RAIS Journal for Social Sciences | Vol. 10, No. 2, 2026
ISSN 2574-0245 (Print) | ISSN 2574-1179 (Online) | DOI:10.5281/zenodo.24454551

From Coaching to Capacity: Leadership Development, Organizational Development, Human Performance, and the Chief Learning & Experience Officer

William J. Triplett

Capitol Technology University, Washington, DC, United States, wjtriplett@captechu.edu

Abstract: Organizations cannot survive in a complex, rapidly evolving digital environment with one-off training and professional learning delivered in isolated silos. The development of leadership should be part of human sustainability and organizational resilience amid contemporary organizational constraints, including technological disruption, employee burnout, cognitive overload, and employee engagement. This paper proposes a Whole-Person Organizational Performance Model that integrates leadership coaching, organizational development, employee experience design, and human performance science into a single organizational posture, managed by the Chief Learning and Experience Officer (CLEO). The paper utilizes the recent research studies on leadership coaching, systems theory, and organizational behavior, the science of occupational stress, emotional intelligence, and performance psychology to validate its thesis that to achieve sustainable organizational effectiveness, there is a need to explicitly integrate cognitive fitness, emotional regulation, physiological well-being, and experiential learning in leadership architecture. The paper also discusses how organizations in the 21st century can change their culture of transactions and training to a culture of development and resiliency that appreciates continuous learning and human-centered performance. The CLEO model is introduced as a new executive model that may integrate learning strategy, organizational alignment, employee experience, and the optimization of human performance into a comprehensive leadership model. It is the position of the paper that future-ready organizations will not only be typified by the level of their technical competence or by the acquisition of skills by their employees, but also by their ability to establish sustainable systems of human performance, which include the organizational effectiveness as well as the well-being and adaptive capacity of their employees.

Keywords: Leadership Development, Organizational Development, Executive Coaching, Human Performance, Employee Experience, Organizational Resilience, Executive Leadership

Introduction

Organizations are experiencing rapid technological change, rapid transitions in talent, global uncertainty, and mental health needs for workers and managers. The introduction of digital disruption, hybrid working arrangements, and the integration of AI, along with the changing demands of workers, radically changes organizational life (Khatoon et al., 2025). This is not the only competency set that defines effective leadership; conventional management skills or technical proficiency are equally important. Rather, organizations are increasingly looking for leaders who are adaptable, emotionally intelligent, resilient, and able to perform in the context of greater complexity and stress.

In the past, most organizations have attempted to develop leadership through a series of training programs, mostly geared toward technical or managerial skills. Such programs have been observed to commonly result in a temporary increase in performance, but they have failed to account for more fundamental organizational and human performance issues that affect long-term performance (Roupnel et al., 2019). The disjointedness of development models that do not link leadership development to organizational systems and employee welfare is not an effective remedy for rising employee burnout, executive burnout, disengagement, and workplace stress.

The present-day organizational issues demand a broader, more comprehensive perspective for cultivating leaders. The science of leadership, organizational psychology, the science of coaching, and the science of physiology and emotional intelligence are gradually revealing that, over time, the effectiveness of leadership depends on the interaction among cognition, emotional regulation, leadership physiology, and the organizational environment (Orkamo et al., 2025). Developing leadership is thus not only a question of inculcating knowledge, but also of developing performance in human beings that is sustainable in complex systems.

This paper introduces a new Whole-Person Organizational Performance Model that combines leadership coaching, organizational development, employee experience architecture, and human performance science into a single executive model. At the heart of this model is the growing role of the Chief Learning & Experience Officer (CLEO), who is tasked with linking organizational learning, the workforce's work experience, and sustaining high performance (Yusoff, 2025). The article suggests a transition to more systemic training, rather than isolated programs, to enable perpetual adaptation, resilience, and human flourishing, which will be critical to future-proof organizations.

Leadership Coaching As Strategic Infrastructure

Leadership coaching has shifted from a corrective program for poor-performing leaders to a strategic capability for an organization to improve leadership effectiveness, adaptability, and resilience. Modern coaching practice models focus on behavioral flexibility, emotional control, self-awareness, and reflective practice rather than mere performance correction. Organizations today are increasingly volatile and cognitively challenging, making coaching an important tool for helping leaders manage uncertainty and maintain high-level performance.

Leadership Coaching has been found to positively impact psychological resilience, goal achievement, emotional intelligence, and work performance. Grant (2016) cited the development of third-generation coaching models that combine system awareness, context, and reflective learning. Theeboom et al. (2015) also concluded that coaching interventions have significant effects on both self-efficacy and well-being, as well as on work performance in organizations.

The value of coaching is in strengthening executives' self-regulation and adaptive decision-making. Leaders in high-stress situations often experience cognitive overload, emotional exhaustion, and decision overload. Coaching provides formality, reflective, emotional processing, and re-framing of cognitions that facilitate sustainable leadership functioning. Today, coaching is increasingly about mental endurance and adaptability, rather than just productivity results.

Additionally, leadership coaching can positively impact an organization's culture by instilling trust, fostering open communication, and promoting developmental leadership. Learning, feedback, and psychological safety are usually encouraged by coaching-oriented organizations (Colgate, 2025). This culture of development is particularly applicable to knowledge-driven, innovation-based industries, where organizations must be agile and adaptable, as continuous learning and collaboration are the only means to success.

Leadership coaching must then not be viewed as an independent executive advantage, but as a component of the organizational system for human performance, resilience, and sustainable leadership growth.

Organizational Development and Systems Alignment

Organization Development (OD) offers a systems-focused approach to improving organizational effectiveness through planned change, collaborative processes, and congruence between an organization's structure and its human resources. Classic definitions of OD emphasize a systems perspective, organizational culture, long-term leadership alignment, and change management. Cummings et al. (2025) described organizational development as aimed at increasing organizational capability through planned interventions in the organization's processes, using knowledge and techniques of applied behavioral science to increase the effectiveness of the organization and its members.

Today's organizations are confronted with challenges that extend beyond the organization to be aligned. Workforce burnout, chronic stress, disengagement, and mental fatigue pose a serious threat to the health of the organization. Contemporary organizational settings tend to focus on efficiency and effectiveness at the expense of human recovery processes and cognitive capacity. Continuous communication technology has rendered the work-life boundary increasingly dissolvable, resulting in the workers experiencing continuous connectivity, micro-mindedness, and chronic stress.

Maslach & Leiter (2016) define burnout from a systemic organizational perspective, rather than an individual psychological perspective, as a function of persistent organizational demand that exceeds human capacity to adapt. As a result, modern organizational development must also consider the balance between workload recovery and psychological health and well-being. The productivity, innovation, and longevity of an organization are ultimately destroyed by any organizational system that is not designed towards human recovery.

Organizational development here would be the active alignment of the expectations of organizations with the realities of human performance, through these combined strategies, making work systems easier for humans by designing work systems that facilitate recovery, creating psychologically safe environments, and making sure that the systems and culture enable sustainable (not chronically depleted) performance (Musaddik et al., 2022). By doing so, the concept of organizational development is aligned with leadership coaching, employee experience, and human performance science.

Human Performance and Fitness Integration

One of the key steps to sustainable performance is understanding the roles of the mind, body, and brain in leadership capability. Neuroscience, stress physiology, and performance psychology show that mental clarity, emotion regulation, and physical health should be central variables in assessing decision-making quality, resilience, and performance.

According to Goleman (1995), studies on emotional intelligence indicate that, in addition to strong performance skills, leaders should possess self-awareness, emotional control, empathy, and social competence (the ability to work well with others). Those with high emotional intelligence are better at managing conflict, reducing stress, and fostering a cooperative atmosphere in the organization.

As mentioned above, Loehr & Schwartz (2006) point out that although high performance can eventually be achieved, it cannot be sustained without proper management of the energies required to prevent breakdown. They further theorized that as much as man must be reconciled to perform well, recovery is essential, or there would be long-term losses of cognitive, emotional, and physical well-being due to sustained stress.

This has been supported by McEwen's (2007) research on the physiology of stress, which noted that prolonged stress has significant neurological and physiological consequences. The negative effects of long-term stimulation of stress response systems include impairments in memory, attention, arousal, and emotional regulation. These impacts are believed to be primarily relevant in executive settings. The benefits of exercise also extend to mental and emotional performance. Physical activity benefits neuroplasticity, attention, good mood, and cognition as demonstrated by Ratey and Loehr (2011). It is also through executive fitness programs that leaders can become more effective and stress-resistant. Consequently, organizations that seek sustainable performance need to realize that there is a symbiotic relationship between leadership capacity and physiological and psychological health. Organizational learning systems should include human performance optimization rather than task-based wellness programs, which are added.

The Chief Learning & Experience Officer (CLEO) Model

With the continued blurring of work, learning, and development, employee experience, organizational learning, and human performance boundaries, a new executive leadership structure has been created that can incorporate these new ways into a unified organizational strategy (Stanikzai & Mittal, 2025). This paper advocates for the Chief Learning & Experience Officer (CLEO) position, a potential senior leadership role that bridges the worlds of workforce learning, organizational culture, and high-performance sustainability.

The CLEO combines the scope of the training and development executive with that of an organizational development professional, employee experience architect, leadership coach, and human performance consultant to provide a comprehensive strategic structure. It expands the CLEO executive's role from operational instructional delivery to a strategic role in designing organizational and human-system environments that promote ongoing learning, brain-based adaptive leadership, and workforce well-being (Chughtai et al., 2023).

As Kimonyo (2024) highlights, the employee experience continues to grow in strategic organizational power. Today, employees demand workplaces that offer development, purpose, latitude, and mental health. Companies that do not provide this face disengagement, turnover, and lower levels of effectiveness.

Therefore, the CLEO is a link between the organization's performance key results and human sustainability. In this way, the CLEO combines workforce analytics, leadership coaching systems, a culture of organizational development, and experiential learning design (Oyas, 2022). Essentially, the CLEO approach does not treat learning as a distinct organizational function but rather as a continuous organizational environment woven into processes and practices of work, leadership, and employee experience.

Whole-Person Organizational Performance Framework

The paper has established a Whole-Person Organizational Performance Framework that integrates cognitive, emotional, physical, and experiential channels of performance into executive and organizational strategy. This structure implies that sustainable organizational performance relies on the integration of leadership development, organizational systems, and employee health (Gustantini et al., 2026).

On the cognitive level, organizations need to support clarity, focus, learning flexibility, and effective decision-making. These efforts aim to reduce information overload and create an environment that supports reflection and creativity.

At the emotional level, organizations must develop emotional intelligence, resiliency, psychological safety, and trust amongst individuals. Emotionally healthy organizations will facilitate cooperation, interaction, and open-mindedness.

At the physical level, an organization should recognize that physiological health is a fundamental aspect of workplace productivity. An individual's cognitive and emotional functioning can be influenced by sleep, exercise, nutrition, and stress recovery.

At the experiential level, organizations must strategically design employee experiences to strengthen meaning, engagement, belonging, and ongoing development. According to experiential learning theories, such as those of Kolb et al. (1984), it is important to combine learning with reflection, action, and experience.

Together, the four levels of the framework provide a holistic model of the organization's effectiveness that focuses on the long-term sustainability of human capacity rather than short-term productivity.

When implementing the framework, organizations may face several barriers, including resistance to change, limited leadership commitment, resource constraints, competing priorities, and limited employee acceptance. Successful implementation requires executive sponsorship, cross-functional coordination, organizational readiness, and integration with existing learning, leadership development, employee experience, and performance systems.

Conclusion

Firms that operate in digitally fast-paced, cognitively stimulating workplaces will not be able to sustain leadership systems that involve fragmented leadership training programs and wellness programs that employees are required to complete at random. This system of leadership has to include leadership coaching, organization development, human performance science, and employee experience design to achieve sustainable organizational performance. A Whole-Person Organizational Performance Model was advanced with the ascendance of the Chief Learning & Experience Officer (CLEO).

The Whole-Person Organizational Performance Framework presented in this paper is conceptual and has not yet been empirically tested across organizational settings. Its applicability and effectiveness may vary according to organizational size, industry, culture, leadership structure, and available resources. Future research should empirically examine the relationships among the model's cognitive, emotional, physical, and experiential dimensions and evaluate whether the proposed CLEO role contributes to sustainable organizational performance.

The model asserts that cognitive fitness, emotional regulation, psychological resilience, and organizational-level alignment are the bases of leadership effectiveness. In reality, as organizational context increases, organizations must seek new ways of development, going beyond transactional approaches to workforce development, whilst nurturing environments focused on adaptation, resilience, and prosperity.

Lastly, physical and financial fitness will have less value to future-ready organizations than neurological and physiological well-being, flexibility, and the strength of human systems. The CLEO is a progressive advancement in the executive architecture that incorporates learning, organizational strategy, and human performance.

References

Chughtai, M. S., Syed, F., Naseer, S., & Chinchilla, N. (2023). Role of adaptive leadership in learning organizations to boost organizational innovations with change self-efficacy. *Current Psychology*, *43*(33), 27262–27281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04669-z

Colgate, M. (2025). The importance and application of a coaching leadership style in businesses. *Businesses*, *5*(3), 32. https://doi.org/10.3390/businesses5030032

Cummings, T. G., Worley, C. G., & Donovan, P. (2025). *Organization Development & Change*. Cengage Learning.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* Bantam Books.

Grant, A. M. (2016). The third 'generation' of workplace coaching: Creating a culture of quality conversations. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, *10*(1), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2016.1266005

Gustantini, L. M., Utami, H. N., Riza, M. F., & Imamah, N. (2026). Determinants of Sustainable Organizational Performance: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, *18*(3), 1465. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18031465

Khatoon, U. T., Babgi, M., Hadi, N. T., Mir, R. N., & Velidandi, A. (2025). Technology-driven change in human resource management: Reshaping Talent Management and organizational design. *Administrative Sciences*, *15*(11), 452. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15110452

Kimonyo, T. (2024). The impact of employee experience on organizational performance: Driving innovation, engagement, and customer satisfaction. *Kabarak Journal of Research & Innovation*, *14*(02), 220–229. https://doi.org/10.58216/kjri.v14i02.417

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

Loehr, J., & Schwartz, T. (2006). The power of full engagement. Managing energy, not time, is the key to high performance and personal renewal. In C. Boersch & F. von Diest (Eds.), *Das Summa Summarum Des Erfolgs* (pp. 199–216). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8349-9251-2_17

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, *15*(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311

McEwen, B. S. (2007). Physiology and neurobiology of stress and adaptation: Central Role of the brain. *Physiological Reviews*, *87*(3), 873–904. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00041.2006

Musaddik, F. D., Abdul Aziz, S. F., Mohd, R. H., & Mokhtar, D. M. (2022). Organizational supports influencing high performance work behaviour and organizational resilience. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *12*(10), 1785-1810. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i10/15397

Orkamo, M., Ukko, J., Rantala, T., & Saunila, M. (2025). Leadership behaviours to promote organisational performance in Private Sector Digital Transformation – A Systematic Literature Review. *Digital Business*, *5*(2), 100155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.digbus.2025.100155

Oyas, G. (2022). Leadership development strategies and organizational culture: Leadership development strategies and organizational culture. *Impact Journal of Transformation*, *5*(2), 169-186. https://doi.org/10.63988/lrbv6411

Ratey, J. J., & Loehr, J. E. (2011). The positive impact of physical activity on cognition during adulthood: A review of underlying mechanisms, evidence and recommendations. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, *22*(2), 171–185. https://doi.org/10.1515/rns.2011.017

Roupnel, S., Rinfre, N., & Grenier, J. (2019). Leadership development: Three programs that maximize learning over time. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *18*(2), 126–143. https://doi.org/10.12806/v18/i2/t1

Stanikzai, M. E., & Mittal, E. (2025). Strategic alignment of organizational structure based on decisions for sustainable organizational performance: A Bibliometric-systematic literature review. *Cogent Business & Management*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2560650

Theeboom, T., Beersma, B., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2015). The differential effects of solution-focused and problem-focused coaching questions on the affect, attentional control and cognitive flexibility of undergraduate students experiencing study-related stress. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(5), 460–469. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1117126

Yusoff, A. (2025). Leadership development in context: Insights and best practices from Global Organizations. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations*, *7*(2), 191-207. https://doi.org/10.22146/jlo.104787