Examining the Foundation of AACP: Report of the 2015-16 Argus Commission

Rodney A. Carter, Pharm.D.[a], J. Lyle Bootman, Ph.D.[b], Patricia A. Chase, Ph.D.[c], Brian L. Crabtree, Pharm.D.[d], Peggy Piascik, Ph.D.[e], Lucinda L. Maine, Ph.D.[f]

[a] Regis University School of Pharmacy
[b] University of Arizona College of Pharmacy
[c] West Virginia University School of Pharmacy
[d] Wayne State University Eugene Applebaum College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
[e] University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy
[f] American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy

INTRODUCTION

The Argus Commission is comprised of the last five presidents of the Association and it is typically charged to examine an issue that is very broad in scope. Recent charges included examining diversity in our applicant and faculty pipelines and the implications of "big data" across all the academic missions. In keeping with her overarching theme of "foundations of citizenship" President Boyle elected to ask the 2015-16 Argus Commission to focus internally and examine key aspects of the organization's structure and functioning[1].

The original charges included the following:

1. Investigate and recommend assessments for the Board and AACP CEO to improve performance;
2. Recommend improvements for Board development processes and programs;
3. Complete the analysis and recommend enhancements in the AACP governance model to optimize opportunities for member/citizen engagement in the work of AACP;
4. Insure that an adequate succession plan for AACP executive leaders is in place and understood by all;
5. Recommend process attributes for the CEO five-year review to be completed by June 2017.

The Commission met at AACP headquarters in October 2015 and completed work on 4 of the charges. The governance review required additional examination and occurred over the months following the meeting in a series of conference calls. In November President Boyle asked the Argus Commission to also review and recommend revisions to the Board's current conflict of interest policy and practices.

BOARD ASSESSMENT

The Argus Commission reviewed several resource documents describing assessment practices of various nonprofit boards. There was general consensus that implementing a process of annual board self-assessment represents a "best practice" in nonprofit board continuous quality improvement. That being said, the Argus Commission noted that the AACP board has operated at a perceived high level of functionality, including successful implementation of four new board positions following the last major governance analysis in 2006-07.

Some different approaches to and potential pitfalls associated with board assessment were discussed. Two that did not seem to offer the right balance of information for the investment of time and other resources were an entrance interview as part of the nomination process and a formal assessment of every board

meeting. Members of the Commission reflected that we should strive to keep the length of the assessment as reasonable as possible.

Two forms of review were identified as worthy of further exploration. The first is an annual self-assessment using an instrument like the one recently released by the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE) in collaboration with Board Source[2]. An exploration of its cost suggested that it would be approximately $1,000 annually but more specific information on its use and the analysis (e.g., benchmarking) was requested. The second form of input on board performance is an exit survey to be administered to those completing service on the board.

The Commission discussed the timing for administering an annual assessment and agreed that it should be sent after the annual meeting to all those serving on the board the previous year. The results would be summarized and disseminated prior to the fall meeting for discussion in an executive session. For those completing service in July there could be a couple of questions to be used as the "exit survey".

An initial discussion of the topic of board self-assessment was docketed to the February board meeting agenda. The recommendation will be to implement an assessment in July/August 2016 as a pilot to see how useful the results are and based on this determine if an annual process should be implemented.

BOARD ORIENTATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Commission members reflected on the changes that had been implemented in the last five years to improve the on-boarding and orientation of newly elected board members. The process begins shortly after election results are certified with a one-hour telephone conversation for each newly elected board member with EVP Maine. This occurs even if the individual has previously served on the Board because, as roles or offices change, the expectations and commitment of the board member changes. The agenda includes a review of how each board meeting operates, including agenda development and meeting components. The role of newly elected board members on the AACP Strategic Planning Committee is also discussed. The first face-to-face portion of the orientation occurs in conjunction with the AACP Leadership Forum in March/April where much of the focus is on financial management. New board members participate in the Forum along with current board and section leaders. New board members are also invited to attend the July board meeting as part of the orientation.

One specific topic that is recommended for more emphasis during orientation is the distinction between leading and managing. The article titled Governance is Governance[3] by Ken Dayton would be a useful background piece to add to the orientation materials and to discuss briefly with new board members. It was also noted that position descriptions for each board position, including those in the "designate" category, should be available. There is a list of specific duties for each Board position that is included in the extensive Board Orientation Notebook. That resource is updated annually and is posted in the Board members' intranet section of the AACP Web site.

Recommendation 1: AACP should initiate an annual process of board self-assessment using a valid assessment tool which includes unique questions for members completing board service. Data from each assessment cycle should be reviewed by the Board during the fall Board of Directors meeting.

Recommendation 2: AACP should provide position descriptions that outline the key responsibilities of and qualifications for all positions on the Board of Directors.

ANNUAL GOAL SETTING AND REVIEW OF THE EVP

EVP Maine described the processes that have been used in somewhat of an irregular fashion with respect to annually establishing unique goals for the EVP (versus AACP strategic planning goals). Commission members agreed that a goals document should be drafted shortly after the Annual Meeting each year and circulated to the Executive Committee for comment. A final set of goals should be shared with the full board and discussed at the fall meeting. At the end of each year the EVP should prepare a reflection on accomplishment of the annual goals that would also be shared with the Executive Committee and then the full board.

Recommendation 3: The Executive Vice President should present a draft set of annual goals and a summary of accomplishments on goals for the previous year for review by the Executive Committee in August and distribute the summary and goals for review by the full Board prior to the fall Board of Directors meeting.

EVP FIVE YEAR REVIEW (2016-2017)

Brian Crabtree shared information from the 2011-12 Bylaws-mandated review of the EVP. This review was facilitated by the Bernard Consulting Group (BCG) and involved a series of interviews of AACP leaders, deans, staff, and external stakeholders. This was done parallel to a major member needs assessment. The first (2006-07) review of EVP Maine was facilitated by Josh Mintz and involved a survey completed by over 130 individuals. The composition of those surveyed mirrored the groups interviewed by the BCG in 2011-12.

The AACP Bylaws require that the review committee be appointed by the President-elect (Joe DiPiro for the 2016-17 review) and is comprised of two past presidents and three past Council chairs. The Commission asked EVP Maine to investigate whether the HR consultants from Raffa, who oversee day-to-day HR functions as well as special projects, could conduct the forthcoming review in an unbiased and confidential manner. They subsequently confirmed this was feasible.

It was noted that it would be highly desirable to fashion any input gathering for the 2016-17 review as part of the 2015-16 strategic planning process if possible. Surveys were conducted as part of the on-going strategic planning process of board members, delegates to the 2016 House of Delegates, and AACP staff. The group designated by President-elect DiPiro will meet with the Raffa team to discuss the need for additional data to use for the analysis and to establish the timeline for completing the 5-year review.

SUCCESSION PLANNING

EVP Maine noted that she had begun development of a succession planning document several years ago that specifies the steps needed for temporary or permanent replacement of the Executive Vice President. She noted that the current executive leadership team would be capable of managing AACP in the event of a short-term vacancy in the office of the CEO. The Commission thought it would benefit the organization for there to be an annual discussion with the Executive Committee regarding who the best member of the current senior staff might be to serve in an interim capacity. In the event that the succession plan needed to be implemented the President would bring a specific recommendation to the Executive Committee. Key questions included the need to engage legal counsel in such a decision and how to mediate disagreements on the selection of the best short-term interim leader.

The formal succession document should include reference to the process of search and selection of a new EVP/CEO, both in a planned and unplanned context. The full board would be engaged in this process which would very likely be managed through retention of an executive search firm. A draft succession

document for the Executive Vice President and CEO has been prepared as part of the Argus Commission charge. That document will be reviewed and approved by the AACP Board of Directors.

The Argus Commission affirmed the importance of continuously developing the executive leadership and management skills of the vice presidents and senior directors. Including conversations in the annual reviews of these key leaders about their career development and aspirations should be a priority. They also noted the importance of having account information and passwords for key accounts and systems in a secure and encrypted system. This is currently the responsibility of the Senior Director for Finance.

Recommendation 4: A formal succession planning document should be reviewed and approved by the AACP Board of Directors in July 2016 and then reviewed annually by the AACP Executive Committee with input from legal counsel as necessary.

AACP GOVERNANCE ANALYSIS

The Argus Commission began the governance discussion with a review of the history of past and current structure and governance changes spanning approximately 40 years. The 1970's marked a significant period of change for AACP in that the House of Delegates was established with representation by both faculty members and administrators from AACP member institutions.

The request to complete a review of AACP governance was largely stimulated by the increasing number of requests to establish new membership interest groups, notably special interest groups (SIGs). EVP Maine and Melinda Colón, Director of Governance and Meetings, provided a summary of recent discussions about this issue among the 2014-15 AACP Program Committee, the Special Interest Group Cabinet and the 2014-15 Strategic Planning Committee. Of note 4 applications to create new special interest groups were submitted for consideration in September 2014 and one was received in September 2015. The 2014-15 SIG cabinet, which is asked to review and vote on each proposal, voted inconclusively on all 4. This resulted in the Board's request for a critical examination of whether the current governance model is sufficient to meet our diverse members' needs or whether there are alternative models of membership engagement that might be more contemporary.

As part of this analysis, EVP Maine examined the structure and staffing of governance and member affinity groups of several other education-related associations. Case reports from the American Dental Education Association and the American Educational Research Association are included in Appendix A.

Governance versus Volunteer Management
One important distinction that is becoming clearer based upon a review of a variety of materials about governance and volunteer involvement in associations is the distinction between governance groups and groups of volunteers united for a purpose (e.g., interest in a topic). Both are very important to the health and vitality of membership organizations.

Goldstein[4] defines governance as follows:

> Good governance means acting as stewards of the public interest and ensuring legal and ethical integrity, ongoing revenue generation and financial viability, board continuity, an effective governance process, and compliance with the corporate charter and bylaws. In your governing role, you should provide oversight, value-added guidance, and final decision-making on strategy, program, and policy formulation; CEO selection; and oversight of strategic plan implementation.

AACP operates with a dual system of governance, shared by the Board of Directors and House of Delegates. Each of these bodies has specific and distinct responsibilities. The AACP Bylaws clearly

delineate the responsibilities of each group as detailed in Table 1 and reinforced in the House of Delegates Rules of Procedures. Argus Commission members agree that the dual governance system is working for AACP. They further agreed that there could be better clarity among the general membership regarding the respective duties of each body through an annual review of the chart of duties.

The primary issue of concern within the existing governance model is that the work of the House often seems to lack energy unless the discussion includes a degree change or a dues increase! The question was asked whether we as an organization are reluctant to raise challenging or controversial issues. There have been attempts by our recent Speakers of the House to study delegate appointment, the work coming before the House, and the policy development process, but these efforts have not seemed to change the overall level of delegate engagement or vitality of the body. No new recommendations for change in these levels of governance were offered. The 2015-16 Bylaws and Policy Development Committee will include further discussion of strategies to increase delegate engagement in its work this year.

Volunteer Groups/Communities of Practice
AACP has many groups of volunteers united for different purposes. These include Councils (3), Association Standing and Ad Hoc Committees (varies), Sections (9), Special Interest Groups (21), and committees within Councils, Sections and SIGs (numerous). Given the definition of governance provided above, none of these groups are appropriately classified as governance groups. They function largely to provide members the opportunity to create meaningful communities of shared interest and to provide for member engagement in the work of AACP and the academy. This engagement provides benefits for individuals and for AACP, including professional and leadership development, issue analysis and problem-solving within interest areas and across the academy, network formation, and member loyalty cultivation and retention.

The Argus Commission celebrated the vitality of individual member involvement in AACP and affirmed that all decisions regarding structure and governance should not only protect but expand such opportunities for meaningful involvement in Association activities. Of related interest and fortuitous timing, AACP participated in a project to assess members' perspectives on serving as a volunteer in AACP. The project was undertaken by the ASAE Foundation in April just as this report was being completed and it contrasted the perspectives of volunteers with other members who had not recently served in any volunteer capacity. Over 25,000 association members from over 100 different associations completed the survey. AACP elected to participate and the survey was completed by over 600 current AACP members. The results will be reported separately from this Commission report.

The Argus Commission requested a comprehensive resource analysis to assess budgeted funds and staff support at all levels of governance and volunteer engagement. Further, it was suggested that clarification of the purpose of and distinctions between Councils, Sections and SIGs would be beneficial. The following section provides an overview of the structure and scope of activity for these membership groups.

Roles and Resource Commitments to Each Sector

Councils: There are currently three councils whose elected chairs, chairs-elect and immediate past chairs serve concurrently as members of the AACP Board of Directors. This provides a direct avenue to bring council issues and priorities to the attention of the board and staff. Each council has a staff liaison who maintains responsibility, along with the council chair, for the annual cycle of Council business. The Councils do not have revenue generating responsibility nor are there distinct Council budgets.

The Council of Deans holds two business meetings annually (Interim and Annual Meetings) and the Council of Faculties holds a business meeting at the Annual Meeting and a Faculty Forum at the Interim

Meeting. Individual members determine their affiliation with either the COD or COF depending upon their title and academic responsibilities.

Table 1.

Duties of the Board of Directors[a]	Duties of the House of Delegates
To develop the Association's strategic plan,	To determine the educational policies of the Association,
To implement the policies established by the House of Delegates (House),	To ratify, reject, or refer back to the Board of Directors any Association policies established by the Board of Directors between meetings of the House,
To establish programs consistent with the strategic plan approved by the House,	To approve the Association's strategic plan as developed by the Board of Directors,
To appoint or otherwise contract with advisors,	To approve institutional memberships,
To carry on the operation of the Association, including the establishment of Association policies, between meetings of the House,	To review programs established by the Board of Directors,
To develop criteria for and subsequently approve the forming of Academic Sections,	To set the annual dues for the members of the Association as described in Article IV, and
To review problems and identify actions which require the attention of the House,	To adopt and amend the Bylaws of this Association.
To appoint the Executive Vice President of the Association for a specified term,	
To appoint the Editor of the American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education,	
To appoint individuals, representatives or delegates at the request of other organizations desiring representation from the Association, and	
To approve the annual budget and review staff organization and administrative policies.	

[a] All corporate powers shall be exercised under the authority of the Board; the Board shall also provide for the dissemination of information to the members of the Association including submitting for the review by the House, an annual report of all programs initiated by the Board since the last meeting of the House

The Council of Sections is comprised of the elected officers of the nine sections plus the secretary, Council chair, chair-elect and immediate past chair. The Council of Sections was reestablished in 2007 to strengthen the connection between the sections and the Board, recognizing that the Sections are the primary affinity group for most members. Previously a one-year rotating model of Section representation on the Board by one Section chair was used. It was recognized in the 2006 governance analysis that this historic Academic Sections Coordinating Council model was not keeping the Section/Board connection sufficiently strong.

The Councils establish annual priorities, typically addressed by the formation of ad hoc committees and task forces. In addition they have standing committees with responsibility for policy, nominations and other routine activities. Each Council has its dedicated listserv to facilitate information sharing between AACP and Council members as well as between members themselves.

Sections: The seven original sections represented the primary academic disciplines in pharmacy education in the middle of the 20th century. The changes in pharmacy education in the last 10 to 20 years, especially with the transition to doctoral level education, brought about a maturation of the role of experiential education faculty and staff. This lead to the modification of the Professional Experience Program SIG to the Experiential Education Section. The AACP Board of Directors has also recognized the expanding number of professional staff who are part of the architecture of colleges and schools of pharmacy and has repeatedly affirmed the importance of maintaining a home for them in the AACP structure. The Administrative Services Section is the most recent change in section structure. This increases the ability to insure that important administrative issues can be brought to the attention of the AACP board.

AACP members can select a primary section and one additional section as part of their membership. The sections do not have dedicated staff liaisons, however their work is coordinated both through the leadership of the Council of Sections and the governance program staff. Each section is allocated financial support in two categories annually: annual meeting program support and special project monies. Table 3 provides details for the last three years for section and SIG financial support. There are no dues for section membership. Each section maintains elected officers, annual programming, committees and occasional special projects (e.g., webinars, awards). These are summarized twice annually by the COS Chair and reported to the AACP Board of Directors. Each section has a dedicated listserv.

Special Interest Groups: The area of membership affinity groups that has experienced the most dramatic growth since 2000 is the special interest groups, growing from 10 in 2000 to 21 in 2013 with 5 requests pending. There are three types of SIGs: topical, functional and demographic. This is an evolutionary versus a more purposeful approach to addressing the unique and diverse interests of our expanding membership. Members can join as many SIGs as they wish and monitor their activities and communications via the individual SIG listservs.

The SIGs do not have dedicated staff liaisons but, like the individual sections, they are supported by the governance program staff. Like sections, there are no dues for SIG membership and each SIG is allocated financial support for programming and special projects. A SIG Cabinet was established in 2008. Each elected officer of the SIGs is a member of the Cabinet which meets face-to-face at the annual meeting and by a conference call in January of each year. In 2014 AACP initiated a SIG Dashboard as a mechanism for aggregating information about the SIGs, including the number of members, their programming, webinars, and other indicators of activity.

The annual cost for supporting programming and special projects for Sections/SIGs, respectively, for the last three fiscal years is: 2013: $25,855/58,085; 2014: $21,454/58,861; 2015: $28,065/69,269.

Proposal to Create Two Levels of SIG Involvement

At the initial Argus meeting, Melinda Colón shared that in July 2015 the SIG Cabinet began to discuss whether there are perhaps two levels of member engagement within each SIG, distinguishing "active/involved" from more "passive/information seeking" members. AACP governance and membership staff drafted a working document building upon the two levels of interest construct for further discussion by the Argus Commission.

It is proposed that a redesigned member profile would allow members to self-identify their primary and secondary SIGs:
- Primary SIG(s) are a SIG or SIGs in which a member wishes to participate actively. Active participation is defined as willingness to serve on committees, take on leadership roles, work on special projects, etc. Members would be able to designate a finite number of primary SIGs.
- Secondary SIG(s) are a SIG or SIGs in which a member wishes to maintain a more passive role, primarily to receive information or monitor/query the listserv. An unlimited number could be selected.

The topic was again an agenda item for the February SIG Cabinet call. There continues to be support for this change among current SIG leaders. They note that active involvement in SIGs (e.g., committee service, elected leadership) requires significant dedicated effort and as this is over and above one's professional responsibilities, family commitments and civic activities it is realistic to limit the number of primary SIGs. That said, there is a recognition that faculty have wide-ranging interests which is why allowing an unlimited number of secondary SIG affiliations makes sense.

The benefits of this bi-level characterization of member engagement include having a more realistic picture of the size of the membership that is prepared to engage in the work of the SIG. The ability to create a quorum for conducting business should also be easier under this model. Implementation of the change, if approved through a vote on Bylaws language changes, would be part of an upcoming change in AACP's membership database and association management software system (estimated in early 2017).

The Argus Commission discussed several scenarios related to the future of SIGs, including numbers of primary members that should be required to constitute a viable special interest group. They examined the SIG and Section establishment and dissolution guidelines and made recommendations to the AACP Board for several potential changes. The Commission also forwarded language for Bylaws amendments to the Bylaws and Policy Development Committee related to the Sections and SIGs

Recommendation 5: AACP should implement through an amendment to the AACP Bylaws two levels of membership in the SIGs (primary and secondary) giving members the opportunity to designate 2 primary SIGS in a single membership year and an unlimited number of secondary SIGs.

Piloting a Community of Practice

One request for an additional SIG was received in 2015 from a group advocating the establishment of an Interprofessional Education SIG. The SIG Cabinet reviewed the request and a strong majority supported the petition. The AACP Board felt that it would not be appropriate to approve this petition while the others remained "pending" and the Argus Commission was working to resolve outstanding questions of membership structure and governance.

After the initial Argus meeting EVP Maine and Dana Thimons, Sewell Fellow in Knowledge Management, began to explore the literature on communities of practice (COP). COPs have been developed in a variety of types of organizations, including businesses, educational institutions, and

associations. Even online communities such as LinkedIn have professional networking communities focused on unique topics (e.g., Games and Simulations for Healthcare).

Reilly et al[5] have published on COPs that were designed to support faculty development and offer the following definition and characteristics of successful communities.

> *A community of practice (COP) is defined as a group of people who share an interest in a domain of human endeavor and engage in a process of collective learning that creates bonds between them [28]. The three main characteristics shared by a COP include: 1) domain (shared knowledge and competence in the focus area), 2) community (interactive members learning together), and 3) practice (shared repertoire of resources, tools and experiences) through which the repeated exchange of knowledge and experience moves the practice of teaching and learning forward. A COP may operate formally or informally and be cohort or issue focused. A COP may be within a single institution (the most common type), a multi-institution setting or on a global scale.* (p.102)

After reviewing the construct of COPs with the Argus Commission, EVP Maine invited the designated chair of the IPE SIG petition group to discuss whether she believed the group would be interested in testing the COP model as a pilot. We reviewed literature on successful COPs and she agreed that it seemed to fit the intent of the group advocating for the formation of a SIG, possibly even more effectively than the traditional SIG model. Subsequently, a design team of IPE leaders has begun discussions supported by Dana Thimons, now AACP's Associate Director of Knowledge Management. AACP has also evaluated the need for an improved member networking and information-sharing solution to replace the current listservs maintained by various governance and membership groups. A new tool will be implemented during the pilot period to strengthen community interaction and resource sharing. The pilot will last the full calendar year of 2016 and both the Argus Commission and Board of Directors will review the results of the pilot in early 2017.

Recommendations from the 2015-16 Program Committee

The Argus Commission discussed the forces that were contributing to the increasing number of requests for establishing new membership groups. Among these were the increasing complexity of our academic programs and the desire for members with like interests to find those with similar interests in the Association. Opportunities for leadership development and active participation are also drivers. It was recognized, however, that the primary driver for many requests to establish new SIGs is the guarantee of a program during each annual meeting and the modest financial support offered for these programs.

The 2014-15 Annual Meeting Program Committee chaired by Timothy Ives studied the current programming dynamics. At the Annual Meeting, sections are each provided two 90-minute program slots and one for a business meeting. SIGs are each provided one 90-minute education slot plus a business meeting at the annual meeting. Collectively this represents 69 program blocks at each meeting.

Under current constraints of space and time, only about 30 additional program proposals from the membership can be offered at the Annual Meeting beyond Section/SIG programming. These proposals come from special (90-minute programs) and/or mini-sessions (30-minute programs) submitted by members. AACP receives approximately 80 proposals each year. Beginning in 2014, AACP accepted mini-session proposals. In the first year 60 proposals were submitted, followed by 120 in 2015, and finally in 2016 the number soared to 180!

With the increase in both mini-session and special session proposal submissions, coupled with the limited programming space, the 2015-16 Annual Meeting Program Committee chaired by Craig Cox looked at

exploring ways to maximize program offerings for membership. In addition, concerns have been raised both informally by membership and through annual meeting evaluations that the quality of some programming could be enhanced. Important to this discussion is recognizing the current process that is undertaken for approval of Section, SIG, special, and mini-session proposals. Section / SIG programming does not formally undergo external review (outside individual Section/SIG membership), but rather when submitted is automatically accepted and included into final meeting programming. On the other hand, all special and mini-sessions undergo a comprehensive review process by members representing a broad range of expertise.

To address these concerns, the Program Committee developed a new process for approval of Section/SIG programs that will hopefully help streamline the process and enhance the quality of programs. The process has briefly been described below:

- All Sections / SIG program proposals (each with a special identifier) will be submitted at the same time as all mini and special sessions (mid-Fall).
- All proposals will be reviewed by AACP Programming Committee utilizing a standardized rubric that is currently under revision (final version completed by 2016 annual meeting).
- AACP Program Committee will select top programs proposals (final number will vary depending on number of slots available). Any top proposals that have been tagged with a special identifier as Section / SIG program will automatically become a part of annual meeting program and count toward Section (2 programs) and SIG (1 program) allocation.
- After AACP Program Committee selections, a remaining list of quality programs will be sent to individual Section / SIG program committees to select from. Each Section will have opportunity (but not required) to select up to one or two additional programs and SIG up to one program depending on how many were already pre-selected by AACP Program Committee in first phase of process (up to but not exceeding their allocation).

The Program Committee is also exploring ways to further enhance the assessment of Annual meeting programs to assist in monitoring the success of the program selection process.   Close coordination with staff responsible for the continuing education process will be critical.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY REVIEW

The Argus Commission examined the current conflict of interest (COI) policy and conflict declaration form and management process. The primary conflicts that AACP board members might present deal with concurrent service in AACP leadership positions and positions on the boards of other national pharmacy associations, selection of award recipients and appointments to the ACPE Board of Directors. Service as an editor or associate editor on a journal that publishes manuscripts similar to those published in the *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* has also been discussed as a potential conflict of interest.

Several recommendations for changes to the policy and declaration form have been presented to the AACP Board of Directors for their consideration.

CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

President Boyle charged the 2015-16 Argus Commission with several important analyses of AACP's "organizational foundations". This provided the opportunity to look both internally and externally at structure and association management practices to identify opportunities for improvement. The formalization of board and executive vice president review practices as well as a succession plan for the

chief executive offer opportunities to make improvements on what the Commission recognized is a high functioning governance model.

Similarly, member engagement in the work of the Association is fundamental to our success by many measures. Enhancing the opportunity to form affinity groups more fluidly once the community of practice pilot is completed is consistent with 21st century membership organizations we studied. AACP's mission is to lead and partner with our members to advance pharmacy education, research, scholarship, practice and service to improve societal health. The Argus Commission believes that our dual system of governance and the many avenues for member networking, information-sharing and collaboration position us well to achieve our mission today and for many years to come.

REFERENCES

[1] Boyle CJ. Capitalizing on Foundations in Citizenship. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2015; 79(6): Article S5.

[2] Board Self-Assessment for Associations. 2015. American Society of Association Executives and Board Source. https://boardsource.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_56nRyXvcV89N57n

[3] Dayton, Kenneth N. Governance is governance. 2001. Published by Independent Sector http://www.independentsector.org/publications?s=kenneth%20dayton Accessed January 25, 2016.

[4] Rick Goldstein. Beginning a review of your association's governance system. 2007. Associations Now/The Volunteer Leadership Issue. American Society of Association Executives.

[5] Reilly, J. R., Vandenhouten, C., Gallagher-Lepak, S., & Ralston-Berg, P. (2012). Faculty development for e-learning: a multi-campus community of practice (COP) approach. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(2), 99-110.

Argus 2016 Governance Case Study #1 – American Dental Education Association (ADEA)

Monique Morgan serves as Senior Manager for Governance in the Office of the ADEA President and Chief Executive Officer. She has been responsible for managing ADEA's governance activities for 12 years which includes the period when the association implemented its open membership model (no individual dues).

The ADEA structure is almost exactly the same as AACP's, including the hybrid membership structure with institutional and individual members. They convene a House of Delegates with 315 delegates at the annual meeting. The Board of Directors (N=11) is comprised of the Chairman of the Board, Chair-elect and Immediate Past Chair, the President and CEO, and the chair of each of the 7 ADEA Councils. ADEA currently has 38 sections and 10 special interest groups.

The councils each represent a distinct dental education constituency, including:
- Allied dental program directors
- Dental school deans
- Dental school faculty
- Hospitals/advanced education programs (e.g., residencies)
- Sections
- Students, residents and fellows
- Corporate representatives

Individuals can join as many sections and SIGs at they wish and since ADEA abolished individual dues there are no fees collected for section or SIG membership. Historically, these groups funded their programs and activities with individual dues assessments and typically maintained balances from year to year. At the point when the collection of dues ceased, each group gave 45 percent of their fund balance to a central programming fund to support programs at the annual meeting. Some groups receive funding for programming from specialty dental societies (e.g., orthodontics specialty organizations for the Orthodontics Section programming).

Each section and SIG convenes a Members' Forum at each ADEA Annual Meeting. This used to be a business meeting and these often failed to attract a sufficient number of individuals for a quorum. The forums do attract more participation. Section and SIG leaders are invited to submit abstracts for annual meeting programs and these go through the same peer review process as submissions from individual members. If a program is accepted, the section or SIG can apply for funding from the central programming fund.

Each governance group has a designated list serv. The chair-elect of each group chairs the Nominations Committee. Elections are held at each group's forum. There is a 5 person administrative board for each governance group at the council, section and SIG levels. There is a staff liaison for each of the 7 councils. Monique serves as staff liaison to the Council of Sections (in which the SIGs leaders also belong). In addition to this council liaison responsibility, Monique provides staffing for the House of Delegates and Board of Directors. She attributes her ability to manage a total of 57 unique governance groups to managing and motivating volunteers to complete the bulk of the activities that move their groups' routine activities and unique priorities forward.

Argus 2016 Governance Case Study #2 – American Education Research Association (AERA)

Sylvie Nguyen-Fawley serves as Governance Manager at AERA. Hers is a 2-person governance team with Andrew Middleditch serving as Governance Associate. AERA is a 26,000 member association (all individual) with a staff of between 25 and 30 people. The AERA Executive Director and the Executive Assistant to the ED are very involved in the activities of the Council.

The AERA structure is quite different from AACP's. Their Council serves in the role of the AACP Board of Directors. There are 12 divisions which represent the major scholarly areas of education research. Examples would include a division on professional education and another on measurement and research methodology. Each section has an elected Vice President and these individuals sit on the AERA Council. Each AERA member is eligible to join one division as part of their membership. They can select additional division memberships for an additional fee. There are sections within divisions but the AERA web site does not make the nature of sections clear.

AERA currently has 150 special interest groups! A SIG can be establish if there isn't an existing niche for the subject matter being proposed. Any group of 75 or more active AERA members may petition to establish a new SIG related to a specific topic or area of research that is not a primary focus of any existing SIG or Division of AERA. Historically a proposal to establish a new SIG would be presented to the AERA Council and it would be approved. Over time that SIG might shift the focus of their activities and the new activities could be deemed duplicative of another governance group.

The association imposed a moratorium on new SIGs about 4 years ago as there were organizational concerns about the proliferation and management of niche groups. During this period the SIG Executive Committee produced a system for the review of each SIG using a tool called the Vital and Health Matrix. Sylvie noted that it has been difficult for AERA staff to manage the primary activities of so many governance groups. This would include monitoring elections (SIGs use different terms of office with some elected officers seeming to be reluctant to relinquish their office once installed), keeping track of awards, and achieving a goal of having a standard set of bylaws for each SIG.

In terms of programming during AERA's primary membership meeting, there are 13,000 proposals submitted for approximately 2,000 sessions! Each SIG has one educational session and one business meeting but all submissions must come through a common submission portal (AERA uses the same vendor as AACP). Education session submissions from individual AERA members have to be tagged to a specific section or SIG. The meetings team manages all of the processes associated with program submission, review and selection.

Financial management of governance group activities is the responsibility of the Director of Finance. Each division is allocated funds based on a formula comprised of a base amount plus a variable amount based on membership. SIG budgets are based purely on their membership and the collection of dues. Each SIG pays a management fee to AERA for the management of membership and finance information as well as communication supports (e.g., listservs and web site presence). The minimum fee for SIG membership dues is $5.