

# 1

## What Is a Next-Generation Corporate University?

*Mark Allen*

**CAN IT BE THAT** corporate universities have actually been around long enough for there to be a second generation? The first corporate universities date back at least as far as the 1940s, but the real growth started in the 1990s, so many corporate universities are now entering their second decade. As these entities grow in size and sophistication, the answer to my opening question is yes, and it is time to start talking about a new generation of corporate universities—ones that go beyond training and development, go beyond merely calling themselves a corporate university, and offer a variety of innovative services that help develop people and expand organizational capabilities. It is those corporate universities and their innovative approaches that are the subject of this book.

The two questions I am most frequently asked about corporate universities are, “Isn’t a corporate university just a fancy name for a training department?” and “What exactly is a corporate university?” A corporate university is not a fancy training department. The best way to distinguish a training

department from a corporate university is to look at the span of activities that each offers. A training department does training. A corporate university does training and many, many other things.

Corporate universities are responsible for developing people and growing organizational capabilities. Lest you think I am discounting training, I believe training is an excellent way to develop people—possibly the best way. However, there are many other ways to do it as well. A bit later in this chapter I list those ways (training is near the top of the list), and it is quite a long list.

So that brings us to the other question: What exactly is a corporate university? In *The Corporate University Handbook* (2002), I offered this definition: “A corporate university is an educational entity that is a strategic tool designed to assist its parent organization in achieving its mission by conducting activities that cultivate individual and organizational learning, knowledge, and wisdom” (p. 9). The most important word in that definition is *strategic*. Although training departments are important, they are usually tactical and operational and are often not tied directly to an organization’s strategy. In order to be considered a true corporate university, the entity must be mission driven and tied to strategy.

This leads us to another question that people often ask: Is it appropriate for my organization to have a corporate university? As much as I am an advocate for corporate universities as vehicles for adding tremendous value to organizations, the concept is not right for every organization. It is not right to create a corporate university when it is viewed merely as a marketing gimmick. If people aren’t coming to your training programs, relabeling them a corporate university may initially treat the symptom—low attendance—but it won’t cure the disease (which is usually a case of having programs that people perceive as lacking value).

The other reason for not creating a corporate university is not having a clear and compelling reason to do so. I have spoken to dozens of people who told me that they were starting a corporate university because their boss read something about corporate universities and said, “I gotta get me one of them.” Someone in the organization was then picked to create a corporate university. Since the mandate can be as nebulous as, “Create a corporate uni-

versity,” it is easy to succeed at reaching that low bar. However, it is virtually impossible to have any real success in terms of adding value to the organization and making a difference when there is no real strategic intent behind the plan. Without any purposeful objectives tied to organizational strategy, it is generally not a good idea to create a corporate university for the sake of having one. In fact, this can be quite damaging to an organization if, sometime later, a genuine strategic corporate university is conceived. People will remember the ill-fated marketing gimmick and will not embrace the concept when there is a real need for it.

So when should you have a corporate university? When there is a genuine strategic need for one. If there is a clearly identified need that involves the development of people, a corporate university can be a valuable strategic tool. Remember: a true corporate university is a strategic tool tied directly to helping an organization achieve its mission.

## Corporate University Functions

Although *strategic* is the key word in defining a corporate university, this book is devoted to the part of the definition that discusses activities. The definition uses some fairly specific words to define a corporate university, but the word *activities* is quite vague, and deliberately so. The reason for this ambiguity is that there are many different ways that a corporate university can fulfill its role of cultivating individual and organizational learning, knowledge, and wisdom. At the time the definition was written, I knew I could not possibly name all of those different ways and that many had not yet even been conceived.

As I've spoken to numerous corporate university professionals over the years, I have compiled a list of these various activities. The list is long, but it is not meant to be comprehensive. First, I am sure I have overlooked some viable developmental methods. More important, I am even more certain that by the time you read this, innovative corporate university professionals will have created new and exciting ways for corporate universities to develop people and add value.

Here is the list of activities and functions that corporate universities can engage in:

- Needs assessments
- Designing training programs
- Delivering training programs
- Designing managerial and executive development programs
- Delivering managerial and executive development programs
- Assessing technology options
- Delivering e-learning or blended learning programs
- Hiring vendors
- Managing vendor relationships
- Marketing programs internally
- Marketing programs externally
- Evaluating programs
- Evaluating the corporate university
- Managing university partnerships
- Executive coaching
- Mentoring
- Career planning
- Strategic hiring
- New employee orientation
- Succession planning
- Culture change
- Strategic change
- Knowledge management
- Wisdom management
- Library and electronic collections of information
- Research and development

Although this list is not intended to be exhaustive, it is nonetheless instructive. The first lesson it demonstrates is that there are many ways to develop people in addition to training. Beyond that, many of the functions listed—knowledge management, succession planning, coaching, mentoring—are not new ideas. What is a recent development, however, is the notion that these functions can be managed as part of a corporate university. Not only can they be part of a corporate university, I would argue that they should be managed by a corporate university, or at least have some degree of corporate university involvement.

When I work with people charged with creating new corporate universities, I give them this list and ask them to create four columns, labeled “responsible for,” “involved with,” “outsource,” and “won’t do.” For each item on the list, I ask them to think about whether their corporate university will be responsible for this function, involved with it, outsource it (which still might involve oversight by the corporate university), or just won’t do it at all.

The last column is perfectly acceptable because although every function on the list could be managed by a corporate university, I know of no corporate university that could do everything on the list, nor would it need to. Depending on the size of the organization, its goals, and a number of other variables, some of the functions on the list might not be necessary.

However, what every function on the list does have in common is that they all relate to people and their development. And while some items on the list are traditionally the responsibility of other departments (for example, human resources usually is involved with strategic hiring and new employee orientation), all of these are development opportunities, and therefore corporate university involvement makes sense.

Consider the example of new employee orientation. At one end of the spectrum are the companies that do half-day orientation sessions explaining the benefits plan and other basic information (for example, how many holidays employees get). At the other end are the strategic efforts to accelerate the acculturation and engagement of new employees, vital components of new employee success. When I speak to groups of corporate university professionals, I ask how many are involved with the various functions on the list. Five years ago, I saw only a few hands go up as I asked this question about

new employee orientation. Now I routinely see more than half the hands in the room raised. What was formerly a standard human resource function has become a strategic corporate university function. And this is true of most of the activities on the list.

It is also interesting to note some things that are not on the list, for example, degree programs. Programs leading to associate, bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degrees remain the exclusive province of traditional universities. A study in 2000 went in search of degree-granting corporate universities and discovered fewer than ten in all of the United States and Canada (Thompson, 2000). The trend for corporate universities to stay out of the degree-granting business has not changed since that study. Due to the complexities of degree programs and the barriers to entry (primarily accreditation), corporate universities that wish to provide degree programs (sometimes customized) for their employees have found it much more efficient to form a partnership with a local traditional university. That's why "managing university partnerships" is on the list but not "offering degree programs."

Also missing is academic research, the kind that traditional research universities undertake. Publishing articles in academic journals would not help develop people or expand organizational capabilities, so it is generally avoided by corporate universities. However, research and development is on the list. Most large companies have a separate research and development department, but some have embraced the idea of having the corporate university administer the process of employees' conducting research that will benefit the company. One of these, Enclos Corp., is profiled in Chapter Nine. Enclos University administers innovation grants that offer money or time away from other tasks (or both) in order to create a new product, service, or process that the company will be able to use.

The absence of degree programs and academic research demonstrates that despite the similarity in names, corporate universities and traditional universities do not have overlapping functions. They certainly cannot be viewed as competitors, except possibly for the very narrow space of executive development programs. These programs are typically not a core part of a traditional university's mission, although many do perform this function. So in some cases, internal corporate universities can be viewed as competitors to university-based

executive development programs. But in other cases, savvy university-based business schools collaborate with corporate universities to create customized degree and nondegree programs.

## How This Book Is Organized

Some chapters in this book are dedicated to many of the functions already noted in this chapter. In fact, this book is devoted to telling stories about how corporate universities have successfully integrated these functions into their responsibilities for developing people and organizational capabilities. A next-generation corporate university is one that goes beyond training to integrate numerous methods for the strategic development of people.

The chapters in Part One focus on the strategic role of corporate universities. In Chapter Two, Aimee George-Leary and Ed Cohen describe how to build a holistic development framework, which they define as one that is linked to all people processes through the organization, and they use their experience at Booz Allen Hamilton as a case study. They begin their chapter with five words that effectively capture the spirit of this book: “Development is more than training.”

In Chapter Three, Karen Barley, president of the consulting firm Corporate University Enterprise, looks at learning as a competitive business variable in order to explore the notion of learning as a strategic business process.

Part Two is devoted to some internal functions of corporate universities. As corporate university professionals look over the menu of possible functions of a corporate university, they need to decide what they are going to do. The next question is equally important: How are they going to do it?

One solution that many organizations have decided on is e-learning. They cite the potential cost savings and the ability to widely distribute learning products as major benefits. What they fail to see is that e-learning has frequently not lived up to its potential of helping people learn and helping organizations achieve better results.

In 2001, I attended the Virtual Corporate University Week conference. Hundreds of people descended on San Francisco to talk about how they were going to get rid of all of their classrooms and have a completely virtual

corporate university. (I wondered at the time why they all needed to descend when we could, theoretically, have held the conference virtually.) Within three years, I knew of no corporate university that was completely virtual. This one-size-fits-all approach didn't work. First, different subjects lend themselves more readily to e-learning than others. For example, how to use a certain software program might be a better e-learning subject than how to conduct better face-to-face conversations. Also, not every employee in an organization has the same learning style. Some people might take very well to an online learning environment, but it just won't work for others. There is no single solution that will effectively engage everyone in an organization. The notion of a completely virtual corporate university has faded away.

*Hybrid programs* and *blended learning* then became the buzzwords. The idea was to blend together classroom sessions with electronic programs and presto, you've got a learning smoothie. But what organizations in fact discovered was that although they could generally get people to show up in classrooms, the e-learning piece was more problematical. People would start these programs but never quite finish.

I knew this part of the business was in trouble when I heard someone bragging that he had developed an e-learning program that was so good that it had a 60 percent completion rate. People looked at him with envy. I tried to imagine a traditional university bragging that its programs were so good that only 40 percent of its students dropped out.

It's not that e-learning didn't hold a lot of potential. It always did, and it still does. The problem is that the focus is usually on the technology (the "e"), not the learning. Although it is not impossible to truly engage people using technology, it is very difficult. Organizations have discovered that most (not all, but most) e-learning programs and blended learning programs have not delivered on their promise.

So the question remained: To e or not to e? Roger Schank provides some answers in Chapter Four. Rather than focus on classroom learning versus e-learning versus blended learning, Schank asserts that we should focus on what he refers to as "splendid learning." As the subtitle of the chapter tells us, the technology doesn't matter. First, focus on ensuring that people are learning and are learning the right things; then determine how to deliver that learn-

ing. Schank was supposed to write a chapter on technology for this book, but he cheated and instead gives us a chapter about learning (imagine that in a book on corporate education!). Nevertheless, he provides examples of how to use technology to deliver learning that is splendid.

An important but often overlooked corporate university function is branding. Annick Renaud-Coulon is the president of the Global Council of Corporate Universities and one of the leading experts on corporate universities in Europe and around the globe. In Chapter Five, she presents the case for corporate university branding as a vital function that has a direct impact on corporate university success.

As ethical scandals dominate the headlines, companies are grappling with how to promote ethical behaviors. In Chapter Six, Philip McGee and John Duncan suggest that corporate universities could take responsibility not only for delivering classes that ensure compliance with ethical requirements, but also genuinely promote an ethical culture throughout the organization. They use three very different organizations as illustrative examples.

Jack Phillips, the guru of return on investment measures for training programs and corporate universities, and Patti Phillips discuss in Chapter Seven the challenges of evaluation and offer suggestions for how evaluation can help both determine as well as add value.

You may have noted that the definition of corporate university earlier in this chapter does not use the word *corporation*. The reason is that a corporate university does not have to be housed in a corporation. In fact, many of the finest specimens are located in nonprofit organizations, governments, and other nontraditional places. In Part Three, we explore these distinctive settings.

Global companies face extra challenges in implementing corporate universities. Different languages, cultures, and time zones are among the issues that global corporate universities face. In Chapter Eight, Ed Cohen, the former Booz Allen Hamilton executive who collaborated on Chapter Two and now heads up the corporate university for Satyam Computer Services, a global company based in India, shares his insights on running a global corporate university and tells the story of what Satyam has done.

Another frequently asked question about corporate universities is how big an organization needs to be for the corporate university model to make sense.

This is a case where size clearly doesn't matter. I have worked with organizations with as few as four hundred employees that have effectively implemented a corporate university. One of them is Enclos Corp. In Chapter Nine, Lee Steffens and Shannon Novotne tell the Enclos story and offer advice on how small companies with small budgets can create corporate universities with large impacts.

The for-profit sector is not the exclusive province of corporate universities. The next two chapters are devoted to the stories of successful corporate universities in nonprofit organizations. First, Deborah Grayson Riegel offers insight into how a nonprofit can effectively implement a corporate university. Then Kevin Bruny, who started and runs the corporate university for Chesterfield County, Virginia, gives a detailed description of a government-based corporate university.

In Part Four, we examine the various functions and activities beyond traditional training that corporate universities can and do engage in. One of the most important and often overlooked aspects of organizational change is culture change. Even when organizations attempt to travel down this difficult path, they usually do not look to the corporate university as the enabler. But since cultures are a product of people and corporate universities are devoted to developing people, Laree Kiely contends in Chapter Twelve that the corporate university should lead the culture change charge. She offers step-by-step guidelines for how this might be accomplished.

Countless organizations are employing mentoring and executive coaching, occasionally as part of formalized programs, but frequently in less structured arrangements. Yet these are exactly the types of functions that can add tremendous value to both individuals and organizations if they are managed properly. In Chapter Thirteen, Lynn Slavenski describes how her organization, Equifax, has put in place a formal process managed by the corporate university to implement mentoring on a widespread basis throughout the organization. Then Merrill Anderson offers his perspective on the strategic contribution of corporate universities to leadership coaching in Chapter Fourteen.

Jack Gregg, the dean of Space University at Northrop Grumman, explores the idea of career path management in Chapter Fifteen. This is another concept that can provide tremendous value to both the individual and the orga-

nization if managed properly and is another function that is not normally thought of as residing in a corporate university.

I have long been mystified by organizations that have a corporate university but conduct succession planning activities without involving corporate university personnel. Succession planning goes beyond identifying candidates; it also entails developing people. I don't see how you can do succession planning divorced from the corporate university. In Chapter Sixteen, Lynn Schmidt goes beyond the old notion of succession planning and discusses succession management, a much more comprehensive process that goes beyond planning and into implementation and management.

In Chapter Seventeen, my eponymous colleague Mark W. Allen (who shares my name and interest in corporate universities but is not related to me) discusses an important but often maligned function: knowledge management. If you ask corporate executives if they agree with the statement, "The most valuable asset in your organization is the knowledge in the heads of the workers," most would say they do. If you then asked, "Do you do a good job managing the acquisition, sharing, and use of that knowledge?" most would say they don't. This is not mere speculation on my part; I have asked these questions of hundreds of managers and executives. Almost all agree with the first statement, and the vast majority concede that the second statement is a problem. Many dismiss knowledge management as a fad or the latest flavor of the month. Yet unless you expect the value of workers' knowledge to decrease in importance, it is unlikely that the concept of knowledge management will fade away.

Part of the reason for the dismissal of knowledge management is that many organizations misfired when they first tried to implement it. Recognizing that there was a need for knowledge to be shared among large numbers of people across great geographical distances, knowledge management promoters decided that a database was necessary. They summoned the information technology (IT) department and put them in charge of building the knowledge management database. The IT folks did what they always do: a good job of doing exactly what we asked them to do. The problem is that we asked them to do the wrong thing. They built it, but no one came.

It turns out that we made two mistakes. First, we confused knowledge with data. Computers are good at storing data, but knowledge resides in people's

brains. Knowledge comes in two flavors: declarative and procedural. Declarative knowledge is facts—the kind that can be written down and stored in a database. Procedural knowledge refers to how to do something. People know how to do stuff, but it's hard to capture that in a database. And guess which type of knowledge is more important to an organization? At the risk of being a heretic, I think Peter Drucker got it wrong (slightly) when he wrote of the growing importance of knowledge workers. We don't value workers for what they know; we value people for what they know how to do. And that is harder to capture in a database.

The other problem is that one of the major issues in knowledge management is the sharing of knowledge. The organization gets much better value out of my knowledge if I share it with others rather than keep it to myself. Unfortunately, for decades, organizations have rewarded hoarding knowledge instead of sharing it. Remember knowledge is power. Whether intentional or not, there are typically organizational rewards and benefits for being the only person in an organization who knows something. Build all the databases you want, but if you're going to reward me for being the only person who knows something, I'm not going to share it with others just because we now have a database.

As it turns out, knowledge management is not at all an IT issue; it is a people issue (though one that can be aided by electronic tools provided by the IT department). This often involves a change in the reward system and frequently necessitates a major shift in culture (as discussed in Chapter Twelve). Since it is a people issue, it is a corporate university issue. Chapter Seventeen delves into the ways that a corporate university can successfully manage an organization's knowledge management function.

And while knowledge management usually focuses on acquiring, storing, and sharing knowledge, the missing link is often applying the knowledge. In Chapter Seven, Jack and Patti Phillips share some research that shows that between 60 and 90 percent of the job-related skills and knowledge acquired in a corporate education program is still not being implemented on the job. So while we might be doing a good job of getting knowledge into the heads of our workers, we have not been doing as good a job of getting them to use it in a way that benefits the organization.

The solution to this is presented in Chapter Eighteen with a topic I call wisdom management. This coda to the book serves as a reminder that all of the good ideas in this book are just that—good ideas—unless they are applied in the workplace in ways that benefit the organization. Wisdom management describes an organized process of ensuring that all of our fine development efforts are put to good use.

The book is intended as a practical, hands-on, how-to book for corporate university professionals. Just as wisdom management prescribes that we use our knowledge to improve personal or organizational performance, those of us who put this book together know you are reading it out of a desire to improve your performance, not understand more theory. The theory is at a minimum here, and the professionals who contributed chapters to this book did so out of a desire to help you by sharing their experience, successes, failures, knowledge, and even wisdom. We hope you enjoy reading about our journeys as much as we enjoyed traveling them.

## References

Allen, M. *The Corporate University Handbook*. New York: AMACOM, 2002.

Thompson, G. "Unfulfilled Prophecy: The Evolution of Corporate Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education*, 2000, 71(3), 322–341.



Mark Allen, Ph.D., is an educator, consultant, author, and speaker. He is the editor of and a contributor to *The Corporate University Handbook* (2002) and the author of numerous articles on the topic of corporate universities. An internationally recognized authority, he is a popular speaker and has published and presented research on corporate universities and nontraditional higher education throughout the world. Other research interests include the assessment of training and development programs and the evaluation of teaching and learning in postsecondary and adult education. He serves as a consultant to both new and mature corporate universities.

Allen is a participating faculty member in Organization Theory and Management at Pepperdine University's Graziadio School of Business and Management, where he also served for ten years as director of executive education. An award-winning teacher, he also teaches at Pepperdine's Graduate School of Education and Psychology.

Previously he was program director in executive education at the University of Southern California's Marshall School of Business, where he developed a variety of highly successful executive education programs. He has also held managerial positions at several organizations.

Among the organizations he has worked with are 3M, Boeing, Caesars World, the Los Angeles Police Department, Verizon, Southern California Edison, Farmers Insurance, Enclos Corp., Infonet, Safeguard, Samsung, Hughes, Kaiser Permanente, and the government of Taiwan.

Allen has a B.A. in psychology from Columbia University, an M.B.A. from Pepperdine University, and a Ph.D. in education from the University of Southern California. He can be reached at [mark.allen@pepperdine.edu](mailto:mark.allen@pepperdine.edu).

<http://www.pbookshop.com>

<http://www.pbookshop.com>