IAAP
**THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY**

TASK FORCE ON IAAP GOVERNANCE

How good is our governance?

In 2020, IAAP will celebrate its centennial. IAAP's approach to governance has remained relatively unchanged over the years. While the current governance structure has served IAAP well over the decades, the fact of the matter is that the world in which IAAP evolves has changed and that IAAP has grown and become more complex over the years.

IAAP's system of decision- and policymaking was developed at a time when telephones and snail-mail were cutting-edge communications technology. But now we're in the thicket of interactive technology that continues to evolve at an exponential pace. So the challenge is to examine governance and determine what system will endure regardless of the latest fad or the next big thing. The question to be posed by the Task Force on IAAP Governance will be whether the current system is a sturdy enough structure that is also flexible enough to withstand change.

CURRENT STATUS

Under IAAP's current governance system, established a long time ago, the Board of Directors (BoD) meets once every two years and is the organization's only policymaking body. Its Executive Committee (EC) meets generally only once per year. The Board is made up of the five EC members or Officers plus 35 representatives from Divisions (18 Division Presidents, and 17 Division Presidents-Elect), and no less that 24 and no more than 45 members-at-large for a total ranging from 64 to 85 members. Division representatives are informed by their constituents and debate different points of view before voting on policy or actions that are in the best interest of IAAP as a whole. Members-at-large represent the general membership. Within this organizational structure, there are several standing committees, task forces and special committees which make recommendations to the Board, which has the final authority in the policy arena.

The report from the Task Force on Potential Strategic Goals for IAAP submitted to the Board of Directors for the 2014 BoD meeting in Paris reveals that:

- There is frustration about governance, as well as hope for change, and there is general agreement that governance needs to be "updated" or "modernized".

- This is accompanied by a desire to "not lose anything."
- There is a desire for less governance time spent on administrative issues and more focus on strategic issues.

The report from the Task Force on Strategic Goals contains recommendations. One of them concerns IAAP governance and reads as follows: "We should revamp the governance and executive structure of IAAP to ensure that the organization is fit for its primary strategic purposes, especially advocacy and dissemination of scientific psychological knowledge internationally." (p. 19). With regard to the Board of Directors, it says: "Reduce the size of the BOD in order to increase its effectiveness and efficiency." (p. 19).

The need to address issues related to IAAP governance has been identified for some time. For example, the current President-Elect announced in his statement as candidate for President-Elect in February/March 2012 that he would create a task force on IAAP governance if he were elected. As the newly elected President-Elect, he repeated the announcement at the meeting of the Board of Directors held in Cape Town in July 2012 when issues concerning terms of office, renewal, succession and rejuvenation of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors were brought up for discussion. However, the urgency of addressing those issues was such that the Board of Directors decided to create right away a task force which was mandated to examine those issues and make recommendations to the Board before July 2014.

The present task force is a logical sequel to the task force created in Cape Town to address issues related to terms of office, renewal, succession and rejuvenation of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors. It will build on the work of this earlier task force. The Task Force on Terms of Office, Renewal, Succession, and Rejuvenation of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors did address key governance issues in its report. However, there are other important questions about IAAP governance which need to be examined if IAAP is to fulfill its mission more effectively and efficiently.

ISSUES

Here are some examples of remaining questions to be addressed by a task force on IAAP governance (it should be noted that the following is not meant to be exhaustive):

- <u>Effectiveness</u>: Are the structures and systems that support IAAP's governance system effective? How might we do better to maximize our organizational effectiveness?
- <u>Accountability</u>: Do we know clearly who is responsible for what? How could we do better? Is there a need for more evidence of accountability? If so, how could do better organizationally and individually?
- <u>Board of Directors</u>:
  - o <u>Role</u> – According to Section 3.01 of the Constitution, "The Board of Directors, broadly representative of the membership, determines Association policies and has final authority over the affairs of the Association." What about that role works very well now? What aspects could be strengthened? What should be very different?

- o Size – IAAP has a BoD which is much larger than the ones found in other international or regional organizations. According to a recent survey conducted by the Task Force on Terms of Office […] (2014), two-thirds of the organizations have an EC consisting of 40 members or less. Research shows that responsibility becomes diffused when a group becomes too large. Larger boards tend also to have less interaction at full board meetings and rely on working committees. Should the BoD be downsized? If so, how could it be done without losing anything?
  - o Composition – The BoD consists of Members-at-Large and Division representatives. Division representatives include Division Presidents and Presidents-Elect. In 2010, the BOD approved a motion to include Division Presidents-Elect in the BOD so as to provide them with the opportunity to become more knowledgeable about IAAP affairs before becoming Division Presidents and to enable them to make more contributions to IAAP as Division Presidents. Whether or not this has worked so far is open to question because BOD meetings are rarely attended by both Division officers (i.e., the President and the President-Elect). Most Divisions send either its President or President-Elect. Occasionally, they even send a representative who is not a presidential officer. Should Divisions have only one representative? This would help to reduce the size of the Board and would help with the quorum for holding meetings.
- Executive Committee:
  - o Role – According to Section 3.02 of the Constitution, "The Board of Officers, which serves as the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors, administers the operations of the Association under the oversight of the Board of Directors." What about that role works very well now? What aspects could be strengthened? What should be very different?
  - o Size –If the recommendation of the Task Force on Terms of Office […] regarding the terms of the presidential officers (President-Elect, President and Past-President) is adopted by the Board in Paris, the EC will consist of only four Officers instead of the usual five because there will be only two presidential officers on the EC at any given time. How will this change affect the capacity of the EC to respond efficiently? Does IAAP need a larger EC?
  - o Composition – It is stated in the Constitution (Section 8.02) that: "The Board of Officers shall consist of the President, President-Elect, Past-President, Secretary-General, and Treasurer and any additional officers approved by the Board of Directors for specific functions." According to a recent survey conducted by the Task Force on Terms of Office (2014), two-thirds of the organizations have an EC consisting of Officers and additional members, either elected or appointed. Doe IAAP need a larger EC? Perhaps the Task Force could examine the desirability of adding members to the EC, either members-at-large or members with specific portfolios or responsibilities.
- Divisions:
  - o Role – Divisions represent major scientific and professional interests that lie within the Association. Their role is to support the mission of IAAP by promoting the science and practice of applied psychology and facilitating interaction and communication among applied psychologists around the world in their own respective field. What about that role works very well now? What aspects could be strengthened? What should be very different?
  - o Number – Do we have too many divisions? If so, how should we proceed to reduce their number? Should the rules for creating divisions be more

demanding? Should a group interested in creating a division be required to demonstrate its viability and vitality as an interest group before being allowed to apply for the status of Division?

- Governance Structure: Does IAAP need a new governance structure? What about creating a council-like body (one that would include, for example, the members of the present Board of Directors) and a board-like body (one that would include the IAAP Officers and a few members-at-large with specific portfolios elected by the council-like body)?

- Information and Communication Technologies: Are we taking full advantage of the new developments in information and communication technologies to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our governance it in terms of communications, elections, and so on? How might we do better?

- Administrative Staff: IAAP has no regular part-time or full-time administrative staff. According to a recent survey conducted by the Task Force on Terms of Office (2014), one-third of the organizations have administrative staff. IAAP could hire permanent part-time administrative staff instead of relying solely on volunteers who come and go. In addition, there are some tasks performed by EC or BOD members that would be better done by professionals who have the knowledge and the experience needed to do them. If the Officers had staff support, it would free them to do what they ought to do as Officers. Perhaps IAAP could hire an administrator or an executive director who could help the Association to fulfill its mission more effectively and efficiently. A suggestion was made in the report of the Task Force on Terms of Office […] to explore the following possibilities:
  - o Administration (e.g., Executive Director, Accounting Manager, Operations Manager)
  - o Web Editorial (Editor/Webmaster);
  - o Membership and Marketing (Membership Assistant, Member Relations and Communications Manager);
  - o Advocacy and Public Affairs (e.g., Director of Advocacy and Public Affairs)
  - o Communications (e.g., Communications Manager)
  - o Development (e.g., Director of Development, Development Coordinator)

- Rejuvenation: Strictly speaking, IAAP has no measures in place to involve junior colleagues in the governance of the Association. Some students who have served on the Board may have joined the BOD as member-at-large or representative of one of the IAAP Division after graduation. However, they are rare and, therefore, it has not contributed significantly to the rejuvenation of the BOD or the EC. Should IAAP create seats reserved for junior colleagues? Should IAAP call for nominations of junior colleagues to recruit younger members to become involved in its governance? Should IAAP develop a mentorship program for junior colleagues to rejuvenate and retain younger members who become involved in governance?

- Elections: IAAP has Rules of Procedure for the elections of the EC officers and the BoD Members-at-Large as well as for the elections of the Division officers and the other members of Division Boards. What aspects work very well now? What aspects could be strengthened? What should be very different?

- Rising to Leadership Positions: Under the current system, it can take members many years to rise to top leadership positions and be recognized for their contributions. How could we help IAAP members attain leadership positions more quickly?

- Priorizing: There is no process to identify priorities and everyone is invited to weigh in on everything. How could we address this issue? Would strategic planning help?
- Rules: Is there anything in our Constitution and our Rules of Procedure that need to be changed to improve the effectiveness and the efficiency of our governance system?

To answer those questions, I propose to create a Task Force on IAAP Governance with a mandate to examine whether minor tweaks, sweeping changes or something in-between may be needed to make our governance system more responsive to members in today's era of evolving technology and rapid world changes.

Our current system has served IAAP well over the decades by representing members' concerns through a democratic process. It may be that the existing system is robust enough to interact effectively with whatever new technology and social networking platforms emerge. For this reason, I expect IAAP to enter this project with an open mind, not proposing to change something just for the sake of change. On the other hand, we may discover shortcomings that need more than a quick fix if IAAP is to work effectively and remain relevant and accessible to all its members.

Janel Gauthier
President-Elect
June 2014

> *If I could ask one thing of a crystal ball in any new situation,*
> *it would not be "What's wrong and what will fix it?"*
> *It would be "What's possible here and who cares?"*
> *(Marvin Weisbord, Founder, Future Search)*

TASK FORCE ON IAAP GOVERNANCE

How good is our governance?

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mandate

The task force will have a mandate to review IAAP's governance practices, processes and structures and decide if modifications are needed to optimize and align those with what his needed to help IAAP to better fulfill its mission as defined in the IAAP Constitution and make IAAP's governance system more responsive to members in today's era of evolving technology and rapid world changes.

Tasks

To fulfill its mandate, the Task Force will:

1. Review and critically evaluate the literature on models of governance for non-profit organizations to identify best practice in governance;
2. Will consider governance and best practices of others international and regional organizations in psychology;
3. Review and critically evaluate IAAP's governance structure and function, including its rules and policies, to identify the strengths and the limitations of IAAP's governance system;
4. Identify ways in which IAAP could make its governance system more effective and efficient for the 21st Century;
5. Make recommendations to the Board of Directors as to what changes IAAP should make to address the issues identified in the foregoing critical review.

The IAAP Governance Task Force will be an iterative process that will engage all relevant groups in providing input, assessing current reality, learning together about what is possible, and deciding together what we want that all will support.

It will use the reports from IAAP's task forces on Terms of Office […] and on Strategic Goals as starting points. It will also survey the EC, Board and committee members to gauge their thinking if it deemed it appropriate to do so.

Procedure

One face-to-face (in person) meeting;
Other deliberations by electronic means (email, teleconference, Skype, etc.).

Composition

Chair appointed by President plus two or three additional participants selected by the Chair of the Task Force in consultation with the President.

Timeline

Work to begin in October 2014;
Final report to be submitted by January 31st, 2016.