Recommendation for Academic Governance at UMUC

Authored by: Aric Krause, Matthew Prineas

Authoring Team: Rich Pauli (TGS), Gretchen Jones (TUS), Katherine Im (TUS), Cynthia Thomes (Library), John Gustafson (TUS), Loyce Pailen (TGS), Jennie Pilato (TGS)

History and Scope of the Academic Governance Recommendations Team

After the June 11, 2015, UMUC academic governance Town Hall, and at the request of the president and provost of UMUC, the deans of The Undergraduate School (TUS) and The Graduate School (TGS) worked with a team of faculty and administrators to review and make recommendations concerning academic governance at UMUC. The team included two members each from TUS and TGS who were elected by their peers, one vice dean from each school appointed by the deans, and one faculty member appointed from the Library.

The team used information and data from several sources to assemble these recommendations:

- Notes from TUS and TGS meetings about academic governance held in the afternoon of June 11, 2015.
- Summary documents (attached as Appendix A) from the various faculty focus groups held in June and July 2015, in which more than 330 collegiate faculty, adjunct instructors, overseas faculty, and members of the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) were invited to take part; a total of 74 actually participated in nine separate sessions.
- The president's PowerPoint from the Town Hall presentation on June 11, 2015.
- Excerpts from the UMUC Strategic Plan 2015–2018.
- Relevant guidelines and documents from USM, MSCHE, the existing Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) from UMUC (including its current constitution), and MHEC.
- A research report prepared by Rich Pauli on the roles and responsibilities of general advisory boards in multiple settings, at the request of the deans in order to explore using an advisory board construct in its recommendations (attached as Appendix B).

The team reviewed all of this material over a period of several weeks during August 2015 and met for approximately seven hours to frame a recommendation for the future of academic governance at UMUC. It is important to note that the team concentrated all of its work on a recommended structure for academic governance that would be optimal specifically for the type of institution that is UMUC, given its unique structure, mission and vision, and position in a competitive market.

The rest of this recommendation is divided into two sections: general observations and conditions for success in academic governance as observed from the data reviewed, and a specific structure for an academic governance body for UMUC.

> *Note: This document and its recommendations assume the continuation of AFA, SAC, and STAC, and address only academic (faculty) governance.*

General Observations and Conditions for Success in Academic Governance

- The new academic model envisioned by UMUC has, at its core, the idea that student learning is our central focus. The implication of this is that the primary unit of analysis is the full "program" rather than any specific course. In other words, a program has specific learning goals and competencies, and each course within a program contributes in specific ways to the achievement of the learning described in the program learning goals and competencies.

  This priority has specific implications for what we are describing as academic governance in that governance must be led by those who have insight and can make decisions about courses relevant to the context of the program as a whole. It is important to the achievement of the academic vision that program chairs and collegiate—currently referred to as "core" faculty—be able to provide advice that is contextualized by the university mission, the academic vision, and the programs (and their learning goals, competencies, and path toward the achievement of same), such that each course fulfills a specific role in the program. For this reason, we recommend that the bulk of the academic governance body comprise those who can provide insight and advice in the appropriate program-level context.

- Several themes arose from reviewing the focus group notes, which can be summarized as follows:

  - **Theme 1—Improve Faculty Communications**: Many adjunct faculty from around the university desire more specific and formal opportunities to communicate about their classes and program curricula. The focus groups reveal an apparently widely shared frustration among adjuncts that their concerns about individual classes are not consistently heard and are sometimes not even acknowledged. While such concerns themselves have little to do with governance, an environment of dysfunctional faculty communications makes healthy governance all the more difficult to achieve. Accordingly, addressing the structural issue of faculty communications may be thought of as a precondition for a healthy faculty governance system.

- **Theme 2—Establish Opportunities for Faculty Input in Decision-Making Processes**: Many faculty feel strongly that there should be more specific opportunities for university constituencies to offer advice as a formal part of decision-making processes. It is not that they expect their advice to be followed every time, but they do seek the opportunity to have their advice included at appropriate points in the process. It is also understood that there are many topics—especially strategic—that may need to remain proprietary. Faculty want to "see" those processes in which it would be appropriate for them to provide advice—if they feel they can contribute—as a formal step of the decision-making process. This issue could be categorized as "internal communications" and recognized as an internal priority. Like the first theme, it should be noted that this issue has little to do with faculty governance, but is an issue that may be thought of as a precondition for a healthy faculty governance system.

  - **Theme 3—Reboot Existing Structure for Faculty Governance**: The focus groups revealed a widespread sentiment that UMUC's existing structure—for whatever reason—may not be able to fully fulfill the role of "governing academics" at UMUC. It was clear that many felt that the existing organization did not represent the broad faculty community. There seemed to be a balance of opinions that either the current faculty governance structure was not optimally structured to be successful, or that there were too many issues to overcome such that the structure could be successful. In either case, a significant number of comments suggested that a "reboot," with a more representative structure in a revised model, was required for success.

- The first two of these themes – each of which may contribute to a feeling of not being valued – are not necessarily governance issues, but it was clear that the focus groups served as an opportunity for faculty to express their feelings, and they took advantage of that opportunity. An underlying current in the focus groups was about trust and being valued.

- The third theme necessitates a recommendation that a <u>new academic governance body be designed</u> that would fully replace the existing Faculty Advisory Council (FAC)—one with a very specific charter and scope. The drafting team was adamant that any recommendation ***not*** be reactionary to current problems; it is critical that our recommendation lead to an advisory body that can truly offer advice that ultimately contributes to a stellar academic experience for our students.

- For that new body to be successful, the team feels, therefore, that several recommendations are necessary in order for the advisory organization to have every chance of accomplishing its mission:

  1. The leadership of each school needs to reestablish "communities of practice" around each program that act as formal communication mechanisms through which to develop

formal communication practices. Led by core faculty, these communities would develop regular and formal opportunities for those teaching in a program to channel feedback about courses, the program, and changes in the professions supported by the program. This feedback can serve as primary data for continued program review and revision. Core faculty could use these communities to communicate out as changes are implemented in programs so that faculty recognize that their feedback is valued and fully considered. This recommendation directly addresses **theme 1** from the focus groups.

2. To facilitate offering of advice in significant decisions – where appropriate – the drafting team recommends the documentation of decision-making processes where all relevant constituencies have a specific role to play in offering advice at specific points in the process. This would allow various constituencies to more clearly know when their opportunity for feedback arrives—and to take advantage of it if they have a contribution. Such points would not need to be lengthy periods; they could be designed so decision processes remain nimble. It is clearly recognized that not all decisions allow for feedback given proprietary aspects of the university's business; where decisions can be open to the community (such as those involving aspects of the academic model, for example) the followed process with opportunities for advice will result in a strengthened culture of inclusion and collaboration. The inclusion of such steps in the process in no way limits leadership's decision—the advice can be included or ignored where appropriate; but, as advice, it does embed a valuing of the insights from multiple vantage points. This recommendation directly addresses **theme 2** from the focus groups.

3. The new academic governance body's charter needs to be unambiguous such that no misunderstandings arise about the nature of the body: The body has an advisory capacity ONLY, and everything—including the name of the body—should signal its clear role and purpose. It should also describe an organization that is committed to bringing far more participation from the entire UMUC faculty community. This recommendation partially addresses **theme 3** from the focus groups.

4. The Library's role in the academic process—design, delivery, and review—should be clearly developed and articulated so that Library faculty, as a stakeholding constituency, also have a clear opportunity to share their collective insight into decisions.

5. Continued work is needed on the names and definitions for faculty members. The term "core" for example has an associated opposite of "peripheral" which, although unintended, is naturally drawn out for those who are not "core." And, peripheral and/or being on the periphery does not communicate what we seek in differentiating names for faculty. Clearly, some clarification between faculty roles is needed; it is hoped we can find words that in their use do not imply lesser or greater valuation for either group.

It may be the case that "curricular faculty" or "design faculty" for "core" and "instructional faculty" for adjuncts and others may suffice, even though these names don't fully highlight the leadership aspects of being a "core" faculty member.

With these observations and recommendations, it is possible to articulate a framework for a **new body of academic governance** that can serve the academic needs of UMUC. This new body would replace the current Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) as soon as the body is approved and elections can be held. The rest of this document lays out such a model and is presented as our recommendation.

The recommendation is made in regular text; all *italicized text* demonstrates the logic and thinking behind each aspect of the recommendation and shouldn't be considered part of the actual recommendation.

Note: The following recommendation should be considered as a general high-level recommendation, with many details intentionally left undefined. Presumably, the newly formed organization would have initial tasks of further defining structure, policies, and processes.

Academic Governance—A Recommended model

Name of Body: Academic Advisory Board [at UMUC]

- *The name clearly articulates that this is about the academic mission of the university – an opportunity for the entire academic community to contribute advice for the betterment of the academic experience.*
- *Continuing to include the word "Advisory" in the title makes it clear that the organization is about providing advice.*
- *The word "Board" is preferred given the accepted nature of internal and external boards as advisory bodies committed to the organization and with an obligation to provide best advice. Other words, such as "Council" or "Senate," seem to imply more formal organizational roles that go beyond advice.*
- *It is recommended that we consider not using the word "Governance" in any way in connection with this body; of course, the body can be formally designated as part of governance to, for example, USM, but the use of the word in the broader academic community invites comparison to more traditional academic institutions and their governing bodies. The formal definition of the root word "govern" fully introduces role ambiguity we feel it is simply better not to introduce.*

Preamble: The Academic Advisory Board (AAB) at UMUC serves as an advisory body committed to enhancing stewardship of the curriculum such that the student learning experience is continuously improved, enhanced, and optimized. The AAB is committed to providing advice that represents the views of all faculty constituencies within the greater university even as the size of various constituencies shifts over time and circumstance, all for the improvement of the academic experience at UMUC.

- *This preamble attempts to clearly communicate the <u>advisory</u> role of the AAB.*
- *More importantly, it makes explicit that the body should always keep, as its primary lens, the quality and direction of the academic experience such that learning is clearly the reason for the organization's existence. While this text is likely not perfect, the preamble should unambiguously make this point abundantly clear.*

Roles: The AAB shall fulfill the following roles:

- Providing a conduit for advice from the full and total body of faculty to the provost and her/his representatives.
- Actively communicating with the full constituency of faculty on academic issues and perspectives (*Note: Posting on Engage is not considered active communication to the drafting committee*).
- Reviewing, suggesting, and recommending on topics related to the academic experience at UMUC.
    - *From these roles, it should be clear that the body is about communicating advice to and from the full faculty constituency. The body should primarily communicate with the provost as the provost is the chief academic officer of the university. The provost and/or the AAB may invite the president or others in the community to communicate with the body at various points, in practice, without adding any ambiguity about the direct relationship between the academic advisory board and the chief academic officer.*

Scope: The AAB shall provide advice on the following:

- Curriculum design and delivery, including learning and learning evaluation, implementation of technologies, pedagogies, and tools;
- The implementation of policies and processes that impact faculty, teaching, and the learning experience *(such as the promotion and renewal policies and faculty training and development)*;
- Policies and processes related to the student learning experience;
- Other specific academic issues and/or insights given their special knowledge and expertise;
- Other issues, in an unsolicited manner, such as the implementation of policies and decisions;

- Changes in the academic/higher education landscape, affecting the learning environment, the competitive framework, or learning science.
  - *This list is intentionally designed to start with everything academic; it is not until the last two bullets where advice on other topics is introduced. It is felt that keeping the list in this order keeps the body focused on the academic nature of their work.*

Composition of AAB: AAB shall represent the views of all faculty constituencies in offering advice to the provost, shall be led by core faculty members, and shall be permanently composed as follows:

- Nine elected members (voting members)

  - Three from TUS: Two core program chairs and one core faculty member;
  - Three from TGS: Two core program chairs and one core faculty member;
  - Three at-large members from any UMUC faculty constituency, including core faculty, CTF, or adjunct, stateside or overseas. Some election process would have to be planned.

- Two Appointed members (one voting and one non-voting member)

  - One voting core faculty member from the Library – appointed by director of Library
  - Vice provost for The Learner and Faculty Experience
    - *This person does not vote; he/she serves as the conduit between the provost and the AAB for regular meetings and correspondences. The provost does not attend ongoing meetings, although there may be regular meetings with the provost and her/his designees.*

- Recommended: Two-year terms for elected members; one-year term for ex officio; maximum three consecutive terms for all members.
- A chair and a vice chair, chosen from the core elected members (only a core faculty member can serve as chair or vice chair)
- The AAB may appoint ad hoc committees comprising members of the faculty community (outside the elected and ex officio representatives on AAB) to evaluate specific substantive academic issues that require deeper analysis for advice to be given on a relevant short-term basis. These ad hoc committees are to address the specific issue, can only present their results to the permanent board, and do not take on any agenda-setting or voting roles within AAB.

  - *The purpose of these ad hoc committees would be to carry out in-depth exploration of issues, such as researching the impact of a potential decision on a particular student*

audience. It is expected that such ad hoc committees would include adjuncts in some cases, so compensation would be necessary. They would be short in duration but would help collect data and observations from the field to be used in constructing recommendations and advice. The leadership of AAB would work with the provost to "review" and "approve" the appointments.

Conclusion/Issues Remaining

- We recommend against using words that are unclear in their definition, intent, and purpose in the community—"governance," "shared," "academic freedom," "council," or any others. The AAB may play an official role in the "governance" of the university according to USM policy, but that does require this body's documents to use those words, the use of which may raise ambiguities.
- Need to identify the appropriate—more neutral, objective—words to differentiate between faculty (who happen to be full-time) who are responsible for leading programs and those who deliver the learning experience. In this document, "core" was used to aid in clarity, but the team did not recommend finally using that naming convention.
- The schools must change the culture of how faculty—full-time collegiates, adjuncts, and CTFs—connect back to their programs in what is being called "communities of practice" in this document. This priority requires us to rethink program and school leadership roles so that community development is given priority, directly addressing the overwhelming root-cause majority of issues raised in focus groups.

Focus Group Summary: The Governance Challenge

By its very nature as a unique university that spans the globe with more than 80,000 students taught predominantly by some 2,700 adjunct instructors, finding a way to provide academic governance presents a unique challenge for University of Maryland University College (UMUC).

As the university moves toward its new organizational model, President Javier Miyares asked that all members of the academic community have an opportunity to provide input into how that governance system should be shaped. Their comments will be used to assist the deans, and the committee they convened to study academic governance, as they consider ways to improve the process.

More than 330 individuals—collegiate faculty, adjunct instructors, overseas faculty, and members of the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC)—were invited to take part in a series of confidential small group sessions. A total of 74 participated in nine sessions conducted in June and July 2015.

This report to the committee is based on notes compiled by journalist Gil Klein. The comments ranged beyond the topic of academic governance and included ways to improve communication, management, and the organizational culture within the academic community.

A recurring theme was the importance of leadership development to harness the intellectual capabilities of the entire university community. The feedback from these sessions will inform the strategic decision-making process as UMUC seeks to position itself nationally as an employer of choice.

This report concentrates on comments about governance issues.

In the first focus session, it became obvious that the complexity of the issues required careful examination, and the moderator, Ford Rowan, encouraged participants to submit written messages via WebEx chat during a session and via e-mail after the sessions concluded. A number of participants exchanged messages with Dr. Rowan and several conversations took place between the moderator and some participants in the focus groups. In all instances, confidentiality was promised; no names have been attached to the comments included in this report.

The individual voices could be heard in the nine sessions. This report is an attempt to summarize these voices into a coherent whole to give some guidance on how UMUC can be governed academically, going forward.

Many participants said the system as it exists cannot serve the needs of the university and its various constituencies and urgently needs repair. An overarching thread through all of the sessions was that faculty believed that the administration was making profound changes in the university's academic structure with little input from the faculty. One participant asked, "Is the administration listening to us?"

Despite the materials posted on the UMUC Future web page (www.umuc.edu/umucfuture), which describe in detail the study of academic governance, the results of the strategic planning process, and the community-wide consideration of the business model changes last year, many participants said they did not know what the administration is planning.

This report attempts to accurately reflect the views of participants, but makes no effort to fact check them or to provide the administration an opportunity to respond. No attempt at finding a consensus was offered participants in the multiple sessions.

As promised to participants, this is the unvarnished summary of what they said about governance. Focus groups provide qualitative insights and are not a substitute for quantitative research, and as such this process has yielded a snapshot of opinion. This report is designed to help inform those tasked with recommending improvements to academic governance.

Much of the discussion focused on problems and ways to fix them. Two of the first sessions involved members of FAC, and some members blamed the administration for a breakdown in dialogue. Subsequent sessions introduced a broad diversity of opinion and a variety of ideas on how to improve academic governance.

One theme centered on the limitations of the present Faculty Advisory Council (FAC). Some of its members said that the administration had stopped listening to them, making major decisions without their input. They said FAC members are not allowed to see university budgets. They indicated they believe FAC has a unique ability to gather information for the administration, but while a lot of information is requested, very little is provided in return. According to some FAC members, they are told of decisions only after the administration makes them.

"Under the University System of Maryland, FAC should at least be able to advise," one said, "but FAC has not on matters of great importance." If there is no consultation before decisions are made, then it makes no difference how many representatives are on FAC, said one participant. Another said the number of people voting in the FAC election has dropped to 177 out of some 2,700 possible voters because people don't feel that FAC is effective. Such an antagonistic relationship means there is no effective academic governance at UMUC, said one.

Some focus group members said that FAC's reports to the faculty are so negative that they have stopped reading them. Many faculty don't want to be associated with those who are just angry, said one participant. "We have to find a way to organize so we can be clear about what is important for us and our students."

Another participant said there should be a way for faculty to get information to top administrators without going through FAC. Some of the collegiate faculty who served on FAC noted the lack of respect that characterized the dialogue. It went beyond anger and created a hostile environment, making people reluctant to serve, even if they thought it was a noble cause. Another said he would not serve on FAC because instead of being a career enhancer, it was too often a career killer. There is an element of fear in the governing process if one questions the administration's actions, said one. "We haven't found a mechanism that helps us work together and understand our common, shared needs," said another. "The divisions among us have not been helpful in our ability to work effectively; we need a basic understanding of the principles, roles, and responsibilities" of academic governance. The only way to build trust at the university is for those who are affected by a decision to be heard before the decision is made, said a participant. If a decision is going to affect a particular discipline, faculty in that discipline should be consulted.

Another major theme of the sessions was how to involve adjuncts in the governing process. While they represent more than 95 percent of the faculty, several participants said they felt that their voices are not heard. They indicated that FAC now is composed half of collegiate faculty and half of adjuncts. If the university moves toward a governing model made up primarily of collegiate faculty, they predicted it would create a disconnect between those who administer the programs and those who actually teach the classes. One participant noted that collegiate faculty serve mostly as administrators and are subject to dismissal by the top administration. They would not be willing to ask the right questions.

But many participants noted the limitations of what adjunct faculty can do or want to do in terms of participating in academic governance. A large proportion of them are professionals with full-time jobs who teach on the side, said one. They have neither the interest nor the time to participate in academic governance. And because adjuncts are not salaried and are only paid to teach, few who *do* have the time will want to engage in that kind of work. But some said there is a core group of adjuncts who *are* interested in governance, and they should be part of the process and provided with incentives to participate. "We should not lose representation of adjuncts," one said. "We should not turn our back on these professionals in the field."

A number of participants agreed that the purpose of a governance structure is to protect against a heavy-handed administration, ensure the quality and integrity of the teaching process, and ensure that faculty members are guardians of their disciplines.

A couple of the participants brought up the Council on University System Faculty report that identified significant barriers to UMUC's shared governance, noting that it said there is a lack of agreement between the administration and the adjuncts about who is "real" faculty.

The participants had a number of ideas of what academic governance should entail, although some ideas were at odds with others. Governance should include a "diagonal slice" of the faculty—both full time and part time—said one participant. Governance should be defined not as control but as clear communication channels so that the faculty have input and are not taken by surprise. The faculty do not have to make the decisions, a couple of participants said, but they should have input before those decisions are made. UMUC has a faculty that has expertise in any number of fields, and that expertise should be tapped. "We should create a system with a more collegial atmosphere," one said. "The culture can change, but it will take leadership and a cooperative environment."

One participant said the two current elected bodies, FAC and the Adjunct Faculty Association (AFA), have overlapping missions. Adjuncts, as the backbone of UMUC, deserve a dedicated association to represent their interests, said one participant. One way to address this challenge, one said, is to use the AFA to represent adjuncts and to reconstitute FAC to represent full-time faculty only. Another proposed to use AFA as the voice of the adjunct faculty and to disband FAC. In its place would be internal mechanisms in the graduate and undergraduate schools to bring full-time faculty into the governance process. But one participant said that the idea that the adjunct faculty can be represented by the AFA "is laughable because it was designed as a substitute for a union."

Participants differed as to whether there should be a bicameral or a unicameral form of governance. A bicameral approach would have a body for the adjuncts and a body for the collegiate faculty. A unicameral approach would combine the two. One said a bicameral approach would just create warring factions. Others said a unicameral system cannot represent all interests. One said there is a fundamental divergence between the interests of adjunct faculty and full-time collegiate faculty, and FAC, as currently organized, cannot effectively represent the interests of both. Another said mixing the interests of part-time teachers and full-time collegiates in FAC is serving the interests of nobody. Others suggested the need for a faculty senate.

But a couple of participants said that thousands of adjunct professors will feel even more marginalized if UMUC moves to a governance structure that relies on the 300 or so core faculty.

"We need a system where adjuncts can anonymously evaluate their academic directors and course chairs," one said. "That would be one way to provide serious feedback" on how decisions made at a higher level are playing in the classroom.

Somehow, overseas faculty need to be brought into shared governance because their perspective on what works in their classrooms in other countries is essential to the long-term success of the university, said one participant. Several added that decisions made in Adelphi just are not working in classrooms at remote military bases overseas.

One participant concluded that what has been discussed does not begin to get to the heart of what is needed to create a successful shared governance model. "We need broader, deeper, longer and more involved shared governance than is being discussed," he said. "Creative minds can develop a 21st-century model for gathering input from faculty members and subject experts, thus ensuring that multiple perspectives are considered in making decisions about courses and academic programs."

To sum up, there was no effort to reach consensus in these small group meetings. The range of individual comments across all nine sessions revealed not only divergent views but a willingness to seek improvements in implementing academic policies. All of the operational aspects—ways to improve internal communication with faculty, management of programs, and leadership development—are being shared separately with the deans, provost, and president. Suggestions regarding course design, electronic resources, programmatic innovation, project management, training, technological change, job security, compensation, organizational culture, and the like involve proprietary information which could benefit UMUC's competitors. These issues will be considered and acted upon concurrently with the consideration of improvement of academic governance.

Appendix B

Applicability of an Internal Advisory Board Structure
to UMUC Shared Governance

I.   Background

At the August 17 kickoff meeting of the Academic governance Drafting Committee, Dean Krause requested a consideration of how boards function in the context of providing advice to decision makers, the thought being that an internal advisory board might be a useful and appropriate mechanism for facilitating a system of shared governance within UMUC.

A quick search of the literature available via UMUC's library databases, coupled with a scan of Internet business sites, indicates that advisory boards are widely used in private industry, government, the not-for-profit sector, and academia. Examples abound, but to illustrate with a small sampling:

In private industry, publishers routinely rely on editorial advisory boards composed of distinguished writers, scholars, editors, and researchers to provide recommendations regarding the development of publishing lines, identification of potential authors, quality improvements, and so forth. In any industry area, businesses in start-up mode may put together short-term boards composed of experienced businesspeople, entrepreneurs, and experts such as lawyers or CPAs to help them get off on the right foot, organizationally speaking.

Local governments may rely on citizen advisory boards to help in the formulation of public policy, provide a forum for community discussion of issues, and related functions. Governments, perhaps most particularly government agencies, may also make use of technical advisory boards in areas such as science or medicine to provide expert opinion, research, or advice on matters of potential regulatory importance.

Not-for-profits, such as theater companies, use boards to obtain sound advice on everything from long-term strategy to financial management (including fundraising and marketing).

In academia, it is common to see industry advisory boards, which meet with representatives of a school or a program to advise on trends within particular industries or the workforce generally and to provide wisdom and advice regarding the development of programs, projects, or initiatives to address these trends within the educational unit's offerings.

II.   External vs. internal boards: commonalities and differences

The salient feature (in a governance context) of all these boards (with the exception, in some cases, of the theater board example) is that they exist solely to provide advice and expertise for the benefit of the organizations they are connected to: they have no authority over organizational decision making, nor do they bear any of the fiduciary or legal responsibilities of a formal governance body such as a board of regents or a corporate board of directors. What these boards can do, then, is help enlighten, contextualize, provide perspective and wise counsel, and recommend; what they cannot do is mandate or veto decisions formally vested in organizational managers (in the case of UMUC, management is vested in the UM System Board of Regents, which has delegated portions of its governance authority and responsibility through the Chancellor to UMUC's President).

In my (necessarily quick and therefore incomplete) research, I found that literature on external advisory boards abounds, but there is a paucity of discussion on internal advisory boards. However, in terms of the decision-making authority point made above, the external/internal distinction appears to be irrelevant—an advisory body, whether called a board, a committee, a council, a task force, an ideation group, or a team (or any other name)—is by definition *advisory*. The main purpose of having such a group is to bring its collective expertise and wisdom to bear on matters of interest so as to elicit insights, ideas, and perspectives that will inform sound decision making by those formally entrusted with stewardship of the enterprise. A subsidiary but also legitimate and important purpose of an internal advisory group may be to represent/advocate the interests of a particular constituency or constituencies whose interests the advisory group may, because of specialized knowledge, experience, or situation, be especially well-placed to comment upon.

In terms of formal *authority*, then, it would appear that there is little or no difference between external and internal advisory boards. In terms of *organizational and interpersonal dynamics*, however, it appears that there can be—and likely will be-- significant differences. What these differences are, and how they play out, are considerations that could easily fill a treatise; here, a small (and simplified) example must suffice:

An external advisory board will in most cases be constituted by members personally selected and appointed by the decision maker and its work will be wholly or largely defined by the decision maker. While in some cases board members may have some present or former association with the decision-maker's organization—and so might be considered stakeholders in some sense—their association with the organization's membership is likely at best to be attenuated; and, indeed, the outsider perspective the members bring to the table is the sine qua non of their inclusion on the board and the board's reason for existing.

While an internal advisory board may or may not have some members appointed by the decision maker, most of the membership of a shared-governance board will typically be elected. The nature of the electorate depends on the nature of the board: in the case of a faculty advisory board, the electorate obviously would be faculty, however defined (more on this below). Members will be organizational stakeholders to varying degrees, but most will probably have a greater stake in the organization than that of a typical external advisory board member. Members will come to the board with a variety of perspectives based on their individual subject-matter expertise, practitioner experience (including external experience), and their first-hand knowledge of the organizational culture. Their work will be partly defined by the decision maker (via direct requests for consultation/input on various matters) but also partly by matters raised by their constituents or independently identified by the board itself or its individual members. So in this way, the scope of the internal advisory is likely to be somewhat broader than that of an external advisory board; and it is also more likely that an internal board will take greater independent initiative in suggesting items or areas for consideration by the decision maker than might be the case with an external advisory board.

III.   Features of an advisory board

Whether an advisory board is internal or external, the same key questions obtain: What goal(s) must the board achieve? How should the board be constituted? How should the board conduct its business?

In addressing these questions in connection with a faculty advisory body, the current Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) Constitution, UMUC's policy on governance (Policy 020.20), and the USM Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland (Policy I-6.00) provide a starting point. As discussed in the kickoff meeting, this committee may wish (or President Miyares may wish) to recommend changes in various provisions of these policies, but it seems useful to understand the current structure before recommending variant approaches.

A. Purpose

What do we want our internal advisory body to accomplish? The current FAC constitution states the advisory body's purposes as seeking to "facilitate communication among the global faculty and between the global faculty and the administration, with the purpose of representing faculty interests and fulfilling faculty responsibilities within the university." (FAC Const. Art. I.A.1.) Current UMUC policy indicates that the governance structure generally is intended to allow "stakeholders to provide input to, and be informed about, significant institutional decisions." (Policy 020.20.II.A.) The Faculty Advisory Council, in particular, "advises the Provost, Vice Provosts, and any others designated by the Provost on faculty issues and UMUC's research agenda." (Policy 020.20.IV.C.)(The Provost heads

UMUC's governance structure, Policy 020.20.I.C.; but it is also explicitly stated in the policy that "Each shared governance body . . . acts in an advisory capacity to the President. . . ." Policy 020.20.II.A.) So, under this view, the advisory board should be informed about and have input into significant decisions.

B. Areas of advisory board participation

Clearly, the decision maker is always free to request opinion/perspective/advice on any matter in any area that he/she wishes to have faculty input about. Additionally, both the current FAC constitution and USM shared-governance policy provide for faculty participation "appropriate to their special knowledge and expertise" in decisions that relate to the following:

- Mission and budget priorities for the University System of Maryland and its constituent institutions;
- Curriculum, course content, and instruction;
- Research;
- Appointment, promotion, and tenure of all faculty members and the development of policies that affect faculty welfare generally;
- Development of human resources policies and procedures for exempt and non-exempt staff;
- Selection and appointment of administrators;
- Issues that affect the ability of students to complete their education; and
- Other issues that arise from time to time that affect the overall welfare of the USM and/or its institutions.

(Policy I-6.00.II.D.1-8.)

Clearly these are areas in which one would anticipate that significant institutional decision making would typically occur. Some of these areas are pretty broad and it might be useful to have some examples of what's contemplated in terms of advisory board input or participation. Also, it seems that the new business model President Miyares is proposing may have some impact on certain of the areas mentioned (such as HR policies, for example). So some discussion is probably worthwhile here. Based on the current language, I hypothesize that decision-makers contemplating actions in the outlined areas should, all things being equal, routinely solicit the advisory board's perspective as part of their decision matrix in order to ensure that the most informed decisions possible are being made. (My personal view is that if this were to become the normal course of institutional decision making such pre-decision consultation would go a long way towards enhancing a feeling of collegiality among those involved with, or having a stake in the outcome of, UMUC's decision-making process.)

C. Composition of the advisory board

1. Eligibility. Current UM System policy requires that "structures and procedures for shared governance . . . address the role of non-tenured and non-tenure track, part-time, adjunct, and other faculty ranks as established by Regent's policy. . . ." (Policy I-6.00.III.D.)   At UMUC there are four categories of faculty worldwide (Policy 202.20.III.B.): Collegiate Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Professors of Practice, and Librarians (Policy 181.00.II.A-D. These provisions describe each category.) The current FAC Constitution requires that all categories of faculty have membership on that body; and it further requires that undergraduate and graduate faculty be represented, as well as faculty from all of UMUC's geographic regions. (FAC Const. Art.II.2.) Interestingly, despite these requirements, I do not know whether Professors of Practice have ever been included on a shared-governance body at UMUC.

In addition to faculty, the current shared-governance structure permits "one or more ex officio members selected from the University's senior leadership." (Policy 020.20.IV.A.)

The current FAC membership requirements require inclusion of Collegiate Faculty from the stateside graduate and undergraduate divisions, as well as from the Europe and Asia divisions, adjuncts (including at least one each from the Europe and Asia divisions), and librarians. (FAC Bylaws Art.II.4.a-e.) There is no specific requirement for a Professor of Practice and, as noted above, I am not aware that any faculty member in this category currently sits on FAC.

The current FAC structure includes UMUC's President and Provost (or their designees) as non-voting, ex officio members. (FAC Bylaws Art.II.2.)

2. Number of members. System policy is silent regarding the number of members that a shared-governance body must or should have. UMUC policy currently requires that each of the university's stakeholder groups (identified in Policy 020.20.III. as students, faculty, and staff) be represented by an "Advisory Council" consisting of "a minimum of 12 representatives." (Policy 020.20.IV.A.) Further, "Each Advisory Council may also have one or more ex officio members selected from the University's senior leadership." (Policy 020.20.IV.A.)

The current FAC bylaws specify 18 voting members (FAC Bylaws Art.II.3.) and 2 non-voting, ex officio members (FAC Bylaws Art.II.2). The voting membership is broken down as follows:

- Four Collegiate Faculty members from [stateside]: 2 from undergraduate programs and 2 from graduate programs (FAC Bylaws Art. II.4.a.);
- Two Collegiate Faculty members from the European Division (FAC Bylaws Art. II.4.b);
- Two Collegiate Faculty members from the Asian Division (FAC Bylaws Art. II.4.c.);
- Nine Adjunct Faculty members, including one from the Asian division and one from the European Division (FAC Bylaws Art. II.4.d); and

- One Librarian (FAC Bylaws Art. II.4.e.).

Essentially, then, the current FAC has 20 members. This is an area where I believe we could and should have some discussion and recommend changes. Even though the practice of the ex officio members has been to not participate in the day-to-day workings of the FAC, the literature on effective teams, as well as my experience during 4 years as a FAC member, leads me to hypothesize that 18 members is too many and leads to an ineffectively functioning body. I personally think that 12 members is too many (my admittedly superficial scan of the literature suggests that 8-10 may be the optimum size).

D. Membership selection

UM System currently requires that "At least 75% of the voting members [of the shared-governance body] shall be elected by their constituencies." (Policy I-6.00.III.B.) Current UMUC policy requires that "all" shared governance representatives (with the presumed exception of the ex officio members; although this is not completely clear) be "duly elected by the stakeholders themselves" (Policy 020.20.IV.A. "Stakeholders," for our purposes, are defined as "Faculty," Policy 020.20.III.B.); and the current FAC bylaws define the voting members of FAC as "those UMUC faculty members elected to the FAC by the UMUC faculty." (FAC Bylaws Art.II.1.) The bylaws provide for an election process. (FAC Bylaws Art.III.)

E. Membership term

Currently, FAC members are elected for two-year terms (FAC Bylaws Art.IV.1.), and members are eligible to be re-elected for two addition terms (FAC Bylaws Art. IV.2): so the total possible service time for an elected member of the shared-governance body is six years.

F. Officers and committees

Currently, the FAC membership elects a Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, and Member-at-Large; and these four members constitute the FAC Executive Committee. (FAC Bylaws Art.V.1.) This committee presides over meetings and "officially represent[s] the faculty and its views to the President and the other officers of UMUC." (FAC Bylaws Art.V.6.a.) The Chari and Vice-Chair are FAC's official liaisons to the Provost's Office. (FAC Bylaws Art.V.6.e.) The Executive Committee also "facilitates the organization of task forces and committees within FAC in consensus with the remaining FAC members." (FC Bylaws Art.V.6.c.)

FAC officers are elected for one-year terms (FAC Bylaws Art.V. 4.) and are eligible for re-election (FAC Bylaws Art.V.5.)

G. General responsibilities

Under current UM System shared-governance policy "all participants share with their Presidents and the USM leadership responsibility for:

- Being informed on issues that confront higher education, the USM, and the institutions;
- Acting within time constraints that are imposed by external agencies and influences, sometimes with little or no notice;
- Sharing appropriate information and providing timely feedback;
- Recognizing the specific goals and needs of the institution, and being accountable to the constituencies represented; and
- Distinguishing the roles played by various units and individuals in decision making and administration.

(Policy I-6.00.III.I.1-5.)

H. Compensation

UMUC currently offers modest stipends to FAC members and officers for their service; but these stipends are for adjunct faculty members only. The theory is that collegiate faculty engage in shared-governance activities as part of their required service to the university; but as adjuncts are hired only to teach, their shared-governance service requires additional compensation.

IV. Conclusion

Although "Advisory Council" is the terminology currently employed in UMUC policy to refer to its shared-governance bodies Policy020.20.IV.A.), such language is not required by UM System policy and so presumably could be easily changed if we wish to adopt the use of the term "Board" in some fashion. As noted above, using this term does not in itself work any substantive changes to shared-governance processes or procedures or suggest any duties or responsibilities different from those of the current FAC. But it may be salutary to change the terminology simply to indicate a fresh start for the shared-governance process at UMUC.

The more important issues to address are suggested in Dean Krause's most recent e-mail and in some of the discussion above regarding expectations, purpose, and structure. I look forward to talking these through with everyone at our meeting tomorrow.