

Policy and Planning Board's 2018 Annual Report:

Policy and Planning Board's Self-Study as a Model for Reviewing APA Governance

Policy and Planning Board Members

2018 Chair: Ronald H. Rozensky, PhD, ABPP
Heather E. Bullock, PhD
Armand R. Cerbone, PhD, ABPP
Nadine Kaslow, PhD, ABPP
Deirdre J. Knapp, PhD
Angela M. Kuemmel, PhD, ABPP
Bruce J. Overmier, PhD
Kenneth J. Sher, PhD
Lori Thomas, PhD, JD
Sarah Magee, Staff Liaison

INTRODUCTION

The American Psychological Association's (APA) Policy and Planning Board (P&P) is charged with "carrying out its mandated five-year review of the structure and function of the Association," which includes "an assessment of the continuing importance and relevance of the Association's governance bodies and programs." (APA Rule 70-1.3; www.apa.org/about/governance/bylaws/rules-70.aspx). Further, that rule goes on to say that P&P "shall make recommendations regarding those [bodies and programs] that should be considered for sunsetting."

The aim of the current project is to help selected governance groups to:

1. Conduct a self-study of activities over the past five years
2. Review APA's new strategic plan (www.apa.org/about/apa/strategic-plan/index) and make recommendations regarding enhancing each group's own role and contributions based on its past accomplishments, with a clear eye toward establishing plans that support the expectations and goals within the new strategic plan.

P&P will then compile all the self-studies and make recommendations regarding enhancing the contributions of governance to the future of APA and psychology.

Despite the long-standing mandate for such a routine governance review, we were unable to identify instances of P&P having executed this charge in the past. Thus, as a first step toward fulfilling this obligation, P&P developed a standardized process designed to illustrate how such a routine review of governance could be conducted.

Rather than taking on a completely independent evaluation of APA governance, we determined it would be more useful for the association for P&P to establish a process by which governance groups would conduct their own self-evaluations in a consistent manner across the association. Thus P&P's role would be to initiate, collate, integrate, and make recommendations to the APA Board of Directors (BOD) and Council of Representatives (COR) about those self-studies. This would include how governance groups and governance, as a whole, contributes to the mission of APA, the association's strategic plan, and the future of psychology.

We believe such a self-evaluation process will prove more beneficial and useful to each governance body than an external review completed by P&P alone. First, carrying out a self-evaluation might engage governance groups more effectively and thus ensure greater participation in this mandated evaluation process. Second, reviewing their own self-evaluations can be more likely to enhance each group's own functioning. Third, the self-evaluations will facilitate P&P satisfying its five-year review of governance as it reviews, summarizes, and prepares recommendations based on results of these self-evaluations. We felt strongly that this approach is respectful of each governance group and will enhance the likelihood that this mandated five-year report will be accurate, practical, and useful to each group, the association, and its membership.

In developing the process for self-evaluation, P&P sought the direct engagement of several governance boards. Their feedback provided input in formulating a uniform self-evaluation survey measure. Feedback also allowed P&P to determine the *foci* for the self-study, including how a given group's agenda reflects the APA's strategic plan, how it evaluates its own efficiency and effectiveness, and how it contributes to APA governance. Of particular interest is each group's contributions to APA policies affecting association members as well as shaping the future of the broader field of psychology. Again, the conclusions of the self-reflection can be used by each group to improve their own functioning and contributions to the new strategic plan.

PROCESS OF BUILDING A GOVERNANCE SELF-STUDY

Before asking the association's governance bodies and programs to engage in their own self-studies, P&P conducted its own self-study as a pilot. The survey of other governance groups is

planned for late spring or early summer of 2019, which follows the COR's ratification of the new APA strategic plan at its February 2019 meeting. This pilot exercise had five major goals.

FIRST, completing the self-evaluation questionnaire and associated discussion served as the second phase of a two-year self-study process undertaken by P&P. The first phase, documented in P&P's 2017 Annual report (www.apa.org/about/governance/bdcmte/2017-policy-report.pdf) was designed to help P&P members review P&P's history and its place as a policy and planning board both historically and during APA's current process of transformation. The nine members of the 2018 P&P were surveyed. This also included a discussion of the future of APA and P&P's role in that future. As P&P noted in its 2017 report, the goal of this two-year process was to use a data-based approach to address "what P&P can do to further maximize its contributions to the future of our association."

SECOND, P&P used its experience with the process of developing and then completing the original questionnaire as a basis for revising the process, as needed. P&P then established a protocol for the self-study process that improved both the content and structure of the questionnaire and the self-study process for use by other governance groups. The goal was to refine the questionnaire with respect to clarity, comprehensiveness, and to maximize the usefulness of data collected for use by boards and governance groups involved (having used their feedback to formulate the initial survey, as described above).

THIRD, through this current report, serving as P&P's mandated yearly report to APA (for 2018), P&P is sharing its own self-study process, results, and recommendations as a model for other governance groups. Hopefully, this will help ensure the mandated evaluation of governance groups is reasonably consistent across selected governance groups and yet still allows the unique voice of each governance body to be heard.

FOURTH, because this is the first time P&P will be conducting such a far-ranging review of governance, we have decided to select several governance groups to survey rather than all APA standing boards, committees, and commissions. As such, P&P will request that these groups participate in this first governance review: the Board for the Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest; Board of Convention Affairs; Board of Educational Affairs; Board of Professional Affairs; Board of Scientific Affairs; Membership Board; Publications and Communications Board; the Finance Committee; the Council Leadership Team; and BOD.

P&P members felt that these selected governance groups provide a range of content areas in psychology as well as governance oversight responsibilities. Once this first review process is complete, P&P will be in a better position to broaden this review to other governance entities.

FIFTH, as required by Rule 70-1.3, P&P will review all self-studies completed by the selected governance groups. While Rule 70-1.3 requires P&P to "make recommendations regarding those [governance entities] that should be considered for sunset," that is not P&P's primary intent or goal in the current process.

Instead, P&P's primary objective is to ensure the engagement of APA governance groups in this process and to encourage the use of these self-studies to help each selected board and committee (e.g., governance groups and programs) in their own planning processes vis-à-vis the recent and new APA strategic plan. Then P&P will integrate those self-study materials, with recommendations to the BOD and COR to help with planning for a stronger APA future consistent with the association's new strategic plan.

As such, P&P will work with each governance group during the preparation of a report designed to provide feedback to the association regarding the enhancement of the roles and opportunities for those governance bodies. This joint process will help ensure that the process maintains consistency but also is tailored to the unique needs of each governance group.

P&P believes that initiating the process at this time will help governance groups look at their past accomplishments and then effectively articulate their recommendations with the association's new strategic plan and new organizational structure as it applies to and impacts their role and responsibilities.

P&P's intent is to use this current review, as described above, to provide a completed document summarizing the results and recommendations of this review in order to meet the Rule 70-1.3 mandate. We are aware that the results of this process will be available for review by COR, BOD, and APA staff. As such, we understand that how the final report results may be utilized extends beyond P&P's purview.

STEPS IN THE P&P SELF-STUDY PROCESS

P&P conducted a brief literature review of governance-based program evaluation and used that information as the basis for developing a prototype self-study process suited to APA's needs. A small work group proposed several areas of inquiry (e.g., mission, effectiveness, operational efficiency), and formulated a series of questions intended to cover those areas. P&P applied tenets of the APA Good Governance project, considering issues related to how governance groups are aligned with APA's strategic goals, efficiency, and nimbleness, and optimal effectiveness of a group's contribution toward the achievement of APA's mission (www.apa.org/about/governance/good-governance/2011-dec-report.pdf). All P&P members reviewed and discussed the initial draft areas of focus and questions, which was then used to revise the self-study questionnaire.

The 2018 chair of P&P met with other APA board chairs to explain that P&P was mandated by Rule 70-1.3 to carry out a review of APA governance and that P&P decided to adopt a self-evaluation approach to this five-year review. Once the first draft of the self-study questionnaire was prepared, the chair then invited those chairs to review that draft. Each selected board responded with recommended changes, which P&P used to finalize the questionnaire for pilot testing on itself. This version of the questionnaire included 30 questions covering eight specific topics. The pilot questions were about equally divided between closed and open-ended response formats.

To conduct the initial self-study, each of the nine 2018 incumbent P&P members completed the questionnaire and the results were collated by P&P's staff liaison. P&P then met face-to-face to review and discuss the findings. Importantly, the discussion itself was an integral part of the self-study process. This allowed P&P members both to review consistency across answers within P&P and discuss where there was disagreement. This helped P&P better understand its own strengths and opportunities for growth.

P&P's intent in its self-study was to conduct a fearless inventory of its recent activities, look for missed opportunities to carry out its mission, and make recommendations to improve its effectiveness and operations to meet P&P's stated mission and enhance its value to APA and APA governance.

As planned, P&P also used its own experience with the self-study process as a basis for revising the questionnaire and detailing a general protocol for other governance groups to follow in conducting their own reviews in 2019. The revised questionnaire is shorter than the original pilot-test version, reducing redundancy by focusing on three broad topics areas: Mission, Effectiveness, and Operations. The presentation of the P&P self-study results below is organized in accordance with this more streamlined vision of the key areas of inquiry.

Survey data, qualitative information collected from the survey and face-to-face discussions, and recommendations from the P&P self-study are provided in the remainder of this document. Appendix A details P&P members' quantitative responses to the survey.

RESULTS OF P&P'S SELF-STUDY

The following sections of P&P's 2018 Annual Report present the results of each subsection of the self-study survey: Mission, Effectiveness, and Operations. Appendix A lists each question, and quantitative response data from the nine 2018 P&P members. Below, we present recommendations based on P&P's discussion of the survey data, review of the qualitative information collected and P&P's face-to-face discussions of all information collected, and where appropriate, a discussion of P&P's role and responsibilities in APA's new strategic plan (www.apa.org/about/apa/strategic-plan/index).

SECTION 1

REVIEW OF THE MISSION/ROLE OF P&P

To prepare to answer survey questions about P&P's mission, P&P members reviewed the sections of APA Bylaws and Rules where its role in APA is defined:

APA Bylaws—Article XI: Boards and Committees (www.apa.org/about/governance/bylaws/article-11)

7. *The Policy and Planning Board's function shall be the consideration of current and long-range policy. As a continuing body, it shall recommend to the Members, Board of Directors, and Council such changes in existing policy and such extensions or restrictions of the functions of the Association, its Divisions, or State/Provincial/Territorial Psychological Associations as are consonant with the purposes of the Association. The Policy and Planning Board shall report annually by publication to the membership. It shall review the structure and function of the Association as a whole in every fifth year and shall make recommendations by written report to Council and by publication to the Association.*

And in Article XX, Section 2 of the bylaws (www.apa.org/about/governance/bylaws/article-20)

2. *Amendments [to the APA Bylaws] may be proposed (a) by Council, (b) by the Policy and Planning Board, (c) by the Board of Directors when approved by Council by a majority vote, or (d) by petition signed by four percent or more of the Members of the Association.*

APA's Association Rules—Rule 70, Policy and Planning Board (www.apa.org/about/governance/bylaws/rules-70)

Association Rules—70. Policy and Planning Board

70-1. Policy and Planning Board

70-1.1 *The Policy and Planning Board shall consist of not fewer than nine Members of the Association. At least one member of the Policy and Planning Board shall be an early career psychologist.*

70-1.2 *Proposed amendments to the APA Bylaws shall be reviewed by the Policy and Planning Board for consistency with existing bylaws before being submitted to the membership for a vote.*

70-1.3 *In carrying out its mandated five-year review of the structure and functions of the Association, the Policy and Planning Board shall make an assessment of the continuing importance and relevance of the Association's governance bodies and programs and shall make recommendations regarding those that should be considered for sunsetting.*

70-1.4 *The Policy and Planning Board shall be responsible for maintaining the Council Policy Manual.*

Survey Data

P&P unanimously agreed that the APA Bylaws and Rules reflect its written charge. However, only one-third of the members felt the mission statement communicated clearly P&P's purpose while 44.4% (4 of 9) thought the purpose/mission of P&P could be more clearly described. An equal number of members (44.4%) thought that P&P actually did more than the mission stated versus doing less than dictated in the mission. The majority (66.6%) felt that P&P's mission was unique enough and that it did not overlap with other governance groups. Approximately half the members thought that governance groups coordinated with each other and with P&P to fulfill their unique and common missions, while half felt groups did not coordinate their roles well.

Review of the survey responses and open discussion of P&P's mission:

- Members felt that the Board does little, now as well as historically, in the way of actual *sua sponte* policy development and planning, especially long-range planning. P&P surmised that in part this reflects a lack of awareness on the part of APA presidents, senior administrative staff, COR, other Boards, and even members of P&P, that policy development and planning are an assigned P&P function. P&P's discussion noted that, despite the title of the Board, the bylaws assign [only] *consideration of current and long range policy* to P&P. Thus, does consideration mean, per the dictionary, careful thought over time—with or without action? The bylaws suggest P&P makes recommendations about policy changes, does that include actual, new policy development?

Recommendation: Clarification in future bylaw and association rule revisions should be considered to make certain P&P has a more proactive role in the development of policy and planning and not only reactive as the current P&P members see in recent history. Since strategic planning is a key element in the success of any organization, considering shifting P&P's role to the "strategic planning" board of APA would keep such planning in the day-to-day role of governance and members of P&P can be chosen for their competencies in strategic planning as well as routine review of policies and policy development.

Strategic Plan: This recommendation is consistent with the new operating principle, build a stronger association. P&P could have a major role in "align[ing] resources, decision-making, and the contribution of governance ... with the strategic plan."

- P&P members were concerned that despite P&P's grand and noble mission, its actual work is more restricted. Some members felt that recent experiences with long-range planning efforts and administrative actions restructuring APA and

its relations with other units (e.g., governance reorganizing authorities, state psychological organizations, insurers, functions like advocacy and training, actions changing bases of COR membership and representation) have been undertaken without consultation with P&P. Other members noted that P&P was consulted by the Office of General Counsel (OGC) regarding bylaws changes and by APA's chief executive officer (CEO) regarding our policy views on the 501c3/501c6 (c3/c6) organizational changes. We also met several times with leaders to discuss the new strategic plan.

Recommendation: Given the split in perceptions of P&P's utility to the association, P&P itself needs to be understood and perhaps re-evaluate its role and make recommendations regarding the new governance and administrative structures and policies and assigned authorities. P&P clearly has a mission to review policies and make recommendations about consistency and changes—key roles within the Association. And, P&P is one of the only groups empowered to report directly to the membership regarding making bylaws changes. This seems intended by the framers of the bylaws as a plan of checks and balances within the association. P&P must assure that this role and this important checks and balance function is maintained in any future bylaws revisions and utilize that function sparingly, but when it seems clear that a change must be made, and the politics of governance is blocking progress.

Strategic Plan: This recommendation is consistent with the new operating principles build a stronger association and increase organizational effectiveness. The policy review function is in ensuring the association makes data-based decisions and maintains its focus on reviewing outcomes of policies and the strategic plan. P&P is committed to improving its role in carrying out these principles.

- Based on its mission, P&P discussed its main contributions over the past five years; the effectiveness of those efforts is discussed below. We noted our routine review of policies sent directly to P&P for comment or policies reviewed from the cross-cutting agenda (thus P&P has reviewed all policies discussed and approved by COR for consistency with APA policy). Beyond its annual reports as mandated, P&P has reviewed all policies listed in the Council Policy Manual—a five-year review required to keep policies current. P&P has consulted with the OGC about the upcoming bylaws revision. P&P was consulted on several occasions about the organizational changes leading to the c3/c6 changes in APA. P&P is carrying out this mandated review of all governance groups in an inclusive, collegial manner.

Recommendation: APA bylaws and association rules should be written to better clarify P&P's roles and responsibilities. P&P must do a better job in making it clear to governance and APA staff of its role per the bylaws and association

rules and our mission. And, P&P must do a better job making sure the organization sees its contributions and seeks to enlist P&P in its policy development, policy review, and strategic planning. P&P must not simply be in a reactive mode, responding to policies and policy issues; but it should step forward with its defined mission and take a leadership role in helping craft policies that plan for the future of the association. More of P&P's time should be devoted to developing a policy-oriented, future-focused agenda and less time spent on reactivity to governance items that are not specifically policy focused.

Strategic Plan: By addressing this recommendation, P&P is committed to the strategic plan objective of helping to prepare the discipline of psychology for the future by participating in generating policies and reviewing the impact of policies on that future. This certainly will help increase organizational efficiency towards that goal.

SECTION 2

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF P&P

Survey Data

P&P members expressed a range of opinions regarding the board's effectiveness based on its contributions to policy review, policy development, and assisting in association planning activities.

Routine Policy Review as Part of APA Governance: Eight of nine (88.9%) of the members reported that P&P consistently reviews cross-cutting items from the perspective of its unique governance role (policy review) while 66.7% felt that P&P factors in its members' content expertise, not just policy review, when looking at COR new business items, directorate initiatives, and general cross cutting items. Discussion suggested that P&P should consider the way in which it reviews policies and continue to focus most on policy review rather than item content. That is, it should be cross-checking the proposed policy with existing policies to make sure there is no conflict and that new policy implications are vetting against the strategic plan and the trajectory of APA's future planning.

Recommendation: To enhance P&P's effectiveness in reviewing (new) policy, P&P proposed adding a question to the COR Council New Business Item (NBI) form: "Does this proposed policy relate to/have implications for other policies?" We have requested our staff liaison to learn the procedure for requesting changes to the NBI form.

Strategic Plan: P&P is addressing the efficiency and effectiveness of APA governance by suggesting changes in how new business items are prepared thus ensuring such items

clearly address existing policies and new policy implication as they directly relate to the new strategic plan.

Recommendation: Orientation of new members and routine reminders of the mission. One of P&P's main charges is to be *consonant with the purposes of the Association*. Broadly stated, this should include an understanding of APA's strategic goals so that members can attend to policies and planning activities in concordance with the mission of the association when reviewing all agenda items, cross cutting or those assigned primarily to P&P. P&P members felt, however, that new committee member orientation should more systematically review the APA mission statement, priorities, or strategic goals and these should be reviewed routinely when P&P is discussing all items. This then would contribute to giving P&P members greater clarity of their role and criteria they are to use in guiding judgments.

Strategic Plan: By addressing its own internal functioning and making certain new, and experienced members, are versed in the new strategic plan, P&P will help build a stronger association and increase organizational effectiveness when carrying out its policy reviewing and planning recommendations.

Looking at P&P's own effectiveness when reviewing governance items, more than two-thirds (7 of 9) of the qualitative responses highlighted the theme that P&P's responses to cross-cutting items are unique by focusing on the policy review role and format. Discussion, however, highlighted ongoing, recent struggles for P&P to focus more on policy implications rather than simply be another group that reviews the content of items. One response spoke for the group when looking at its item-reviewed effectiveness: "I'd give P&P a [grade of] B and note we are working to be more focused on looking at policies from our bylaws role."

Recommendation: To enhance its internal effectiveness, during P&P member orientation, and at the beginning of each meeting, virtual or face-to-face, P&P should review its own mission and policies that focus on reviewing governance items, policy implications and item policy format as the primary focus of the deliberations with content of items second, with deferral to content boards and committees unless a member of P&P has specific content expertise in that item. The discussion highlighted, P&P should reflect on its own current policy review process to ensure that it maps on its bylaws mission and implications for other policies.

Strategic Plan: As stated above, by addressing its own internal functioning and making certain new, and old members, are versed in the new strategic plan, P&P will help build a stronger association and increase organizational effectiveness when carrying out its policy reviewing and planning recommendations.

Role in Governance/Informing Association Members, Governance, and Staff of P&P's Broader Role: Looking at its effectiveness within the APA governance structure and when working with APA staff, there was a consensus that "it seems like we have to fight for our role [in governance]." Qualitative responses to P&P's role in governance ranged from members noting that P&P's role is not clear and that this adds to internal struggles "not knowing what we are supposed to be doing is a problem." A minority felt that P&P's role in impacting governance was "virtually nil." A lengthy discussion about the role of the P&P, now and in the future of APA governance focused on how better to define the role moving forward. Opinions ranged from P&P needing to clarify its mission and bylaws-prescribed activities, both internal to P&P and within governance in general, to the belief that in recent years P&P already has begun to more assertively define its responsibilities. This includes making more policy-related statements when it reviews NBLs, policies, and in its association planning role vis-à-vis recent governance discussions on the new APA c3/c6 structure, new strategic plan, and upcoming revisions of the bylaws.

One challenge and activity for the P&P has been to make others aware of the role and responsibilities of P&P as charged. Recent chairs have actively pursued this and tried to expand the purview to include planning as well, not as self-aggrandizement but as service to the association as charged in P&P's mission. This challenge has been and continues to be particularly acute in the domain of organizational planning; this is a disappointment to board members who envisioned greater participation in association planning when seeking to be elected to P&P but have felt that they have been afforded little opportunity to do so.

Recommendation: Given P&P's effectiveness in impacting the policies and planning of the association, members felt that P&P has gone through somewhat of an identity crisis in recent years, leaving some of its own members unsure and unclear about its role within governance. This identity crisis also seems to have diminished some members' perceptions of P&P's effectiveness and impact. P&P recommends that it focus on its bylaws-driven mission, speak more assertively in each policy review of new governance items and policies, and speak at each COR meeting, as needed, about policy implications when a business item is discussed.

Recommendation: The P&P chair exercise his/her role by attending each COR meeting to both show P&P's presence in governance and P&P's active role as a policy and planning board.

Recommendation: P&P should review, internally, its role in APA strategic planning as potentially the lead governance group in such activities, including its role when the formal strategic plan is reviewed. This should include actively working with the APA CEO and his/her designees during development, implementation, and review of the strategic

planning as the designated governance board to assist in this function.

Strategic Plan: The above three recommendations focus on P&P's wish to make a positive impact on the association by helping build a stronger organization by addressing directly how it routinely can increase organizational efficiency and thereby help strengthen APA's standing as an authoritative voice for psychology. This can only happen when APA policies clearly are driven by consistent application of strategic goals and objective and P&P's role of reviewing policy development should help in these goals.

Recommendation: P&P should review its membership and slating activities and decide if some type of direct strategic planning experience be required as a primary criterion for membership on the board given its defined policy and planning mission.

Strategic Plan: P&P's intention with this recommendation is to ensure that it helps model inclusiveness and diversity in its daily function and seek out members skilled in strategic planning expertise to help with the principle of increasing the association's effectiveness and building a stronger, collaborate organization.

Effectiveness of P&P's Mandated Responsibilities

Management of Council Policy Manual. P&P is mandated to review the APA Council Policy Manual with its 276 extant policies every five years (www.apa.org/about/policy). This process entails working with all APA boards and their staff liaison to determine which policies are outdated, have been replaced, should be archived, or amended with major or minor edits. P&P carried out this function during the 2018 COR year and COR voted in February 2019 to accept this review and P&P's recommendation. By its own review, this is the first time in recent memory that P&P successfully and effectively carried out this function in the mandated timeframe.

Bylaws Review and Revision: P&P has been working with APA's OGC in recent years, and more recently with members of the BOD, to review proposed bylaws changes and in preparing for a major revisions of the entire APA bylaws document. This involves being the first board to review revisions, giving feedback in writing and through in-person interaction on proposed changes. Contrary to some of the feelings of P&P members about P&P's recognized role in governance, APA staff have recognized P&P's mandated bylaws revision function and have engaged P&P early in the process.

P&P's Annual and Five-Year Reports. The P&P annual reports have provided major assessments of key issues within the association and psychology as well as providing important

contextualization to challenges facing the organization at various points in time. These reports are required per the association bylaws, which state, *The Policy and Planning Board shall report annually by publication to the membership*. These reports have served as a basis for recommending policy change or development; such as the 2017 P&P report that focused on the past c3/c6 structures of the organization. However, P&P members raised some concerns that believe these annual reports will be less available as they will no longer be archived in APA's main membership journal, *The American Psychologist*. However, the reports can be found online at the APA website, and in order not see the importance of these reports be diminished, P&P has met with the APA Chief Communications Officer to review ways to better package P&P's report to reach a wider audience. P&P's five-year reports differ from the annual reports in that their purpose is to review the structure and function of the association. Past annual and five-year (2010 and 2015) reports can be found on the policy and planning board website (www.apa.org/about/governance/bdcmte/policy-board).

Recommendation: P&P is mandated to prepare annual and present five-year reports to the membership-at-large; reports that are intended to look at the association's functioning and how APA policy reflects current discipline-wide and societal issues. P&P recommends that its annual and five-year reports be put on the agendas of both the BOD and COR for direct review and discussion. We see this as helping these two governance groups focus on an independent review of key issues to the field and association. This also helps make clear to governance the role of P&P.

Strategic Plan: This recommendation is designed to enhance P&P's role in helping the association to be a more effective organization by routinely reviewing key issues.

Recommendation: P&P should continue to work with APA's communications organization to establish a more effective mechanism that alerts governance members and members at large to the publication of these P&P reports per the bylaws. Use of APA's *The Monitor on Psychology* and other print and digital methods should be explored.

Strategic Plan: If P&P does its best to disseminate its activities and its reviews of APA issues, policies, and governance, it will help strengthen APA's standing as an authoritative voice for psychology and help build a stronger association by communicating directly with members and governance, thus enhancing engagement of members.

Five-Year Review of Governance. Another mandated responsibility of P&P is the current five-year review of APA governance represented in the current report and described in depth in the introduction to this document. Its ultimate effectiveness is to be determined when the entire process is complete. This process, and directly involving governance boards in the development of

the process, is the first time in recent memory that P&P has taken on this task. It should be noted that 75% of P&P members felt that completion of the survey that is the basis of this five-year review was seen as useful to the group and that it gave individual members a "chance to say what I think" and the process "requires us to step back and reflect on what we are doing, how we are doing it, and why."

Recommendation: Complete the five-year review process by continuing to engage boards and committees in the process, complete P&P's review of the survey results and boards' discussions, and formulate and present results, on a timely basis, to governance, as mandated.

Strategic Plan: As stated above, if P&P does its best to disseminate its activities and its reviews of APA issues, policies, and governance, it will help strengthen the association and help ensure member engagement with building a stronger future of psychology.

P&P Operations Manual. To enhance its own effectiveness and operational efficiency, for the first time in decades P&P has revised its own policy manual describing its own internal operations during 2018. This was done to make certain that P&P has a clear set of rules to govern its own meetings, communications internally, and enhance the effectiveness of its responsibilities vis-à-vis APA governance.

SECTION 3

REVIEW OF P&P'S OPERATIONS

All Board members were aware that as the basis of its operation as a board P&P convenes virtual or face-to-face meetings on a regular basis, and 88.9% reported that most members participate in the group discussions in accord with written operating procedures that facilitate efficient management. Approximately 77% felt that the group worked reasonably effectively via remote, teleconference and listserv discussions. However, qualitative data and group discussion made it clear that remote discussions were useful for "surface issues, not real time for depth ..." Virtual work time was seen as acceptable for concrete items with "difficulty to do the creative and policy work" that are a charge of P&P. There was concern that virtual meetings were difficult to fit into some individual's routine work day and when they occurred, not enough time was available to accomplish all tasks. Discussion focused on how P&P has had to adapt, with some difficulty, to having lost both its annual face-to-face retreat where its annual report was the focus, and one of the two consolidated, face-to-face meetings. Eleven percent of P&P felt that no face-to-face meetings were needed, 22.2% thought two meetings was acceptable, and the majority, 66.7%, felt that a return to historically effective three meetings a year as best to help accomplish the board's work. Discussion suggested that face-to-face meetings facilitated a larger, more consistent participation by

more members and that fewer meetings were a disincentive for participation and undervalued governance input. Face-to-face meetings with other boards and committees present were felt to enhance P&P's policy and planning role and elevate governance awareness of P&P's work given the opportunity to interact with other groups during formal discussion of cross-cutting issues or informal networking and problem solving.

Recommendation: P&P should continue to advocate for the return and routine financial support of a second consolidated meeting for most boards and committees. Further, P&P should continue to discuss with governance, the BOD, and APA senior management the importance of the annual P&P retreat and financial support for its return.

Strategic Plan: P&P continues to focus on the importance of organizational effectiveness and strongly believes that boards and committees meeting together enhances communication and builds a stronger association. For example, P&P has a mandated function of reporting to the membership annually and every five years. With the loss of P&P's annual retreat, which historically was dedicated to preparing the annual or five-year report, P&P has had difficulty efficiently completing those assignments in a timely fashion and thus, we believe, hinders the effectiveness of P&P and in turn, the organization. As part of its own self-study and review of its role, P&P will evaluate the discharge of its responsibilities, but believes, for now, that the return of the retreat would enhance that role and contribution to the association and the provision of timely information to help with ongoing strategic planning.

Even though this past year P&P updated its own policy manual with operating rules and expectations, with a 100% vote to accept the new manual, only 83.3% believed that P&P has a detailed, written operating procedures.

Recommendation: Include the P&P Policy Manual, supplemented with procedural material, in the orientation of all new members and provide a quick review of it at the beginning of each Spring Consolidated Meeting.

Strategic Plan: Recommendation is clearly designed to enhance P&P's organizational efficiency and thus help contribute policy review and planning to increase association strength and effectiveness.

P&P members felt that the nomination process resulted in a balanced, representative group of nominees and thus board members. However, there was strong opinion that more nominees would be helpful and while the board has ensured a diverse membership, future boards must keep an eye on that issue. The board is often tasked with reaching out to nominees given the number of nominees, and thus working earlier in the election cycle would be helpful to broaden the pool.

Recommendation: P&P should routinely review its call for nomination and directly work to recruit nominees with experience with strategic planning and policy development. This recruitment process should be an active role for P&P and move P&P beyond its traditional situation of waiting for the response of governance-based nominations and self nominations. This active recruitment should be added to the P&P's Policy Manual to make certain it is seen as a yearly responsibility.

Strategic Plan: Recommendation is designed to enhance P&P's effectiveness, diversity, and inclusiveness so that its roles policy review and planning recommendations are seen as based on a broad understanding of the association, the field of psychology, and with a strong knowledge base of competencies needed to carry out such reviews.

P&P operates within the structure of APA governance and works with other boards and committees. P&P reviewed both its overlap and cooperation with other boards in order to understand its current role, success and opportunities for improvement in that role.

As noted earlier, 88.9% of P&P noted that the board routinely reviews cross-cutting items from its perspective as a policy and planning board. While 66.7% of the members suggested that the board uses the content expertise of various members to make comments on cross-cutting items, 33.3% felt the board generally focused on its policy review function when looking at such item. Members noted that in recent years P&P has tried to focus more on its policy mission rather than general item review to be less in a reactive mode to content and more focused on policy implications of items. In this, the process could well be considered overlap with all boards—and in the past did so. Now, to avoid redundancy in carrying out this review, P&P focuses its review only on the policy aspects and implications of the forwarded documents rather than substantive issues better dealt with by other content boards and on congruence with APA goals.

P&P has cooperated with other boards in the development of the self-study survey instrument designed all boards and committees to utilize to carry out this self-assessment. We also worked cooperatively with early career professionals in developing actions plans for increasing their roles within the association. While P&P liaisons to other boards (e.g., Finance, Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice, each board, and the new Advocacy Advisory Committee) brought back key information to P&P to enhance the board's judgments and decisions, few if any other boards have regular liaisons to P&P. Hence, it is unclear what impact they might have, absent actual experience. Finally, in carrying out P&P's mandated five-year review of all APA policies found in the APA Council Policy Manual this past year, P&P worked closely and cooperatively with the primary boards that initiated each policy to determine if the policies needed updating,

revision, or should be archived. In this, P&P came in contact with nearly every other board and their staff liaisons.

Recommendation: Fully articulate the role of P&P liaisons to other governance groups and make clear liaisons' mandate to review any policy development issues within their assigned group.

Recommendation: Each year, P&P should reach out to other governance groups to offer P&P assistance in their development of policy items and to make clear to governance the role of P&P in policy development, review, and association planning.

Recommendation: P&P's chair should seek to meet with major board chairs at least once during each consolidated meeting. This will help facilitate board chair interactions and their boards' interaction with P&P, ensuring the role of P&P is communicated to others, and, as per the strategic plan facilitate breaking down silos and enhancing communication and joint planning.

Strategic Plan: The above three recommendations focus on P&P's goal that it enhances its impact on the effectiveness of governance thus making the association stronger and more effective. As such, by helping with the process of governance—policy review and strategic planning—P&P will contribute directly to the strategic vision of a strong, diverse, and united psychology and all that will result from robust association and an impactful field of psychology.

Interaction with APA Staff

P&P, in the past two years, has increased its interaction with APA staff members. Our work with staff liaisons regarding the review of the APA Council Policy Manual has been key to carrying out the mandated function. During the lead up to the COR vote on the decision to combine the APA c3/c6 entities, P&P met several times with APA's CEO and general counsel to discuss the policy implications of that change, including several phone discussions immediately prior to the COR vote. P&P worked closely with the OGC to prepare a rule change that COR accepted. P&P also has met several times with the general counsel to discuss upcoming changes to the APA bylaws and has been recognized in its role as the first governance group to review bylaws revisions. During the lead up to and vote on APA's strategic plan, P&P met several times with APA staff charged with formulating that plan and with APA's CEO to discuss details of that plan. Once the decision was made to combine APA c3/c6 functions, P&P took a positive, but vocal role in advocating, with chairs of other major boards, that the Practice Leadership Conference be broadened to include members of the science, education, and public interest communities to enhance our goal of building one APA.

Recommendation: P&P, through its chair, should reach out directly to APA's senior management to communicate and reinforce P&P's policy and planning roles. This includes the routine invitation to the CEO and general counsel to P&P meetings to discuss specific items on the current agenda but also to discuss P&P's role in APA's long-term planning.

Strategic Plan: Working directly with APA senior management would enhance P&P's direct contribution to the development, monitoring, and evaluation of strategic planning—a function that could be an expanding as a service to a stronger, more effective association.

Limitations of and on P&P as Discussed in Our Self-study

P&P is empowered to communicate directly with the membership, an important checks and balance function in the APA Bylaws. Over its history, this function has been used sparingly regarding suggested policy changes. We believe that this important function is little known or understood by both governance and membership at large. P&P also is charged with communicating its annual and five-year report directly to the membership. The effectiveness of this yearly communication is complicated by the decision of *American Psychologist* to no longer publish our reports (see recommendations above). P&P suspects that most members are unaware of the existence and roles of P&P including present governance members and senior management.

There needs to be better organizational clarity about roles and responsibilities of P&P related to planning and policy development. Presently, there is inadequate communication across all units charged with policy development and planning.

The nominations and slate development process for elections to P&P, and for other boards as well, is not generating enough nominations nor is goodness of fit required to serve on P&P given attention by nominators. While P&P believes its membership has done a good job in carrying out its mission, P&P is often forced back onto a memory-based availability heuristic to generate nominees for slates. This heuristic does not lead necessarily to a well-balanced broadly representative set of slates for election. Again, P&P has recently managed to obtain a good mix of individuals who provide representation across characteristics, but better systematic nomination inputs would be best. P&P could start earlier in the year seeking nominees and direct experience in strategic planning and policy development should be an important criterion.

Limitations of the Self-Study

While P&P members concluded that, all-in-all, the self-study process was helpful for our own board and in preparing to carry out the review of governance, we noted a few limitations.

We developed and revised the survey materials and the process while we were undertaking the self-study. This made this a task with multiple simultaneous goals, which then added to the length of the process. It is our hope that this will be less a problem for other governance groups as the self-study process moves forward as the task will be to review themselves only. We had limited time to carry out this process face-to-face but were able to do our best with phone-based discussions and continued drafting and revisions of both our survey instrument and the self report both.

NEXT STEPS: TRANSITION FROM P&P'S 2017 AND 2018 ANNUAL REPORTS AND

Self-Study to the Mandated Governance Review Process

P&P's self-evaluation served as a pilot test for the process of reviewing APA governance that P&P is mandated to carry out per APA Rule 70-1.3. The results of the process were presented above. Select APA governance groups will implement this process in 2019. Because this is the first time P&P will be conducting such a wide ranging review of governance, we have decided to select several governance groups to survey rather than all APA standing boards, committees, and commissions. As such, P&P will request that these groups participate in this first governance review: the Board for the Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest, Board of Convention Affairs, Board of Educational Affairs, Board of Professional Affairs Board of Scientific Affairs, Membership Board, Publications and Communications Board, the Finance Committee, the Council Leadership Team, and the BOD.

P&P members felt that these selected governance groups provide a range of content areas and governance oversight responsibilities. Once this first review process is complete, P&P will be in a better position to broaden this review to other governance entities.

P&P will provide governance groups:

- General timeline for completing the self-study
- Link to the electronic survey
- Link to be used for supporting references
- Process consultation

The self-study process involves (a) gathering and compiling information, (b) group review and discussion, and (c) development of conclusions and documentation. This section of P&P's 2018 Annual Report provides some guidance for implementing the self-study process across the selected APA governance groups.

Before commencing the process, P&P created a timeline (see Figure 1) for completing the work and made internal assignments for how various members and our staff liaison would support the study. This included identifying one person to facilitate group discussion and writing assignments for the study report.

FIGURE 1

Steps in Self-Study

- 1 Develop detailed timeline
- 2 Identify key background documents to provide to participants (including numbers of policies generated by your group, passed by COR, and number of policies reviewed).
- 3 Identify survey respondents
- 4 Make work assignments
- 5 Administer survey
- 6 Summarize survey result
- 7 Discuss survey results (likely an iterative step)
- 8 Document process and findings

The primary tool for gathering information is the self-study survey. P&P will provide each governance group and their survey respondents with a link that they can use to post key background materials for easy reference when completing the survey (e.g., mission statement, meeting minutes, and other work products from the preceding three to five years). Given time constraints in the implementation of the P&P self-study, we relied on people to look to their own readily available reference materials if they so desired.

In contrast to the survey completed by P&P members, the revised survey is shorter and more tightly focused on three areas of inquiry: mission, effectiveness, and operations. There is liberal use of open-ended response formats to allow respondents the latitude to freely express their input, while still using close-ended formats to help quantify the sense of the group.

P&P chose to collect survey input from all nine 2018 P&P members. It would also be appropriate to include prior governance group members (e.g., those who have rotated off the group in the prior year or two), instead of, or in addition to, new group members who have limited experience with the group. A link to the

online survey itself is available through APA and could be administered and survey results compiled by each group's staff liaison.

Timing of the P&P self-study allowed us to discuss the survey results over several hours, in person, at the 2018 Fall Consolidated meetings. This was ideal, given that it allowed a rich dialogue of reactions and idea-generation that would be difficult to replicate in a remote meeting. If an in-person meeting with at least three to four hours to discuss the survey results is infeasible, a series of at least four, one-hour teleconferences scheduled within a short timeframe (say four weeks) would work reasonably well. Stretching the discussion across a longer timeframe would likely lead to lost momentum on the thinking provoked by the survey responses and preceding group discussion, so P&P encourages meeting face-to-face.

Whether in person or remote, group discussion should be facilitated. This does not necessarily have to be done by the governance group chair. Of most importance is identifying someone who has experience in group facilitation who can strike a balance between a free-flowing conversation involving all group members and keeping on task to ensure all elements of the self-study are sufficiently addressed. For example, the discussion facilitator would probe the group to explore differences in how people responded to each question, issues or ideas expressed on the survey, and ideas for doing things differently in response to any areas of improvement identified.

The discussion should result in some basic conclusions related to each set of questions on the survey. Having this in mind will facilitate writing up the self-study results. A note-taker should also record enough of the discussion to incorporate some of the richness of that discussion in the written evaluation report.

Drafting the report will help solidify the evaluation results and ideas for moving forward, so should be considered an important component of the self-study process in and of itself. P&P members volunteered to draft various sections of the present report. Then the full report was discussed by the full group to refine the content. Early reviews focused on content and later reviews focused on style.

Since the P&P discussion included issues related to the survey and associated process, as well as the substance of the self-study, it proved challenging to organize and summarize points made in the substantive discussion especially as time passed from the initial meeting. Hence, P&P encourages other groups to stay focused on the survey questions, with associated discussion and recommendations, then promptly transfer thoughts to paper to document their review.

The present report serves as a model for the documentation reports. P&P will gather the reports and look for commonalities, ideas, and observations captured through the individual group self-studies that might prove useful to consolidate and share

more widely within APA governance. The primary intended audience for the report, however, is each governance group itself. P&P's vision is that the report will serve as a roadmap to help inform and enrich each group's future activities.

With that in mind, the self-study report will ideally include at least these sections:

- Process details, including when the study was done, who participated, etc.
- Summary of the survey results and associated discussion for each major section of the survey (mission, effectiveness, and operations); remember, each group is reviewing its last five years.
- Data that include the number of policies generated by your group, number of those policies passed by COR, number policies reviewed by your group and a discussion of perceived importance and impact of each self-generated policy.
- Summary of recommendations, which may be targeted to the group itself and perhaps more broadly to APA governance as well. Recommendations are to be based on data and discussion about the group's progress over the past five years. HOWEVER, each group is encouraged to review the new APA strategic plan and include recommendations that would be germane to the new plan.
- Conclusions, with a commentary on the process or value of the self-study exercise that could be used to improve it for potential use in the future.
- Limitations on the interpretability of the findings.

At any point in the self-study process, P&P encourages governance groups to confer with P&P, other governance groups, or APA staff liaisons about the process to help ensure the exercise is as simple as possible while meeting the goal of systematic self-reflection across all APA Boards and Committees about their mission, procedures, and effectiveness with an eye to optimizing future success in advancing APA's strategic goals.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY ITEMS AND P&P RESPONSES**Policy and Planning Board**

Responses to Self-Assessment

SEPTEMBER 2018

Individual, open-ended responses are not included in the responses below.*A. MISSION/CHARGE**

1. Is there a written mission or charge statement?
100% (9) Yes
2. Does the mission/charge statement communicate a clear purpose for your group?
33.3% (3) Yes
44.4% (4) Yes, but it could be communicated more clearly
22.2% (2) No
3. Is the mission/charge statement consistent with what your group perceives as its mission?
11.1% (1) Not really
44.4% (4) Yes, but we actually do more than this
44.4% (4) Yes, but we actually do less than this
4. Does it seem that the mission of your governance unit overlaps with other governance units at the same level (i.e., other boards or committees)?
33.3% (6) Yes
66.7% (3) No
5. If yes, do these groups coordinate to fulfill the common mission areas?
50% (1) Yes
50% (1) No
6. Based on your answers to these questions and other ideas or concerns you might have about your group's mission, please offer your overall assessment of that mission.

B. MISSION

7. What do you perceive as your group's main contributions over the past five years? Please provide a list of highlights here and provide additional details as desired below.
8. How do you determine success or impact of your group's work? Please provide a brief response here, with additional detail as desired below.
9. Do you have examples of how your group has worked with other APA B/Cs, COR, or APA staff in furtherance of its mission?
10. Based on your answers to these questions and other ideas or concerns you might have about how well your group meets its mission, please offer your overall assessment of your group's impact in the past five years.

C. ANCILLARY RESPONSIBILITIES

11. Does your group consistently review cross-cutting items from the perspective of its unique governance role?

88.9% (8)	Yes
11.1% (1)	No

12. Does your group consistently review cross-cutting items, COR new business items, or Directorate initiatives from a content perspective using the expertise of its members?

66.7% (6)	Yes, if we have one or more members with content expertise, we factor that expertise into our commentary.
33.3% (3)	No, we generally stick with commentary related to our group's mission.

13. Is it your impression that your group's responses to cross-cutting items are largely unique from or redundant with responses provided by most other groups? Why?

14. Based on your answers to these questions and other ideas or concerns you might have about how your group's ancillary responsibilities, please offer your overall assessment of your group's role in the past five years.

D. EFFICIENCY OF OPERATION

15. Does your group convene regularly (either virtually or in-person)?

100% (9)	Yes
----------	-----

16. Do most members regularly participate in group discussion (e.g., during meetings or on your listserv)?

88.9% (8)	Yes
11.1% (1)	No

17. Does your group have sufficiently detailed written operating procedures to facilitate efficient management of the group's activities and consistency across chairs?

83.3% (5)	Yes
16.7% (1)	No

18. What is your operational procedure for reaching final decisions (e.g., voting, consensus)? Is the decision-making process effective and efficient?

19. What factors, if any, have impeded your group from achieving resolution on agenda matters?

20. How effectively does your group work remotely, using web-enabled teleconferences and listserv discussions, and other remote strategies?

22.2% (2)	Not very effectively
77.8% (7)	Reasonably effectively

21. Briefly describe the inefficiencies that you experience working remotely and/or the ways in which you have successfully used technology to maximize the effectiveness of communications.

22. What is the minimum number of annual in-person meetings that you believe are required to accomplish your work?

11.1% (1)	0
22.2% (2)	2
66.7% (6)	3

23. If the answer to the preceding question is more than zero, what necessitates in-person meetings?
24. Based on your answers to these questions and other ideas or concerns you might have, please offer your overall assessment of the effectiveness of your group's operating procedures.

E. GROUP COMPOSITION

25. Does your group have adequate representation to support its mission (e.g., practice vs. research, health-care vs general applied practice, range of expertise within domain of responsibility, career stage)? Please explain.
26. Does your group get sufficient nominations to facilitate selection of strong slates of candidates who agree to serve? Are these nominations received sufficiently in advance with supporting materials for your selection process?
27. Does your group have effective strategies for ensuring strong and balanced election slates? If so, what are they?
28. Based on your answers to these questions and other ideas or concerns you might have, please offer your overall assessment of the nomination process your group uses.

F. PRIORITIES

29. Do your group's goals map onto APA strategic goals? Comment below.
100% (6) Yes
30. Could this link be better? Comment below.
100% (8) Yes
31. Does your group have adequate member representation to reflect APA priorities (e.g., demographic diversity, early career)?
71.4% (5) Yes
28.6% (2) No
32. Please explain:
33. Do liaisons or observers, if any, play a role in your group's functioning?
22.2% (2) Yes
77.8% (7) No
34. Please briefly describe below.
35. Based on your answers to these questions and other ideas or concerns you might have, please offer your overall assessment of the effectiveness of your group's priority setting processes.

G. BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

36. Do you believe that there are barriers to the success of this Board/Committee (e.g., time, technology, reporting relationships)?
100% (9) Yes
37. If yes, please describe how this is being addressed and what reasonable steps could be made to address and alleviate.

H. FUTURE TRENDS

38. Are there future trends (e.g., in APA's governance structure or in the external environment) that will (or should) impact this Board/Committee's mission or operating procedures?

75% (6)	Yes
25% (2)	No

39. If yes, please specify:

WRAP-UP QUESTIONS

40. What other information would you want others to know about your board/committee that has not been covered in the self-study questionnaire?

41. Was the process of completing this self-assessment useful to your group?

75% (6)	Yes
25% (2)	No

42. If yes, in what ways?