roles in the industry/community. It has been clear in many cases that these people required an investment in them to encourage development of confidence and related skills to allow them to feel able to participate on committees.

As a result of both the Women in Dairy and Young Dairy Farmers Development Program, many graduates have become actively involved in decision making bodies. It has been identified by the state dairy organizations that their directories of office bearers at a local, regional and state level highlight the emergence of many women who have completed the women in dairy leadership program.

A further example of the increased level of participation is a young Gippsland Dairy Farmer. Tim Kennedy was moving down the sharefarmer to owner path when he was offered the farm manager position for the Tarago River Cheese Company. In conjunction with this entry into corporate farming, Tim Kennedy participated in the Young Dairy Farmers Development Program and became aware of opportunities to become involved in decision making processes. He actively worked with the UDV to explore the issue of full membership status for dairy farm managers. Tim is now on the Gippsdairy Board heading up the committee to develop the leadership capacity within the region.

### ***3. Provision of a broader mandate to develop the industry***

The provision of links between industry and participants, both formally through the nomination process, mentoring, and industry dinners and informally by participants undertaking a related project, has resulted in people feeling better placed to make a difference in their industry. Where previously participation in significant projects has been left to a select few, graduates of the Participation and Representation programs have been more likely to feel mandated to take on industry challenges. For example a participant of the Young Dairy Farmers' Development Program organized a discussion group for young dairy farm managers, another organized a workshop on the practical skill area of front end loader safety and another organized a forum with key industry leaders to discuss current issues of concern.

### ***4. Increased opportunities/pathways for industry members.***

Work with industry organisations, coupled with the linkages developed between participants and their industry has resulted in the development of new opportunities for individuals to participate. Participation in the courses raises the profile of participants resulting in them being more likely to be nominated for industry positions.

In other instances, graduates have been provided with opportunities resulting from the restructuring of their representative organisation and a greater awareness of the need for succession planning. This has lead the organisation to invest in distributing information across a broader range of individuals within their industry.

## ***Conclusion***

A progressive, profitable and sustainable industry is dependent on quality leadership.

The leadership development program outlined in this paper is bringing about cultural change by raising the level of professionalism and strategic planning at an individual, enterprise and industry level. There is now considerable evidence across two commodity groups and one cluster of rural communities to demonstrate the impact of the program. Not only is there increased participation but increased professionalism, commitment and an ability to operate within a whole of industry context is now evident.

A challenge for the research team was to move away from defining success by the number of people completing the courses to the development of a culture of continual improvement, with training simply being a tool for achieving industry development.

This program takes an inclusive approach and is predicated on a belief in the potential of all industry stakeholders to contribute to the future development of the industry. A critical success factor is for the facilitators, together with all elements of the program to model this belief and to genuinely invest in each participant.

The creation of a safe yet challenging learning environment is an essential component of the program.

The involvement and public support of industry organizations and 'champions' makes a significant contribution to the program and enables the outcomes to relate to and be incorporated into the industry. Furthermore, industry involvement has resulted in a growing awareness of the need to create pathways for future leaders and intentionally support graduates as they begin their involvement in the industry's decision making processes. The mentoring program has also demonstrated significant benefits in building relationships between existing and future leaders.

There have been considerable learnings through the process of developing, implementing and refining this program. However, it is believed that this leadership development program, when implemented in total, can significantly enhance the leadership capacity within an industry.