

# INNOVATION IN EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIETAL TRANSFORMATION

## THE MACARTHUR FOUNDATION, JESUIT BUSINESS SCHOOLS, AND THE WORLD

JAMES A. F. STONER  
*Gabelli School of Business*  
*Fordham University*  
*New York, New York, U.S.A.*  
*stoner@fordham.edu*

**ABSTRACT.** On June 2, 2016, the MacArthur Foundation announced a competition awarding \$100 million to a single project that would contribute toward solving a significant societal problem. Six weeks later, in Nairobi, Kenya, the members of the annual meeting of the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools' World Forum unanimously passed a resolution requesting the submission of an application that utilized the resources of the global network of Jesuit business schools in addressing the inter-connected problem of global unsustainability, social injustice, and poverty. This article reports on the resulting 2016 application as well as on a possible 2019 version that builds upon it. The article emphasizes four aspects of innovation at the core of both these applications and the 2016 MacArthur Foundation competition. The four areas are: 1) the MacArthur Foundation's innovative approach to inspiring societal change; 2) innovation in teaching and research content—transforming teaching materials and research topics in business schools, both Jesuit and other; 3) innovation in the processes of organizational transformation—participating business schools transforming their teaching and research in an “impossibly” short time period of only

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE IN PRESS: Stoner, J. A. F. 2018. Innovation in Educational and Societal Transformation: The MacArthur Foundation, Jesuit Business Schools, and the World. *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability* 6(2).

three years; and 4) innovation in the processes of societal transformation—achieving collaborative transformation among business schools, the business community, governmental agencies, spiritual and religious organizations, social enterprises, and not-for-profits.

**KEYWORDS:** global sustainability; global flourishing; sustainability education; global transformation; MacArthur Foundation

## OVERVIEW

In 2016, 1,904 applications were submitted to the MacArthur Foundation's "100&change" competition (Conrad, 2016). At stake was a \$100 million prize that would be used to fund a single project aimed at solving a "critical problem of our time," one that might seem unapproachable and unsolvable at first. The specific requirements of the competition included finding and defining a meaningful problem, describing the communities targeted by the proposal, plans for engaging with them, and showing how the proposal would measure real progress toward a "verifiable, durable, and feasible" solution.

This article briefly comments on this initiative of the MacArthur Foundation and then reports on just one of the applications sent in, a proposal submitted by the leadership of the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools (IAJBS) and the Colleagues in Jesuit Business Education (CJBE) on behalf of the global network of Jesuit business schools. That proposal was designed to create a global conversation and set off actions that would take our broken producing-distributing-consuming systems—ones that are destroying our planet's capacity to support our own and other species—and transform them into systems that will enable our own and other species to, in the words of John Ehrenfeld, "flourish forever" on this planet (Ehrenfeld, 2008).

The IAJBS/CJBE proposal sought to create that global conversation and actions for societal transformation by

1. recognizing that our current producing-distributing-consuming system is unsustainable ("the global system is broken");
2. recognizing that global business school teaching and research as a whole supports and contributes to that broken system ("admitting that we are part of the problem");

3. supporting 40 business schools in the transformation of their teaching and research toward aligning with the needs of a sustainable world (“transforming business education”);
4. having those business schools create their own individual transformations in collaboration with businesses and other societal institutions (“collaborative transformation”);
5. having them do so in the seemingly impossibly short time period of only three years (“doing the impossible”); and
6. having them share the procedures and results of their transformations in a variety of completely transparent and widely visible processes that will inspire and enable other business schools and all other institutions to begin their own parallel transformations immediately (“inspiring global transformation”).

The proposal’s design emphasized that no one really knows how the world’s business schools “should” go about transforming themselves, and it is unlikely that one approach, even if it could be agreed upon, would work for all of them. Each of the 40 business schools, therefore, was to develop its own approach for executing its transformation within its own unique situation. These 40 “parallel projects,” in turn, would generate a variety of innovative approaches and discoveries and provide opportunities to learn from many different methodologies and their results.

This article focuses on the innovative nature of the MacArthur Foundation initiative, the multiple innovations called for by the design and intent of the original 2016 IAJBS/CJBE submission, and a potential project/submission for 2019 that builds on the 2016 application. It concludes with suggestions on how an application planned for the 2019 competition can be used as a vehicle for achieving the meta-goal of the original 2016 submission—using the visible and public transformation of business education to start the immediate transformation of the global producing-distributing-consuming system and of ourselves.

## **INTRODUCTION: WHAT’S SO? SO WHAT? NOW WHAT?**

*What’s so?* As we grapple with a great many intractable societal problems in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Albert Einstein’s observation that “we cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we

created them” (AZ Quotes, n.d.) rings especially true. We need to find innovative new ways to conceptualize these complex concerns, these problems that have been labeled “wicked” (Churchman, 1967; Rittel & Webber, 1973; Waddock, 2013), and move forward toward effective “solutions.” Alas, no problem is more difficult to grapple with—and more in need of creative thinking, innovative approaches, and bold actions—than the problem of global unsustainability. Our global producing-distributing-consuming systems are broken, and they are rapidly destroying the capacity of the planet to support our own and other species.

*So what?* The 2016 MacArthur Foundation 100@change competition, by inviting interested parties to submit proposals aimed at solving a critical societal problem and offering generous funding for the implementation of the winning pitch, sought to inspire exactly the kind of new thinking and innovative actions Albert Einstein called for. This article notes the innovative nature of the MacArthur Foundation initiative and emphasizes the multiple levels of innovation present in a 100&change proposal that moves toward “solving” the most critical problem of our time—the problem of global unsustainability.

*Now what?* Although the 2016 IAJBS/CJBE entry did not “win” the competition’s US\$100 million prize, this article concludes with some of the actions being taken in 2019 that build upon that 2016 proposal.

## **INNOVATION BY THE MACARTHUR FOUNDATION: A “THEORY OF INNOVATION” CONSISTENT WITH THE 100&CHANGE COMPETITION**

An over-arching “theory of innovation” that might be consistent with the broad scope of the MacArthur 100&change competition and which definitely guided the IAJBS/CJBE 2016 proposal as described later in this article can be captured in two quotations. First, there is “Hal” (Harold J.) Leavitt’s oft-repeated recommendation that “when you don’t know how to do something, give it to a group” (Stoner, n.d.). Second is the quotation from William Hutchinson Murray that is frequently attributed, though not very accurately, to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and which is often phrased as follows:

Until one is committed, there is hesitancy, the chance to draw back, always ineffectiveness. Concerning all acts of initiative (and creation), there is one elementary truth, the ignorance of which kills countless ideas and splendid plans: that the moment one definitely commits oneself, then Providence

moves too. All sorts of things occur to help one that would never otherwise have occurred. A whole stream of events issues from the decision, raising in one's favour all manner of unforeseen incidents and meetings and material assistance, which no man could have dreamt would have come his way. I have learned a deep respect for one of Goethe's couplets:

*Whatever you can do, or dream you can, begin it.*

*Boldness has genius, power, and magic in it!* (Murray, n.d.)

The 100&change competition invited groups and institutions to propose projects that would invest \$100 million each in one brief commitment, spanning approximately 3 to 5 years, to solve societal problems that might initially seem unapproachable and unsolvable. The applicants were required to figure out what problem to grapple with, how to address it, how to measure their progress and results, and to share what they did so others can learn from their experiences and outcomes. Rather than telling the applicants what concerns to focus on and how to address them, the competition called for innovative thinking on how to define and approach major societal problems.

The innovative design of the 100&change competition and of the three areas of innovation described in this article call for participants to discover creative and bold ways of doing the impossible in incredibly short periods of time. The approaches they will need to follow and the actions they will be called upon to take in making the impossible happen embody the following two part theme: when you have an enormously challenging, bold, and perhaps impossible project, 1) *give it to a group* that is 2) *fully committed* to making it happen. And, oh yes, a third part: make sure that group's progress on its project is 3) *publicly visible* and *fully transparent*.

Viewed in the spirit of Einstein's statement, the competition does not seek simply to solve one or a few societal problems; it is, rather, a bold and innovative initiative to inspire many more projects than the MacArthur Foundation could ever finance. In this light, one of its key goals—and perhaps its main purpose—would be to inspire a great many individuals and groups to dream up bold and innovative ways of approaching major societal problems, ways that would not be constrained by the usual feelings of financial stringency that narrow one's thinking and willingness to commit to bold action. The 1,904 applications received would therefore mark the competition as a very solid success indeed—if reasonable measures of “success” for this apparent goal are the number of entries received and, thus, the number of major projects designed and potentially committed to.

In addition to this initial commentary on the innovative nature of the MacArthur Foundation competition, this article also comments on the innovative aspects of one of these 1,904 applications—an entry inspired by a resolution passed at a conference in Nairobi, Kenya that was attended by members of a number of Jesuit business schools—and on a possible future application based on it.

Three remaining aspects of innovation are also discussed herein: 1) innovation in teaching and research content—transforming teaching materials and research topics, first in Jesuit business schools and then in others; 2) innovation in the processes of organizational transformation—participating business schools transforming their teaching and research within the impossibly short period of only 3 years, and showing other schools and organizations how to transform themselves; and 3) innovation in the processes of societal transformation—achieving collaborative transformation among business schools, the business community, governmental agencies, spiritual and religious organizations, social enterprises, and not-for-profits.

## THE ROAD TO THE “NAIROBI RESOLUTION”

The MacArthur Foundation 100&change competition was announced on June 2, 2016. On July 10, the possibility of joining the competition was suggested at the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Colleagues in Jesuit Business Education at Le Moyne College in Syracuse, New York. On July 18, at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual World Forum of the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools in Nairobi, Kenya, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

The annual meeting of the IAJBS requests the IAJBS leadership, CJBE leadership, and the rest of the network of Jesuit business schools to work together to apply for the MacArthur Foundation 100 million dollar 100&change competition with a project to transform Jesuit business education to be fully aligned with the wisdom in *Laudato Si'*, with our universally-valid Jesuit educational tenets, and with the need for global sustainability, social justice, and poverty alleviation.

## THE IAJBS/CJBE APPLICATION(S)

On October 2, 2016, the IAJBS and CJBE, not-for-profit professional organizations that support collaboration and shared learning among Jesuit business school administrators and faculty (IAJBS, n.d.; CJBE, n.d.),

submitted a proposal built on the Nairobi Resolution to the MacArthur Foundation. The proposal was designed to utilize the network of Jesuit business schools as a vehicle for transforming not just Jesuit and other business education but all of the world's producing-distributing-consuming systems as well. It did not win the \$100 million prize, yet its basic conceptual structure and the details of the original application offer the possibility of inspiring a new initiative for the transformation of business education, our entire set of global producing-distributing-consuming systems, and our ways of being in the world. Innovations in teaching and research, in organizational change and transformation, and in societal change are all called for in the original proposal as well as in a possible 2019 initiative inspired by 100&change.

The 2016 IAJBS/CJBE application called for 40 business schools to invest the \$100 million MacArthur Foundation prize in the alignment of their research and teaching with the Nairobi Resolution's implicit call for organizational and societal transformation. Such a public commitment to transform business school teaching and research would be done in ways that call very visible attention to the seriousness of the global unsustainability situation and to the need for dramatic and immediate action. Transformational processes, in a similar vein, would also be conducted in a manner that encourages all of the world's business schools to confront the need to do the same, and at a very rapid rate. The two most important contributions these 40 leading business schools would make, therefore, are in 1) calling the entire world's attention to the no-longer-deniable reality that our producing-distributing-consuming systems are destroying the capacity of the planet to support our own and other species, and 2) inspiring all the world's business schools to transform their own teaching and research in collaboration with business and other institutions and, in doing so, to work with those other institutions toward aligning their own actions with the need for a sustainable world.

*The initial group of business schools.* In the 2016 proposal, at least 20 of the 40 business schools would be Jesuit institutions. These schools would also be invited to take the lead in this endeavor for at least six reasons in addition to the fact that the Nairobi Resolution inspired the proposal itself.

First of all, the espoused values and *raison d'être*s of Jesuit educational institutions are in very close alignment with the intent of the Nairobi Resolution and are consistent with the approach to transformation presented in the proposal. The Nairobi Resolution and the 2016 application are simply asking the Jesuit business schools, in many ways, to walk their own talk.

Second, the Jesuits have a long history of bringing about societal change through education and other initiatives. Indeed, the history of Jesuit educational innovation and leadership made it appropriate for Chris Lowney to call his first book *Heroic Leadership: Best Practices from a 450 Year-Old Company that Changed the World* (Lowney, 2003).

Third, the Jesuit business schools make up the world's largest group of business schools with a common heritage. The scope, depth, and reach of these institutions are obviously substantial: the IAJS Executive Director (Ulferts, 2018) reports that there are 261 business programs worldwide, encompassing everything from traditional brick-and-mortar university campuses to innovative internet programs that provide access to business education in places where a campus is not feasible. There are Jesuit-affiliated business education facilities in at least 28 countries on 6 different continents. Various members of these schools have also worked together on social justice, social enterprise, poverty alleviation, sustainability, and other initiatives for many years.

Fourth, many of the estimated 17 million alumni of Jesuit educational institutions are likely to be very supportive of the type of educational and societal leadership that the 2016 and (potential) 2019 proposals seek to create.

Fifth, the Jesuit business schools are connected to each other through the IAJS and other support institutions, including the predominantly US-focused CJBE which may soon become a more global organization.

Sixth, a Jesuit business school-inspired proposal that calls for aligning how we produce-distribute-consume as a society is very much in keeping with the call for radical change toward eliminating the climate crisis, a call that Pope Francis detailed recently in *Laudato Si'* (Francis, 2015). Such a call has been issued in a number of other Roman Catholic and Jesuit encyclicals and publications such as *Caritas in Veritate* (Benedict XVI, 2009) and *Healing a Broken World* (Álvarez, 2011).

*The three-year target.* Each of the 40 participating business schools would have only three years to transform themselves, three years to complete the development and implementation of their new curriculum and research programs. It seems to be an impossible task, yet part of the reasoning behind the setting of the three-year target was a suspicion that what cannot be done in 20 years in the university might well be doable in three. Nevertheless, such a short time frame for accomplishing this transformation also recognizes that the state of the planet is quite perilous, that we do not have 40, 30, or even 20 years to begin solving our problems.



*The meta-goal.* The IAJBS/CJBE application might appear on the surface to be about training individuals for playing leading roles in the creation of a sustainable world in 20, 30, or 40 years' time, namely, when they reach positions of significant power and influence. Such a laudable goal was not the true aim of the proposal, however, for we simply do not have time for that kind of thinking. The intent was to start bringing about what is essentially an immediate transformation of global producing-distributing-consuming systems, beginning when the very first business school commits publicly to its own transformation.

*Innovation in teaching and research content—transforming teaching materials and research topics/programs in business schools, both Jesuit and others.* No one knows what the “perfect” business school curriculum and research program would be for creating a socially just, poverty alleviating, and sustainable/flourishing world. Many good ideas along that line clearly exist, however (e.g., Christopher, Laasch, & Roberts, 2017; Gosling & Mintzberg, 2006; Laszlo, Waddock, & Sroufe, 2017; Mårtensson, Bild, & Nilsson, 2008; Parris & McInnis-Bowers, 2017; Pirson, 2017, to suggest just a few).

Forty business schools attempting to transform teaching and research, learning about existing concepts, and experimenting, amending, and choosing among them would likely generate and test a great many more ideas than this short list suggests. Rather than attempting to decide at the beginning of the project what the eventual curricula and research program should look like, or asking all 40 participating schools to agree on a common curriculum and research approach and then directing them to implement and hopefully improve on their results, the IAJBS/CJBE proposal took a different path: each school was asked to choose its own destination (what its own eventual curriculum and research program would look like) and to figure out how to get there (“how do we go about bringing forth a new curriculum and research program?”). The proposal was designed to liberate all 40 participating schools for innovation and experimentation in creating their own curricula and research programs. In this manner, it followed the concept of “parallel research projects” similar to those used by the 3M Corporation in developing new products and by NASA in its program for landing a person to walk on the moon in the 1960s. We do not know what to do and we do not know how to do it, so we will ask a lot of groups to figure out what to do and how to do it, and then to go and do it ... and we will give each of them \$2.4 million to do so.

*Innovation in the processes of organizational transformation—participating business schools transforming their teaching and research, and therefore themselves, in only three years.* Although many good ideas about

organizational transformation clearly exist (e.g., Bushe, 2011; Cooperrider & Sekerka, 2006; Goldman, Purmal, & Janzer, 2016; Whitney, 1996), no one knows for certain what the “perfect” way would be for any business school to transform what it is doing, much less how to do so in the impossibly short period of only three years. Forty business schools attempting to transform themselves would likely test many existing ideas and, in doing so, generate a great many more new ones. The IAJBS/CJBE proposal is quite explicit about not attempting to tell the business schools how they should bring about their transformation; it was quite clear, in fact, that each school would be responsible for figuring out how to accomplish that transformation on its own. They, of course, would be likely, would be wise, and would have the money to draw upon some of the world’s leading thinkers and consultants, individuals and maybe even consulting organizations likely to be excited by and attracted to any business school bold enough to engage in such an undertaking. Indeed, some of these individuals and consulting organizations might even be enthusiastic enough to offer their services for free.

*Innovation in the processes of societal/global transformation—achieving collaborative transformation among business schools, the business community, governmental agencies, spiritual and religious organizations, social enterprises, and not-for-profits.* No one knows the “best” way for inspiring and bringing about the types of transformations necessary if we want to reduce the burdens caused by our failing and unsustainable producing-distributing-consuming systems to a level that our planet can actually bear. Despite the availability of many good ideas about societal and global transformation (e.g., Fullerton, 2015a, 2015b; Khondker & Schuerkens, 2014; Korten, 2015; Maxton & Randers, 2016; Raworth, 2017; Scharmer, 2009, 2018; Whitney & Cooperrider, 2000; Wijkman, Lovins, Fullerton, & Wallis, 2018; Winston, 2014), the initial group of 40 participating business schools (along with other institutions inspired later on to join similar initiatives) will want and need to engage in active collaborations with businesses, governmental agencies, spiritual and religious organizations, social enterprises, and not-for-profits to help bring about their own transformations. Such collaborative work, in turn, will bring about change and transformation in those partnering organizations. Indeed, as the schools and other organizations work together on their mutual transformations, they will likely discover and generate many new ideas about how we can move our entire global community forward.

Such a global transformation will begin as soon as the first business school takes its first transformative steps in collaboration with other institutions within its environment. In doing so, it will begin increasing the number of parallel transformative projects being implemented as partner institutions become involved in their own transformative processes.

In addition to what participating business schools, businesses, and other organizations will need to discover as they co-create collaborative and shared transformation, the proposal itself relies heavily on still one more form of societal innovation that is at the very core of the 2016 IAJBS/CJBE proposal and a possible 2019 initiative. It involves creating the global conversation concerning the need for immediate action that can restore and protect the ability of our planet to support our own and other species. Indeed, as Nathaniel Rich and George Steinmetz recently described and illustrated so effectively, we had—and missed—the opportunity *30 years ago* to create the dialogue that might have enabled us to avoid our current situation (Rich & Steinmetz, 2018, emphasis added).

Indeed, the world we have been so accustomed to living in is becoming less and less available to us every day (McKibben, 2011). Echoing the Stockdale Paradox (Collins, 2001), this new global conversation needs to help us find the shared courage to confront the brutal facts—that the existing producing-distributing-consuming system is broken—and yet never allow us to lose faith that we can find the creativity, resolution, and shared commitment to create and live in a new and different world, one that works for all and with no one left out.

The creation, however, of that global conversation will itself need to be grounded in many innovative ideas and actions. It will begin when the very first business school says, loudly and clearly, that global business education as a whole is part of the problem of global unsustainability. When that school is soon joined by others, the conversation will then need much fostering and support if it is to become viral, global, and effective. Richard Nixon's reputation as a staunch anti-communist Cold War warrior, for example, gave him the opportunity to lead the way to a new relationship between the People's Republic of China and the United States in the 1960s. Now, in the same vein, the history of the world's business schools in supporting our current global producing-distributing-consuming system gives them the opportunity to lead us to new ways of meeting our needs and appropriate wants and new ways of being in the world.

## **A POSSIBLE 2019 100&CHANGE APPLICATION: AN OPPORTUNITY TOO GOOD TO MISS**

The MacArthur Foundation is scheduled to announce the guidelines for a second 100&change \$100 million competition in early to mid-2019. In this light, one may view the original IAJBS/CJBE 2016 application posted and available on the Social Science Research Network website ([https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3270030](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3270030)). One of its “offshoots,” also posted on the site, is a somewhat tongue-in-cheek, somewhat serious line-by-line rewriting of the United States Declaration of Independence that is consistent with the theme of the 2016 proposal. Titled “The Declaration of Business School Independence,” it can be found at <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3163080>.

Building on the Nairobi Resolution and the original IAJBS/CJBE proposal, it is recognized that any single entry, especially one as bold as the original 2016 IAJBS/CJBE application, is very unlikely to win the \$100 million prize, especially with close to 2000 applications in the 2016 competition and maybe even more in 2019. The structure and intent of the original application, however, can serve as the basis for a 2019 submission that will not require winning the \$100 million MacArthur prize to move toward its goals. The 2016 application, for one, has required relatively little tinkering to convert it to a 2019 edition; such tinkering, in fact, is already largely complete, with the current version of a possible 2019 application already posted on the SSRN site ([https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3270054](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3270054)). This 2019 edition is likely to evolve over time, however, and so the file currently posted is only the latest iteration and not the final version.

*The Possible 2019 Proposal.* The major changes in the 2019 proposal as it stands at the moment, and given the caveat that it is likely to evolve, are as follows:

1. a clarification of each participating business school's processes for independence and public accountability as they bring about their own transformations and the requirement for sharing the ongoing results of their initiatives,
2. administrative oversight for the whole project reduced to an absolute minimum,
3. a structure that allows the project to move forward immediately one business school at a time, and

4. a very minor increase in the grant for each business school from \$2.1 million in the original 2016 proposal to \$2.4 million.

The 2019 revision still sees Jesuit business schools, individually and/or collectively, as key leaders and players in this transformative initiative. In a similar vein, the emerging proposal welcomes, and hopes for, the active encouragement and involvement of the IAJBS and CJBE in the project, without requiring them to supply either resources or administrative work to do so.

Plans are currently underway to visit a number of Jesuit business schools to learn about five topics, four of which are directly related to a potential 2019 100&change application. The topics are

1. the possible interest of the school and university in being one of the participants of a 2019 application and in starting the transformation immediately;
2. the ways in which the school's teaching and research are already closely aligned with the Nairobi Resolution's call for teaching and research to be aligned with the need for global sustainability, social justice, and poverty alleviation;
3. how the business school and university have responded to the calls for ecological dialogue and action in *Laudato Si'*, and what plans are in place for doing so in the near future;
4. which individuals or institutions might want that business school to be one of the first ones to lead this transformational process and might be willing to contribute financially and perhaps professionally to this transformation, and
5. a somewhat separate topic about the finance faculty—who among them is most likely to be involved in teaching and research that grapples somewhat, in some way or other, with the problems of global unsustainability.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to visiting individual Jesuit business schools—and perhaps even some non-Jesuit ones that might wish to be leaders in this

---

<sup>1</sup>This last topic is connected to an on-going inquiry into financial management and global sustainability (Werner & Stoner, 2015; Stoner & Werner, 2017).

initiative, formal and informal presentations on this opportunity have also been occurring regularly in a number of academic conferences. These include a conference of the Academy of Management in 2016, the Management and Organizational Behavior Teaching Conference in 2017, the Colleagues in Jesuit Business Education Annual Meeting in 2017, a keynote address at the 2017 IAJBS World Forum, a 2018 World Forum session based on an early draft of this article, and a session at the 2018 Academy of Business Education Annual Meeting also based on this piece.

## 2019 AND BEYOND

The two questions that are the two 800-pound gorillas sitting in the living room are as follows:

1. where will the \$100 million dollars for 40 participating business schools come from if not from the MacArthur Foundation (given the very low probability of winning the competition's prize), or, more immediately, where will each tranche of \$2.4 million come from as each school signs up and begins its three-year transformation commitment? and
2. which school will be the first one to state publicly, implicitly or explicitly, that global business education is currently active in supporting the world's broken producing–distributing–consuming systems and to state that it is taking active leadership in discovering how to break away from that support by transforming first itself and then the world?

Of the two tasks—raising the money or finding the schools that will take the leadership role—getting 40 business schools—or even just one—to make this transformative commitment may well be a greater challenge than raising \$2.4 million for each of them. The current approach involves beginning the search for both at the same time—for the first \$2.4 million and for the first business school.

The fact that publicity and recognition often flow very heavily to the entity that is the first to undertake any action might encourage the first business school to commit to the transformation. The first one is always unique, and so the attention paid to the first school, the *leader* of this initiative, is likely to be especially high.

In a similar vein, the first \$2.4 million grant may not be that difficult to find because it could well be interpreted as the first investment that will encourage other similar investments from other sources: the “seed money” for an eventual sum of \$100 million from a variety of different sponsors. So it might yield a 4000% “return” as it inspires 39 more grants of \$2.4 million each.

This search process eventually brings us back to a quotation early in this article:

the moment one definitely commits oneself, then Providence moves too. All sorts of things occur to help one that would never otherwise have occurred. A whole stream of events issues from the decision, raising in one's favour all manner of unforeseen incidents and meetings and material assistance, which no man could have dreamt would have come his way.

This article is thus one step in the process of inviting providence to start moving.

## REFERENCES

- Álvarez, P. (Ed.). 2011. Healing a broken world: Task force on ecology. *Promotio Iustitiae*, No. 106, 2011/2. Available at [http://www.sjweb.info/sjs/documents/PJ\\_106\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.sjweb.info/sjs/documents/PJ_106_ENG.pdf) (accessed September 2, 2018).
- AZ Quotes. (n.d.). *Albert Einstein quotes*. Available at [https://www.azquotes.com/author/4399-Albert\\_Einstein](https://www.azquotes.com/author/4399-Albert_Einstein) (accessed November, 26, 2018).
- Benedict XVI. 2009. *Caritas in veritate*. Available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_enc\\_20090629\\_caritas-in-veritate.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate.html) (accessed September 2, 2018).
- Bushe, G. R. 2011. Appreciative inquiry: Theory and critique. In D. Boje, B. Burnes, & J. Hassard (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to organizational change*: 87–103. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Christopher, E., Laasch, O., & Roberts, J. 2017. Pedagogical innovation and paradigm shift in the introduction to management curriculum. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(6): 787–793.
- Churchman, C. W. 1967. Wicked problems. *Management Science*, 14(4): B141–142.
- CJBE [Colleagues in Jesuit Business Education]. (n.d.). *Colleagues in Jesuit Business Education* [mission statement]. Available at <https://www.ignited.global/about/colleagues-jesuit-business-education-cjbe> (accessed September 1, 2018).
- Collins, J. 2001. *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap ... and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.
- Conrad, C. A. 2016. *An update on 100&change: Administrative review*. Available at <https://www.macfound.org/press/perspectives/update-100change-applications/> (accessed September 2, 2018).

- Cooperrider, D. L., & Sekerka, L. E. 2006. Toward a theory of positive organizational change. In J. V. Gallos (Ed.), *Organization development: A Jossey-Bass reader*: 223–238. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ehrenfeld, J. R. 2008. *Sustainability by design: A subversive strategy for transforming our consumer culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Francis. 2015. *Laudato si': On care for our common home*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Available at [https://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco\\_20150524\\_enciclica-laudato-si\\_en.pdf](https://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si_en.pdf) (accessed September 2, 2018).
- Fullerton, J. 2015a. *Regenerative capitalism: How universal principles and patterns will shape our new economy*. The Capital Institute, April. Available at <http://capitalinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2015-Regenerative-Capitalism-4-20-15-final.pdf> (accessed November 26, 2018).
- Fullerton, J. 2015b. *Regenerative capitalism: How universal principles and patterns will shape our new economy*. Yale School of Management, April 21. Available at <https://cbey.yale.edu/events/regenerative-capitalism-how-universal-principles-and-patterns-will-shape-our-new-economy> (accessed November 26, 2018).
- Goldman, L., Purmal, K., & Janzer, A. 2016. *The moonshot effect: Disrupting business as usual*. San Carlos, CA: Wynnefield Business Press.
- Gosling, J., & Mintzberg, H. 2006. Management education as if both matter. *Management Learning*, 37(4): 419–428.
- IAJBS [International Association of Jesuit Business Schools]. (n.d.). *IAJBS* [mission statement]. Available at <https://www.ignited.global/about/iajbs> (accessed September 1, 2018).
- Khondker, H. H., & Schuerkens, U. 2014. Social transformation, development and globalization. *Sociopedia.isa*. Available at <http://www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/SocialTransformation.pdf> (accessed September 3, 2018).
- Korten, D. C. 2015. *Change the story, change the future: A living economy for a living earth*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Laszlo, C., Waddock, S., & Sroufe, R. 2017. Torn between two paradigms: A struggle for the soul of business schools. *AI Practitioner*, 19(2).
- Lowney, C. 2003. *Heroic leadership: Best practices from a 450-year-old company that changed the world*. Chicago: Loyola Press.
- Mårtensson, P., Bild, M., & Nilsson, K. (Eds.). 2008. *Teaching and learning at business schools: Transforming business education*. Aldershot, UK: Gower, 2008.
- Maxton, G., & Randers, J. 2016. *Reinventing prosperity: Managing economic growth to reduce unemployment, inequality and climate change*. Vancouver/Berkeley: Greystone Books.
- McKibben, B. 2011. *Eaarth: Making a life on a tough new planet*. New York: Times Books/Holt.
- Murray, W. H. (n.d.). *William Hutchison Murray* [quotable quote]. Available at <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/128689-until-one-is-committed-there-is-hesitancy-the-chance-to> (accessed September 3, 2018).



- Parris, D. L., & McInnis-Bowers, C. 2017. Business not as usual: Developing socially conscious entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(5): 687–726.
- Pirson, M. 2017. *Humanistic management: Protecting dignity and promoting well-being*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raworth, K. 2017. *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Hartford, VT: Chelsea Green.
- Rich, N., & Steinmetz, G. 2018. Losing earth: The decade we almost stopped climate change. *The New York Times*. Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/08/01/magazine/climate-change-losing-earth.html> (accessed September 3, 2018).
- Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. 1973. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2): 155–169.
- Scharmer, C. O. 2009. *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Scharmer, O. 2018. *The essentials of Theory U: Core principles and applications*. Oakland: Berrett-Koehler.
- Stoner, J. A. F. (n.d.). *Private communications* [while teaching with Hal Leavitt at Bell Labs and after.]
- Stoner, J. A. F., & Werner, F. M. 2017. Transforming finance and business education: Finance's unique opportunities. *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability*, 5(2): 15–52.
- Ulferts, G. 2018. *Private communication* [with R. Ellsworth]. August 8.
- Waddock, S. 2013. The wicked problems of global sustainability need wicked (good) leaders and wicked (good) collaborative solutions. *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability*, 1(1): 91–111.
- Werner, F. M., & Stoner, J. A. F. 2015. Transforming finance and business education: Part of the problem. *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability*, 3(1): 25–52.
- Whitney, D. 1996. Postmodern principles and practices for large scale organization change and global cooperation. *Organization Development Journal*, 14(4): 53–68.
- Whitney, D., & Cooperrider, D. L. 2000. The appreciative inquiry summit: An emerging methodology for whole system positive change. *OD Practitioner*, 32(1): 13–26.
- Wijkman, A., Lovins, H., Fullerton, J., & Wallis, S. 2018. *A finer future: Creating an economy in service to life*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Winston, A. S. 2014. *The big pivot: Radically practical strategies for a hotter, scarcer, and more open world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

**James A. F. Stoner** received his Ph.D. in Industrial Management from M.I.T. He sits in the James A. F. Stoner Chair for Global Sustainability, a chair endowed in his name by his ex-student Brent Martini and Brent's father, Robert Martini.