

## Final Report of the Working Group on IDO Structure and Governance

Eileen Bragg Memorial University	Carole Dence Carleton University	Joy Mighty University of New Brunswick
Lynn Taylor University of Manitoba	Rhoda Weiss-Lambrou Universite de Montreal	Ros Woodhouse Queen's University

Over the last ten years, the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) has enjoyed strong growth and has welcomed increasing diversity in its membership. This increase in size and diversity has strengthened the Society's capacity to influence change in post-secondary institutions with respect to how teaching is valued, practiced, and rewarded. At the same time, these developments present challenges for individual constituencies who, in addition to their commitment to teaching and learning, may have distinct roles in their institutions and within STLHE.

STLHE members who work in faculty development roles constitute one such group. While many of us also have teaching or administrative responsibilities, our primary commitment (and our reason for participating in STLHE as our primary source of professional development) has been to foster and develop the practice and scholarship of faculty development. The IDO constituency's need for a professional organization that supports the advancement and evolution of faculty development interests gave rise to a discussion that took place during the IDO meeting held as part of the 2001 STLHE Conference in St John's, Newfoundland. This discussion articulated a range of concerns about a proper and mutually beneficial relationship between the STLHE organization as a whole and the IDO group within that membership. As a result of that discussion, a working group was struck to make recommendations to the IDO group about how a forum focusing on faculty development interests could be created within the larger context of STLHE.

### Terms of Reference of the Working Group

The terms of reference for the Working Group on IDO Structure and Governance (following a new order that evolved as we came to better understand our task) were:

1. to characterize the general purpose for an IDO caucus within STLHE
2. to suggest possible IDO/STLHE relationships
3. to suggest a possible structure for an IDO caucus within STLHE
4. to propose a possible structure for the IDO caucus leadership
5. to draft tentative terms of reference for an IDO caucus.

The need for a forum specifically dedicated to faculty development issues arises from change in faculty development practice and in STLHE itself. Increasingly, expectations for faculty development units include facilitating institutional development and problem solving in areas such as faculty renewal, academic integrity, and the use of technology, in addition to our traditional work with individual faculty and academic units to enhance teaching. Faculty

developers are becoming involved as change agents, and the strategic planning and leadership abilities once applied in working with individuals and units are now being called upon in institutional contexts. In this context of change, the support we as faculty developers receive from our academic and professional organizations will be critical to our growth and development as practitioners and scholars.

Juxtaposed on these changes in faculty development practices are changes within STLHE. With the growing diversity of roles and interests among STLHE members, the strong focus on faculty development which characterized the early history of STLHE has shifted to include the wider interests of faculty members and, to a lesser extent, administrators. Faculty developers have supported and encouraged this transformation. However, STLHE has now evolved to a point where a separate forum dedicated to the advancement of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship is needed within our national organization. Creation of such a forum, confirming STLHE as the primary professional development organization for faculty developers in Canada, can only enhance the role of STLHE itself as the national voice for teaching and learning.

The Final Report of the Working Group on IDO Structure and Governance outlines a series of 9 recommendations regarding the establishment of a faculty development caucus within STLHE. These recommendations emerge from the concerns articulated at the June 2001 meeting in St. John's, from the working group's collective experience in diverse communities of practice, from research on structures in similar organizations, and from input from IDO colleagues at the February 2002 IDO meeting in Vancouver. Based on the terms of reference given the working group, the report presents recommendations respecting:

- the purpose of an IDO caucus;
- the future relationship of the IDO caucus to STLHE;
- the structure of an IDO caucus within STLHE;
- a leadership/governance structure for an IDO caucus;
- terms of reference for an IDO caucus.

For reasons that will become clear later in the report, the proposed IDO group is referred to as the STLHE IDO Caucus. In this context, the term caucus is used in the sense in which it is defined in the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary and Thesaurus: "a group of people united to promote an agreed-upon cause." <<http://www.m-w.com/home.htm>>

## **Working Group Processes**

The processes adopted by the working group included three face-to-face meetings, two teleconference meetings, research efforts by different working group members, and an on-line discussion group. These processes supported wide-ranging discussion, and preliminary work was shared with the full IDO community at the February 2002 IDO meeting. Interim work on terms of reference 1, 2, and 3 was presented at the February meeting, and input from colleagues has been integrated into the draft recommendations with respect to these items. A full consultation on Terms 4 and 5 was held with those attending the February meeting, and the subsequent draft recommendations are intended to reflect the input received.

## **Recommendations**

### **Respecting the purpose for an IDO caucus within STLHE**

A number of important issues relating to contemporary faculty development practice and the changing face of STLHE prompted interesting discussions at the June 2001 and February 2002 IDO meetings and within the working group itself. Among these issues are the changing expectations concerning the roles faculty developers play at the institutional level, in particular. Also significant are the demands faculty renewal will place on faculty development units, both in terms of increased numbers of new faculty and in terms of renewal and growth within our own ranks. These changes create new demands for the professional development of faculty developers themselves.

There are a number of ways in which STLHE is best suited to provide a structure within which these professional development needs can be met. The values and goals of STLHE are widely shared among faculty developers (Appendix A). Participants in these discussions expressed a strong preference for operating within the mandate and structure of STLHE, while also articulating a need for a more specific focus on faculty development issues within its broader teaching and learning context. A structure that can provide opportunities to continue to optimize communication and collaboration with colleagues in teaching and administrative roles, while providing a forum for pursuing ways to advance the aims of STLHE through the faculty development role, has the potential to strengthen the present “IDO Group” within STLHE while at the same time advancing the broader aims of STLHE itself.

### **Recommendation#1: That the general purposes for an IDO caucus within STLHE would be:**

- a) to strengthen the position of STLHE as the professional/academic organization of choice for faculty developers, and particularly for those practicing in Canada**
- b) to pursue the aims of STLHE with particular attention to their application in faculty development contexts**
- c) to provide leadership in the professionalization of the faculty development role**
- d) to foster the advancement and evolution of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship**
- e) to create a national forum where emerging and problematic faculty development issues can be candidly discussed**
- f) to create a collegial network within which information, strategies, and resources can be shared**
- g) to facilitate communication among faculty developers who are members of STLHE**
- h) to provide professional development opportunities for experienced, new and potential faculty developers**
- i) to advocate, through STLHE, for faculty development issues at an a national level.**

## **Respecting the relationship of an IDO Caucus to STLHE and other organizations**

Faculty developers have always contributed to the leadership and development of STLHE. As STLHE evolves to provide leadership on broader issues of the practice, culture, politics and scholarship of teaching and learning, it is critical that faculty developers remain actively engaged in the full spectrum of the STLHE mandate. It is also clear, however, that faculty developers need a place in which to focus attention on their specific roles. A structure within STLHE has the potential to respond to both these needs. In addition, there are regional groups in Canada with mandates that support and enhance faculty development and which would be important partners for an IDO Caucus.

The working group developed a set of guiding principles that we propose should characterize the relationships between an IDO caucus and STLHE and regional groups (Appendix B). The recommendations with respect to potential IDO/STLHE relationships are based on these guidelines and on feedback from colleagues who participated in a discussion of these relationships in the June 2001 and February 2002 IDO meetings. The essence of this set of recommendations is that the IDO Caucus would focus on strengthening the faculty development domain within STLHE while at the same time providing a national body to facilitate communication among regional organizations interested in partnerships with each other and with STLHE. As discussed in June 2001, formal partnerships with other national and international organizations would fall under the mandate of STLHE.

**Recommendation #2: That the relationships between the IDO Caucus and STLHE be characterized in the following ways:**

- a) It is critical that an IDO Caucus act within and in synergy with the mandate of STLHE. Being grounded in and in open communication with the larger organization will be essential to the work of the Caucus.**
- b) The aims of STLHE will remain the aims of the IDO Caucus. The work of the IDO Caucus will focus on applying these aims in faculty development contexts.**
- c) The more diverse membership of a contemporary STLHE is focusing, as it should, on the larger context of the practice, culture, politics and scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education. Because faculty developers are intimately involved in many aspects of this work, it is expected that faculty development specialists would continue to play important roles in the broader STLHE mandate and to participate in the leadership of STLHE.**
- d) The primary function of the IDO Caucus will be to enhance networking and to advocate, on a national level, on behalf of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship. This is a narrower function than that of STLHE, but one that is wholly consistent with STLHE aims.**

**Recommendation #3: That an IDO Caucus should be structured to strengthen communication and partnerships among faculty development groups operating in different regions of the country. That relationships between the IDO Caucus and existing regional groups should be defined by establishing, through dialogue, appropriate roles for a national group vis a vis local and regional networks.**

**Recommendation #4: That relationships with other national and international organizations, while facilitated and supported by the IDO Caucus, would be initiated and sustained through STLHE.**

**Regarding a structure for an IDO caucus within STLHE**

To facilitate a discussion of possible IDO Caucus structures, the structures used by similar organizations including AAHE and HERDSA were reviewed in terms of their relationships to the central organization, mission, membership, fees, and budget (Appendix C). During discussions in February 2002, the caucus structure as described in Appendix C emerged as most appropriate in terms of

- the relationship to the central organization (recognition in the constitution of central organization; permanent; representation on central governing board) and
- mission (a group which has particular individual or professional identity or interests; works on behalf of that group within the aims of the larger organization; sponsors communication, community, activities, projects).

**Recommendation #5: That an IDO Caucus be created to work within the aims and structures of STLHE to facilitate the advancement and evolution of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship by coordinating communication, networking, professional development opportunities, and advocacy strategies.**

**Recommendation #6: That the IDO Caucus:**

- a) be formally established through appropriate amendment to the STLHE constitution**
- b) be constituted as a permanent structure within STLHE**
- c) represent the particular professional identity and interests of IDO members of STLHE and work on behalf of that group within the aims of the larger organization**
- d) develop a mission statement reflecting the purpose of the IDO Caucus and its relationship to STLHE**
- e) sponsor and organize communication, regular meetings, and initiatives and projects on behalf of the IDO Caucus membership.**
- f) be represented on the STLHE Steering committee.**

**Recommendation #7: That STLHE should create an administrative “Secretariat” structure to facilitate and sustain its own work and the work of the IDO Caucus, and that the IDO Caucus should share in the basic STLHE infrastructure created to support communication and programming.**

### **Respecting a structure for the IDO Caucus leadership**

The recommendations for IDO Caucus leadership are based on suggestions generated during the February 2002 IDO Meeting.

**Recommendation # 8: That the leadership structure be formal, but also simple and linked to the function of the IDO Caucus. (One suggestion was to have co-chairs with responsibilities for different aspects of Caucus activities, including IDO Meetings, professional development activity, or representation on the STLHE Steering Committee.)**

### **Respecting terms of reference for an IDO caucus**

The following terms of reference for an IDO Caucus were generated by IDO colleagues participating in the February 2002 meeting, and are summarized below into general themes.

**Recommendation #9: That the terms of reference for an IDO Caucus of STLHE include:**

- a) provide leadership for the advancement and evolution of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship**
- b) facilitate communication among STLHE members who share interests in faculty development**
- c) provide a clearing house for information of interest to faculty developers**
- d) create a forum for sharing information on specific issues and topics**
- e) provide professional development opportunities for potential, new and experienced faculty developers, including mentoring opportunities for faculty developers**
- f) organize regular meetings of the IDO caucus**
- g) coordinate specific national initiatives identified by IDO Caucus members**
- h) working closely with STLHE to optimize the contributions of faculty developers to the larger STLHE mandate**
- i) develop and advocate for common standards for faculty development programs**
- j) raise the profile of faculty development work in post-secondary institutions.**

### **Conclusion**

In recent years, STLHE has benefited from healthy growth and increasing diversity among its membership. In this new context, the traditional “IDO group” has taken many opportunities to work within the larger STLHE membership to achieve the aims of our organization. The working group proposes that this critical work continue. In addition, we propose that an IDO Caucus be created to advance the specific interests of the faculty development constituency within STLHE to the benefit of that constituency and of STLHE itself. The proposed recommendations are intended to strengthen the STLHE by taking proactive action to sustain and support the faculty development contingent within its membership in ways that facilitate achieving STLHE aims and at the same time increase the capacity of STLHE to support the advancement and evolution of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship. As with all of our work to date, these recommendations are offered to promote further discussion and to provide the basis for action on this matter.

## APPENDIX A

### Aims of STLHE:

- “\* to increase the emphasis on teaching in post-secondary education;
- \* to encourage and facilitate the improvement of teaching and learning and the scholarship of teaching in post-secondary education;
- \* to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on post-secondary teaching and learning;
- \* to contribute to the professional development of members;
- \* to disseminate scholarship on teaching, learning, instructional development, and policy in post-secondary education;
- \* to recognise and reward outstanding contributions to teaching excellence and educational leadership in post-secondary education;
- \* to encourage cooperation between STLHE and other societies in Canada and abroad that have complementary interests.”

<<http://tss.uoguelph.ca/stlhe/>>

## APPENDIX B

### Guiding Principles for the Formation of an IDO Caucus within STLHE

1. With the growth in STLHE well beyond membership and interests of faculty developers, there is a need to formalize the IDO meeting (s) to create a forum within STLHE where faculty development issues can be candidly discussed and the development of the field itself can be fostered. This forum is tentatively being called the “IDO Caucus.”
2. The term caucus is used in the sense in which it is defined in the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary and Thesaurus: “a group of people united to promote an agreed-upon cause.” <<http://www.m-w.com/home.htm>>
3. It is critical that an IDO Caucus would not be separate from STLHE, but would act within and in synergy with the mandate of STLHE. Being grounded in and in open communication with the larger organization would be essential to the work of the Caucus.
4. The more diverse membership of a contemporary STLHE is focusing, as it should, on the larger context of the practice, culture, politics and scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education. This leadership role is essential to the development of post-secondary education in Canada. Faculty developers are intimately involved in many aspects of this work. We cannot separate ourselves from the larger enterprise we were created to foster and support, and it is expected that faculty development specialists would continue to play important roles in the broader STLHE mandate and to participate in the leadership of STLHE.
5. The primary function of the IDO Caucus would be to enhance networking and provide advocacy, on a national level, for faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship. This is a more narrow function than that of STLHE. However, there is a need to recognize emerging faculty development issues within the larger context (e.g. academic integrity, faculty renewal, the integration of technology, etc.), to collaborate on developing resources, to share information on success strategies (and what to avoid), to provide opportunities for professional development for established and new faculty developers, and to foster the scholarship of faculty development.
6. One of the challenges in defining work best done at the national level is to establish, through dialogue, appropriate roles for a national group vis a vis local and regional networks and how to structure a IDO Caucus to strengthen communication and partnerships among regions.
7. The IDO Caucus ideally would take a proactive stance on the evolution of faculty development as a field of practice and scholarship. The Caucus would be support open discussions and critical analysis of where faculty development is likely to go in the future in response to new expectations and pressures. For instance, many of us are experiencing a shift away from primarily a micro practice (individual clients and specific teaching issues) to a blend of micro and macro activities in our practice profiles. We need to gear up for change, strategic planning, leadership, and obtaining more resources to meet growing expectations. Our task is to conceptualize a structure where faculty development interests can be advanced and developed within the larger context.
8. In structuring an IDO Caucus, we should communicate with other potential caucus groups such as the 3M Fellows, to attempt to develop a template for a single caucus framework to be used within STLHE.
9. An IDO Caucus will require some degree of infrastructure for leadership and communication. Proposals for this structure will be based on how other organizations work, emerging issues, and on our own unique context.



APPENDIX C

Organizational Structures in Related Organizations

<b>Structures</b>	<b>Relationship to Central Organization</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Membership</b>	<b>Fees</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b>Caucus</b>	Constitution of central organization; permanent; Representation on central governing board.	Represent a group which has particular individual or professional identity or interests; works on behalf of that group within the aims of the larger organization; Sponsors communication, community, activities, projects	Voluntary in addition to required membership in central organization	May have separate fee	Mixture of independent and support from central organization	AAHE (Black Caucus; Senate Leadership, etc.)
<b>Regional Branch</b>	Regional version of central organization; Responsible to central organization	Identical to central organization	Through central organization	None	Support from central organization	HERDSA
<b>Regional Affiliate</b>	Voluntary; negotiated, cooperative.	Aligned overall	Independent	Independent		None
<b>Program Affiliate</b>	Voluntary; cooperative; negotiated case by case.	Aligned with respect to the program only	Independent		Driven by the program	AAHE &TLT Group
<b>Partner</b>	Voluntary; negotiated May be limited to certain activities or projects; May be different types of organizations	Separate except for the program in question	Independent	Independent	Separate except as specified in the terms of partnership	AAHE &IUPUI;
<b>Affiliate</b>	Voluntary and negotiated	Aligned with respect to general aims; each has a unique contribution to make to the shared mission, based on geography, resources, etc.	Independent	Independent		
<b>Standing Committee</b>	Constitution; Responsible to organization	Responsible for a program or activity of the main organization	Automatic from central organization	None	From central organization	EDUCAUSE; AAHE
<b>Networks; Special Interest Groups</b>	Constitution of organization in general terms; Not permanent	Defined by a theme, topic, problem or particular interest	Voluntary in addition to membership in the central organization	Usually none	Usually None; not formally provided for	AAHE Action Communities; HERDSA Special Interest Groups

## APPENDIX C

### Organizational Structures in Related Organizations