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ABSTRACT

Industry-academic collaboration is a strategic necessity in today’s fragmented and turbulent economy. Advisory boards are an effective tool to start, sustain, and leverage industry-academic collaboration. The linkage afforded by boards provides a tool to remain relevant given the rapid pace of technological change. In this paper, we show how advisory boards enable sustained industry-academic collaboration in the context of Information Systems programs in the United States. The analysis and discussion is based on in-depth case studies of four different institutions. The paper discusses the value proposition for advisory boards and provides a comparative analysis of mission and objectives, governance, recruitment, selection, renewal, and role of board members across the four different institutions. The paper also provides archetypes that encapsulate different models of implementation and best practices that summarize the key insights.

1 INTRODUCTION

Information systems (IS) academics and practitioners live and work in an unprecedented era of technology enabled change and opportunity. Almost every industry is being transformed by digital business models resulting in vast new areas of research and the emergence of new career paths (e.g., IT auditing, digital marketing, analytics). Yet, both IS academics and practitioners face major challenges.

The influence of corporate Chief Information and Technology Officers (CIOs and CTOs), the traditional practitioner counterpart to IS academics, is threatened by new functions such as Chief Innovation or Chief Data Officers, and by functional managers who focus on strategic IT, relegating ‘keeping the lights on’ to CIOs. On Wall Street, the term CIO now means Chief Investment Officer. In parallel, IS academics in business schools, who are the natural counterpart to corporate CIOs, face questions about their role as the content of business disciplines is increasingly influenced by digital content, media, and business models. IS academics have also found it difficult to absorb and rationalize the massive dot com era gain, and subsequent loss, in interest and enrollment.

Corporate IT and academics rarely meaningfully engage with each other beyond forums at conferences and occasional thought piece articles. Practitioners seldom apply or are even aware of IS research and worry instead about the quantity and skill level of available talent. Academics find it difficult to sustain systematic conversations about the knowledge needs of the next generation with practitioners focused on short term concerns.

Establishing the importance of IS and bridging the academic-industry divide are hard problems. There are no simple solutions. Yet, IS academics and practitioners consume and produce the talent and knowledge that has much to gain (or lose) from technology enabled change. It seems that both groups should help each other. This goal is even more germane today because it is no longer just well-funded industry or academia who take advantage of radical technology advances; the intuition is just as likely to come from digital natives who can spark innovation. Industry and academe share the goal of shifting institutional structures to encourage innovation. Partnerships that include the digital generation can catalyze new opportunities like never before in history.
One route to addressing the above challenges and opportunities is to construct structural linkages between practitioners and academics. Linkages that are sustained and deep can enable the complex conversations required to exchange knowledge and produce human capital. In this paper, we focus on advisory boards as a key enabler of systematic industry-academic engagement for IS programs in the United States. The paper is designed to assist academics and industry partners in forming and managing boards, and generating sustained strategic value.

2 ADVISORY BOARDS

According to the Business Dictionary, an advisory board of directors consists of *individuals appointed to offer expert advice to the elected board of directors. Neither they are bound by the legal duties imposed on the elected board members, nor the elected board is bound by their recommendations.*¹ In academia, the same distinction typically applies in that advisory boards are different from ‘governing boards’ and do not have a fiduciary, governance, or legal responsibility and typically focus on offering advice, fundraising, program development, and institutional engagement. Further, according to the Association of Governing Boards, *their roles, activities, and responsibilities also vary widely from one institution to another. Some have fairly clear responsibilities to help with fundraising while others are asked primarily to give advice on curriculum, help with specialized accreditation, and connect faculty and students with industry. Still others help with recruitment and retention.*² The focus of this paper is on departmental advisory boards also known as advisory councils, boards of visitors, and industry roundtables.

Conroy et al. (1996)³ in a study of advisory boards in hospitality-management note that the principle of drawing on industry practitioners dates from the earliest days of American education. Conroy et al. found that 42 out of 50 surveyed four year institutions had advisory boards ranging in size from 8 to 46 members with a mean of 27. These boards focus primarily on reputation development, advocacy, resources, and curriculum improvement. Advisory boards are not new in IS⁴. For example, Watson (2012)⁵ provides important insights from creating and managing the University of Georgia’s MIS board.

We define departmental boards as a group of qualified volunteers that provide direction, content, and resources to develop knowledge and human capital through a formal structure termed an advisory board. Board activities include, but are not limited to professional development, research, curriculum, resources, and influencing the strategic direction of the department. The paper builds upon the Watson article to generate board creation and management best practices based on a comparative analysis of multiple institutions. First, we discuss advisory board value propositions and downsides. Next, we provide a comparative analysis of four different canonical archetypes across different institutions. This is

---

⁴ The University of Minnesota’s, Management Information Systems Research Center (MISRC) started in 1968.
followed by detailed insights on creating and managing boards. The paper ends with a summary of best practices.

3 THE ADVISORY BOARD VALUE PROPOSITION

Departmental advisory boards often go beyond what the word ‘advise’ suggests and provide a structured, easy to understand, and sustainable model for industry-academic collaboration. Boards both provide input on knowledge and talent development (e.g., human capital priorities, research questions) and consume the results (e.g., apply the research, hire the students). Table 1 lists the responses of advisory board members across different institutions to the following questions: Why do you stay on the board? Why did you join? What is the value proposition for you personally and for your firm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Value proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All of us can go to the Microsoft’s, Intel’s of the world to see what is coming (roadmaps of products) but it does not give a sense of how it might be implemented and used. This is one of the biggest reasons I like the Advisory board. Especially with the new generation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2   | a) Ability to shape student’s learning experience  
    b) Recruitment opportunity  
    c) Give back to local community  
    d) Energizing experience  
    
    Set myself up for a teaching job when I retire. |
| 3   | It has been a great way to stay connected with the University and ensure that students are getting educated with the skills we need at our company. I joined to give back to the University, I stayed because it has been such a great way to keep my company connected with students and professors. I enjoy networking with the other board members as well as with the students. I always learn something new at every board meeting. |
| 4   | The value proposition for me is in shaping the program to produce students I want to hire. |
| 5   | 1. Interactions with the new generations of students (firm and personally)  
    2. Discovering and addressing existing and emerging issues (Firm and Personal)  
    3. Ability to help students problem solve and broaden their perspectives (personal)  
    4. Stay current with education industry and the evolution (personal) |
| 6   | One reason why I joined, and why I stay, is very personal. I myself came from a socioeconomic background very similar to that of most of the XX students. I would not have had the success in the business world that I did if I had not had a quality, affordable college education. That was my springboard. |
| 7   | The value proposition for me is having a program that listens to market needs and develops and executes the curriculum to produce graduates that we want for the long-term. |
| 8   | We actively hire 10-15 local college grads each year and I want to stay in touch with what they’re being taught to ensure there’s a demand in the market for them. I joined to give back whenever possible and I get energized being around the university. The value proposition is simple, it gives us an opportunity to compete for the best and brightest new graduates in the valley. This allows |
us to continue to bring new ideas and value propositions through these innovative young professionals to our clients.

I forget to mention I enjoy working with the guy in charge of the program.

Table 1: Value proposition for board members

What is striking in the above quotes is the diversity of perspectives and interests. It is clear that at the macro level, IS advisory boards can provide the direction, content, and resources to develop knowledge and talent, but at the micro individual level, for each board, board member, and institution, the specific roads to realizing this vision vary. The following tables categorize the key value propositions that influence academic institutions, boards, and their members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop faculty and students</td>
<td>Access the latest industry best practices to inform research and curriculum. Develop students, access to projects, internships, and placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validate plans</td>
<td>Informally or formally validate curriculum and research plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct research</td>
<td>Build contact networks, resources, and gain data to perform research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate resources</td>
<td>Gain funding or other resources such as expertise or in-kind contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase reputation</td>
<td>Gain the endorsement of high profile executives and their firms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase influence</td>
<td>Leverage the status and knowledge of board members to advance departmental needs within the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Key academic value propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop talent</td>
<td>Recruit and maintain close ties with students, alums, and faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop insights</td>
<td>Gain knowledge from research and by engaging with young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Connect with other board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain strategic relationship</td>
<td>Fulfill corporate commitment to a university partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence higher education</td>
<td>Influence the direction of research and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give back</td>
<td>Give back to higher learning in general or as an alumnus. Fulfill social responsibility requirements of employer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Key industry value propositions

Each item above represents a value proposition, a driver that can start, endure, or expand the engagement or lead to loss of interest. It is only through a sustained and careful alignment of the above drivers that boards can generate value for IS practitioners and academics. It is important to note that
the value propositions are not mutually exclusive. Nor is it practical to assume that every value proposition is achievable. Further, as shown in Table 1, some or all of them may apply to different individuals and in different contexts. It is also important to note that industry and academic value propositions rarely match. For example, a mismatch will occur when academics are interested only in research, while executives are only interested in recruiting. The challenge is in finding common ground and setting up structures so that both entities realize some portion of their value proposition. To summarize, value propositions vary greatly within and across boards. Acceptance of this variation and the need to carefully move toward alignment is the key to gaining value from an advisory board.

A poorly conceptualized board may provide little value, or worse, end up damaging the reputation of the school. Conversely, a well conceptualized board that accommodates differing contexts and follows through on its value proposition is a major step toward the ideal of knowledge and talent development. For example, an institution with a good placement record can focus on applying research to strategic problems to visibly increase the value of the IS function to the firm. Similarly, some senior executives in the same board who are less motivated by firm visibility and more on giving back may gain more value from mentoring. A formal and visible student mentoring program involving senior executives can increase the footprint and value of IS in the school.

In sum, to realize sustained value from an IS advisory board, it is critical to identify, integrate, and continuously refine the value proposition(s). This is a challenging task. Next, we analyze four different institutions to provide insights on how to create and manage IS advisory boards that generate value.

4 FOUR ADVISORY BOARD, FOUR FORMS

In this section, we present four mini-case studies of IS advisory boards at US universities. We also present an archetype framework to analyze the evolution and management of each board.

Each of the authors was directly involved in founding and managing the boards detailed in Tables 4 and 5. The board members are listed in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temple University</th>
<th>University of Alabama</th>
<th>Arizona State University</th>
<th>Florida State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public/private</td>
<td>Public*</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of institution (number of students)</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students associated with IS</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>110 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Northeast US – easily accessible urban location in large city with many businesses and universities</td>
<td>Southeast US – difficult to access small college town in rural location</td>
<td>Western US – easily accessible urban location in large city with many businesses</td>
<td>Southern US – difficult to access small city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Commonwealth of Pennsylvania institution which gets a small portion of its funding from the state

Table 4: Case study institutions
The Information Technology Advisory Board of the Department of Management Information Systems and Institute for Business and Information Technology at the Fox School of Business, Temple University was co-founded in 2005 by the department chair and a senior industry executive. IS at Temple was established in 2000 so board formation was seen as a natural step in the department’s evolution. Philadelphia is a major metropolitan area with significant industry presence. Yet, there are more than 80 universities within 50 miles of the city that compete for industry attention. After some time spent recruiting, the board was founded with seven individuals representing local firms with an industry executive as chairman.

The University of Alabama IS board was founded in 1996 by faculty managing the IS programs of the Information Systems, Statistics, and Management Science department of the Culverhouse College of Commerce in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. The original vision for the Alabama board was to improve curriculum and more quickly gain needed resources for the IS program. Tuscaloosa is a small college town of less than 100,000 in west central Alabama, there are only a few major regional businesses, and the town is served by Birmingham (50+ miles) or Atlanta (200+ miles) airports. The majority of members fly in for an all-day meeting.

The Arizona State University IS board was founded in 2003 by the chair of the Information Management department of the W. P. Carey School of Business in Phoenix, Arizona. The formation of the board coincided with the splitting of the Accounting and IS groups and the start of a new MS IS program. Phoenix is a major metropolitan area and many of the board members represent major industries in Arizona.

The Florida State University IS board was started in 1998 by the department chair for the then College of Business, Management Information Systems department, in Tallahassee, Florida. As he was leaving the College, the previous department chair transferred a number of industry contacts to the chair. In addition, in 1998, the program was receiving significant industry interest to recruit MIS students. The IS board was created to systemize recruiting relationships and create additional opportunities for the department. Tallahassee is a college town and state capital of about 250,000 that hosts many legal, lobbying, and trade firms. It is served by a regional airport, with Tampa about 200 miles away.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temple University</th>
<th>University of Alabama</th>
<th>Arizona State University</th>
<th>Florida State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission focus</td>
<td>Research + Programs</td>
<td>Research + Programs</td>
<td>Curriculum + Programs</td>
<td>Research + Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of members</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of firms</td>
<td>57% Very large</td>
<td>24 firms: Fortune 500, global consulting firms, State CIO, and small consulting firms</td>
<td>60% Very Large 30% Medium 10% Start-ups</td>
<td>50% Very large 30% Medium 20% Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% alum</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>About 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal stated goals?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management relationship with</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>Yearly meeting with the dean</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>No relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent college</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>External appointed chair</td>
<td>Internal appointed chair</td>
<td>Internal appointed chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of influence</td>
<td>Advise only</td>
<td>Advise only</td>
<td>Advise on strategy, improve curriculum</td>
<td>Advise only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of members</td>
<td>Board chair and department chair</td>
<td>Chair and board vetting of nominee</td>
<td>Department chair and faculty</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership criteria</td>
<td>Senior executive with decision authority (e.g., VP, CIO, Editor, Partner) and membership in associated institute.</td>
<td>CIOs, VPs, Consulting Partner / Principals, or above</td>
<td>Senior executive with decision authority (e.g., VP, CIO, CTO, Director, Partner)</td>
<td>Recruiting partner at university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-committee structure</td>
<td>Yes (scholarship, awards, &amp; conference)</td>
<td>Yes (curriculum review and endowments)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term of members</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for continued membership</td>
<td>Regular participation and specific contribution</td>
<td>Regular participation and specific contribution</td>
<td>Regular participation</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Three 2.5 hour evening meetings plus individual meetings with chair and participation in activities</td>
<td>Two 1.5 day meetings plus annual meeting with director and sub-committee meetings</td>
<td>Two half-day meetings</td>
<td>Two half-day meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td>$5,000 or $1,000/yr.</td>
<td>$10,000/yr.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>$1,000/yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Analysis of each IS board

4.1 Archetypes—Starting the Boards

The focal boards differ in context such as location and structure and function such as size and role. In this section, we define four board archetypes (see Table 6). The archetypes are not ideal types nor do they exist in pure form; instead they serve as a discussion reference - ’canonical form’ – for creating and managing boards across different contexts, structure and function, and with unique value propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceremonial</th>
<th>Forum</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easier to manage</td>
<td>• Exciting and topical</td>
<td>• Generates long term commitment</td>
<td>• High levels of engagement and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Members have a lower time requirement</td>
<td>• Ideal for limited focused projects</td>
<td>• Role and impact is visible to all stakeholders</td>
<td>• Less susceptible to turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can generate resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Drawbacks | | | |
| • Lower commitment | • May not generate resources | • High time requirement for members | • Requires continuous active management |
| • Substitution of members is likely | • Harder to manage due to size and | • Requires extensive administrative | • Turnovers can cause major |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ceremonial</th>
<th>Forum</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Easier to manage</td>
<td>• Exciting and topical</td>
<td>• Generates long term commitment</td>
<td>• High levels of engagement and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Members have a lower time requirement</td>
<td>• Ideal for limited focused projects</td>
<td>• Role and impact is visible to all stakeholders</td>
<td>• Less susceptible to turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can generate resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Ceremonial | Forum | Mentor | Partner |
| | • Lower commitment | • May not generate resources | • High time requirement for members | • Requires continuous active management |
| | • Substitution of members is likely | • Harder to manage due to size and | • Requires extensive administrative | • Turnovers can cause major |
Table 6: Board archetypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>turnover</th>
<th>support</th>
<th>setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member level</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member firm size</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of board</strong></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High (in meetings)</td>
<td>High (one-to-one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value proposition compatibility</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time commitment</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High (individual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ceremonial: The ceremonial archetype structures relationships with high profile individuals providing the basis for investment in the university. Meetings are formal and informational rather than discussion oriented. The shared value proposition focuses on creating and sustaining the board structure – there is less focus on operations. The ceremonial archetype is also relevant when the stakeholders do not have the time to contribute significantly, actively manage the board, and align value propositions. However, ceremonial boards do not last unless an external driver sustains existence since engagement levels are lower. Institutions in transition can leverage ceremonial boards as a holding model. The following quote highlights the benefits and downsides: *While the interaction with Deans, Provosts and Presidents may provide benefits to the department, this interaction seems much more staged and has not moved the partnerships forward.*

Temple started with a ceremonial board with high profile executives to legitimize the creation of the new department. Expectations were low and centered on meeting attendance. Florida State also started with a ceremonial board, but the impetus was different. The dot com hiring boom was in full bloom. There was less concern with high profile executives and more interest in creating a structure to routinize recruiting relationships that could later lead to other benefits.

Forum: The forum archetype facilitates knowledge and human capital exchange. The board is a platform for sharing ideas and networking. The firms of members often have a multi-layered relationship with the university (e.g., financial support or contractual research projects), but this is typically handled separately so the forum archetype accommodates diversity in value propositions. Forums tend to attract members from larger firms with recruitment of students often serving as the initial justification of participation. Forum boards are larger in size, exhibit frequent turnover, and discussion and networking provide the key value proposition for most members. The following quotes illustrate different aspects of the forum:

- *The forum allows the executives to interact in an informal environment and we gain insights from one another. There is not the pressure that occurs in other business settings*
- *I have been consistently impressed and appreciative of how much the XX professors listen and act on the input from the board.*
- *The value is …discussion around new innovations with like-minded people.*
- *There is a great openness to the meetings, there is a genuine goal to make the program, and therefore the students, better.*
Coinciding with the launch of an MS program, the Arizona State IS board started as a forum. Members provided input on the curriculum and helped recruit students especially by sending employees to the new MS. The Alabama board also started as a forum focusing on curriculum. However, a subset of members were more aligned with the value proposition of the mentor archetype and this later expanded to encompass the majority of the board (see below).

**Mentor:** The mentor archetype values engagement with students and faculty. For example, members work with students on professional development such as interview skills, participate in course and program design, and engage in research projects. The board actively reviews program proposals and may even vote on and ‘approve’ curricula. Members are committed and aligned with institutional goals but need help coordinating all the activities. The following quotes illustrate the mentor archetype:

- *Direct interaction with the students, provides a great understanding of their capabilities and their motivations. Both help us in recruiting and onboarding.*
- *The faculty work in a highly collaborative manner with us in the XX to continue to tweak the program to drive continuous improvement.*
- *The faculty work tirelessly, coaching and mentoring the students and driving the projects they undertake with us in the IT business community.*

The Alabama board evolved into the mentor archetype as members coalesced on the value of aligning curriculum to industry needs and developing students. Members participated in undergraduate program redesign and directly supported professional development by performing student behavioral interviews. Overall, at Alabama, the board frequently engages in student activities involving sophomores, seniors and Master’s students.

**Partner:** The partner archetype generates the highest level of collaboration. The board is a trusted entity that actively leads or engages on multiple dimensions including program design, co-chairing events, research, and professional development. However, partner boards require constant coordination. When board members lead rather than provide input, work styles will collide: senior executives expect immediate top-down implementation, whereas universities operate more slowly and often by consensus. Such misalignments require decisive management. Value proposition alignment will increase over time as the board successfully works through the process, building a sense of community and shared vision. However, the loss of a few key members can cause a major setback, especially if the board is small in size. The following quotes illustrate the partner archetype:

- *There is a true partnership between the XX program and the XX members.*
- *Biggest positive is that members are committed to the success and ongoing improvement of the institution.*
- *I’d summarize it as XX demonstrating it wanted partnership with industry. In partnership there is give and take. I find the partnership intent genuine in both regards.*
- *I think that the group today is substantially different from the group seven or eight years ago, and all to the better. There is much more direct engagement with the students and with the critical endeavors of the department, such as the technology conferences.*

The Temple board now operates as a partner with members engaged at many different levels such as planning conferences together and other activities (see next section). The board has overcome several challenges including differences in research perspectives and project management style.
4.2 **Archetypes — The Boards Today**

Temple started with the ceremonial and evolved into the partner archetype. Three factors played a role in the evolution: 1. The board chair’s insistence on high degrees of involvement creates a participative culture, 2. The ‘start-up’ of the MIS department frequently generates new engagement opportunities, and 3. The associated Institute for Business and Information Technology structures the opportunities so that they are relevant for industry. Consequently, the board has improved the curriculum, created opportunities for faculty and students, generated resources including scholarships, periodically engaged in research, and increased the visibility and status of the department. Another department recently recruited the chair to help restructure their board. The board has also helped create advisory councils for new Master’s programs and research centers. Overall, the impact has been positive and members are vocal about their pride in the department. However, even though there are a few success stories of members participating in research, Temple has not fully realized the vision on knowledge generation and sharing.

The Arizona State board is evolving into the partner archetype – a new ‘executive council’ includes a subset of members that contribute resources and collaborate on specific initiatives. The overall board includes a larger number of members, especially ones who bring value independent of financial resources, as well as small startups that contribute entrepreneurship and innovation perspectives. The board has played a major role in shaping the IS department’s faculty members’ research impact on industry. Arizona State University aspires to be the ‘New American University’\(^6\) which means community engagement and research that impacts local problems with global implications. The council structure better aligns department research initiatives with the university’s tenets.

Alabama now functions as a mentor board. A few members partner even more extensively with the program on conferences and training programs and some have sustained participation over a long period (10+ yrs.). The members are heavily involved in networking events such as lunches and banquets and formal student projects. Further, like the University of Georgia\(^7\), membership fees partly fund scholarships. The value propositions are aligned and members and other stakeholders at the college and university level see direct and visible benefit to students. Overall, Alabama is centered on talent and knowledge dissemination, there is little activity on research.

Florida State started with the ceremonial archetype but could not sustain initial momentum. Interest fell off considerably around 2001 after the Internet bust. A few members remained, but it became increasingly difficult to get them engaged because they had been recruited by a chair who was no longer there. In 2009, the MIS department was restructured into the Management department and the board become dormant. The Florida State story demonstrates the challenge of sustaining boards that focus on one or two value propositions – in this case the need for talent during the dot com boom and the personal relationship of the chair. When the underlying factors change, the departure of the chair and dot com bust, it is difficult to sustain the board, especially with the ceremonial archetype.

---

\(^6\) The New American University design includes for example, measuring success by the success of the people admitted rather than focusing on percentage of rejections, research is pursued directly for the public good; and the institution assumes responsibility for the well-being of the surrounding communities. More at: http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu.

The above summaries show that board archetypes are malleable and evolve over time. There are multiple paths to generating value for academics and industry. The summaries also show that the four cases are very different on demographics, rural vs. urban, region of the country, board member interests, and value propositions. Yet, the archetype framework is successful in explaining the start and evolution of each board. Therefore, we believe that the framework will serve as a useful starting point for other institutions. We acknowledge that smaller programs may face challenges of scale and critical mass. The next section presents insights on creating and managing boards.

5 CREATING BOARDS

5.1 MISSION AND OBJECTIVES
Mission and objective statements are important for setting direction. Table 7 lists mission statements from each case. The table illustrates the variety of board vantage points and shows that mission and objective statements are general and leave significant room for interpretation. The statements provide an important tool for structuring value proposition conversation within the department and school, especially when starting a new board or resetting an existing structure. Yet, the process can easily become a distraction when underlying interests have not surfaced. Once the utility starts plateauing, we recommend stopping the process and adopting the current version as the official document. The process can restart after several years when value propositions are clearer and more in alignment.

Mission statements can include objectives that encompass educational goals such as curriculum design, professional development, research goals such as facilitating data collection, funding such as scholarships, and reputational activities such as bringing in high profile speakers.

Since partner and mentor boards typically afford high engagement levels, the mission and vision gets reaffirmed through interaction and thus does not require detailed elaboration. Conversely, ceremonial and forum style boards will need a clear and detailed statement that serves as a reference point and organizational memory, especially for new or infrequent members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mission and objectives statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>… will assist the … department and associated Institute for Business and Information Technology (IBIT) in realizing its vision of becoming a nationally ranked premier provider of integrative business and technology education and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Alabama</td>
<td>To ensure The University of Alabama MIS program continues to prepare and graduate successful IS solution providers and to assist MIS faculty in the development of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>… is comprised of local and national professional business leaders who are current and potential employers of our students. The main objective of the Advisory Board is to provide advice on curriculum development along with general business advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>A way to formalize contacts between the firms and the … Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To provide a forum for the free exchange of ideas and concerns between the firms and IMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To enable IMS to keep its technological infrastructure up-to-date through regular financial contributions from the member firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To establish research contacts in the firms for IMS faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 **RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION**

Most academic institutions strive to recruit the highest level industry executives while firms and prospective members prefer association with the best academic programs. This is easier espoused than accomplished. There are several relevant factors:

Local constraints and history: Existing contacts can both constrain and enhance the process. If the department has a positive relationship with a local recruiter, then this history will likely require board membership. Yet, it may make sense to select a different executive because the recruiter may not have the interest or clout to expand the relationship beyond human capital. However, given the value of the long held recruiting relationship to the college, there is often internal resistance to change. At Florida State, recruiting relationships were the primary reason for forming the board. After the dot com boom it was hard to sustain the board because jobs were scarce, and the relationships had never evolved beyond interest in human capital. It is therefore important to carefully review the long term pros and cons of adding existing relationship individuals to the board. Does short term expediency justify having the ‘wrong’ person on the board? Moreover, archetypes are difficult to evolve if the members are one-dimensional.

The challenge of status: Boards are status symbols for the members and the academic institution. Executives often list board membership on resumes and value the board network, while academic institutions proudly proclaim the achievements, seniority, and name recognition of board members and their firms. Status is an important tool for recruitment but it is also problematic:

- Executives value board membership and will apply every possible tool to avoid ‘removal’. Yet, as boards evolve from one archetype to another, some members will no longer fit the new direction.
- Executives will calibrate seniority and will opt out if other members are not at a similar level, or they may even avoid joining.
- As the board becomes known, prospective members will directly contact the chair about membership. These contacts will also include individuals interested in a new position or making a sale to another member. Further, members will enthusiastically recommend others – often as a courtesy rather than a systemic evaluation of fit. Evaluating fit is as difficult as it is to say no to members who recommend others or to reject influential individuals.

In light of the above, it is critical that the first few board members reflect institutional aspirations. Further, we recommend taking the long view on board member fit over short term expediency.

Who are the best board members? The IS discipline naturally aligns with corporate Chief Information Officers (CIOs), yet today diversity is highly desirable. First, CIO importance is questionable in firms where interesting IT decisions are made by functional managers. Second, the IT ecosystem is diverse and includes CIOs, CTOs, Chief Innovation or Data Officers, as well as IT vendors, infrastructure providers, small entrepreneurial digital businesses, consultants, outsourcers, and large firms where IT is critical. Third, diversity is a tool for recruitment and retention, as one member stated: Another positive is that many different aspects of business and industry are represented, which brings a welcome diversity of thought and experience.
Temple, Arizona State, and Alabama include CIOs, consultants, vendors, recruiters, and tech entrepreneurs, as well as managers of key tech-centric industries (e.g., media). At Florida State, board members were mostly recruiters or consulting firm partners.

A diverse board will require active management:

- **Vendors**: Vendors bring resources (e.g., sponsorships, in-kind technology donation), industry pulse, and name recognition. Including household brands such as Microsoft, Apple, and Amazon will meet stakeholder (e.g., alums, parents, deans) expectations for association with the technology industry. Local vendors are also important as they can sponsor regional conferences, hire students, and provide at or no cost consulting services (e.g., set up a complex software package). Vendors also bring challenges when they market and evangelize products. The hard sell will turn away corporate members, especially ones that have strict vendor interaction policies. On balance, vendors add value and setting ground rules for interaction among members will lessen the downsides.

- **Consultants**: Consultants bring industry best practices relevant for curriculum design and research. Consulting firms, especially the big 4, follow a rigid recruiting cycle that is aggressive and different from corporate HR practices. If not managed, this can result in an imbalance where corporate members do not get access to good students.

- **Corporations**: Corporate members are the most interested in student development and faculty knowledge exchange. They often last longer than vendors or consultants and follow-through on commitments (e.g., attend meetings). Therefore, long term relationships are possible with both the executive and the sponsoring firm. The dual relationship provides continuity when executives change roles.

- **Retired executives**: Retired executives bring experience and personal networks and time for board activities. Yet, networks do atrophy and retirees typically cannot commit corporate resources. Committed retirees add significant value when they apply their experience to develop and sustain the board. For example, at Arizona State, retirees maintain close ties with prior employers and are instrumental in recruiting new high level board members.

Overall, vendors think in terms of solutions, and the next best thing. The timeline is usually short. This perspective has value but is different from academics – who are more long term and abstract, while corporate members and retired executives are more problem and process focused, and consultants are more focused on planning. The difference in mindset requires active management. Managed well, the diversity generates leading edge conversations and initiatives, but it is equally likely to devolve to superficial pleasantries if the actors perceive a large gap.

Given the above dynamics, we recommend a three part board composition strategy. Note: It is possible to include competing firms by positioning the board as a neutral forum:

- Start with a core of corporate members which include executives from a few marquee firms.
- Add influential recently retired executives.
- Add vendors and consultants to balance the portfolio.

All things being equal, the seniority of the executive will play an important role in generating long term value. Titles are one indicator of seniority, yet they vary significantly among industries. Financial services industry titles are incompatible with other service industries, while consulting firms follow a completely
different model. Decision authority is a much more important indicator of influence as measured by dollar signing authority or number of direct reports.

Finally, the size and type of firms is a factor. The needs and orientation of large vs. small firms are different. Large firms may seem advantageous; more resources and greater need for human capital. However, small firms bring dynamism and a readiness for experimentation that is often missing in large firms. Therefore, including visionary leaders from small firms such as startups is valuable. Members will appreciate the opportunity to network with individuals from a diverse set of firms.

Role of the dean and university administrators: The interests of university administration including the dean and development personnel will not always match the needs of the department. For example, the dean’s office may advocate individuals that support the overall college. The duality is part of the normal give and take and is only a problem if a large percentage of the board is appointed by others. Then, value proposition mismatches will become significant resulting in lack of cohesion and loss of interest. We recommend that parent organizations take on a consultative role and leave member selection and day-to-day management to the sponsoring department.

Are alums critical? Academics boards tend to include alums. At Temple and Alabama, the most committed members include both alums and non-alums. This is also the case at Arizona State, but there is increasing interest from master’s program graduates who have advanced in their careers. At Florida State, alums represented about half of the founding members even though there was no formal alumni requirement. Overall, alum members are important; they have an intrinsic interest, are more dedicated on average, and are more likely to join. However, we see little correlation between contribution and alumni status. It goes back to values, when they align, the relationship is successful, regardless of alumni status. Therefore, we recommend calibrating member recruitment on accomplishments, stature, and interest rather than alum status.

Does board size matter? If a board is small, it lacks critical mass and is vulnerable to the departure of even one member, and if it is too large, it is difficult to hear everyone out when dealing with complex issues such as curriculum. Smaller boards are more efficient in decision making and achieving consensus, while larger boards can bring more resources. At Alabama, the board is large and diverse enough to ensure participation and support, yet small enough so that each member can tangibly discern their contribution. Cohesion is important as noted by one member: I would also just offer as a caution that it is probably wise not to add too many members all at once. One of the reasons the group works well is the comradery and working relationships that develop over time, and too many too soon may compromise that outcome.

Board size is also a factor of the desired archetype. Ceremonial, forum, and mentor boards can accommodate large sizes (20+), while it is difficult to manage a partner board with more than 20 individuals. Ceremonial and forum archetypes require less coordination so they are better suited for large size boards than the mentor or partner approach. In sum, large boards bring resources, greater reach, and more actors to support activities such as student mentoring, while smaller boards are effective in collaborative and intense activities such as revising curriculum.
6 BOARD MANAGEMENT

6.1 GOVERNANCE
At Arizona State and Florida State, the department chair is the board chair and responsible for operations. At Temple, the chair is external and appointed, while at Alabama, it is an externally facing center director. All these approaches can lead to success. The departmental chair approach is efficient because it provides ready access to resources (e.g., departmental administrative coordinator) and alignment with academic goals. In contrast, external chairs with experience will likely gain greater and quicker rapport with likeminded executives, activate personal networks, and deploy corporate resources. External chairs are also less likely to succumb to internal academic pressures. A significant downside is the need to continually coordinate value propositions between the external chair and the sponsoring academic institution. Some boards have academic and industry co-chairs.

The board chair normally manages operations including:

- Selecting and renewing members
- Scheduling meetings
- Setting the agenda
- Managing scope
- Establishing and managing sub-committees

Sub-committees are effective in large forum or mentor boards but require significant coordination and leadership to achieve timely success. More generally, partner and mentor boards require continuous governance and management while ceremonial and forum boards are slightly less demanding. All the archetypes will take several years to gestate and produce value. Therefore, regardless of the governance model and archetype, the time and management skill of the chair is by far the most important critical success factor of any board. The board chair will need incentives to sustain participation, as well as a structure and model for performance evaluation.

When the chair is a faculty member or department head, universities can offer course releases and stipends that are tied to annual performance evaluations. For external chairs, the employer will need to acknowledge the time commitment. Increasingly firms require employees to spend a documented percentage of time on community service (e.g., Big four consulting firms). At Temple, the external board chair accounts for participation as community service. Each year the board and department chair review performance in a meeting with the dean.

6.2 MEETINGS: AGENDAS, ACTION ITEMS, AND PARTICIPATION
The symbolic value of meetings is critical in showcasing commitment while providing an important social and mutual affirmation component. Functionally, meetings enact the board through an agenda and subsequent action items. Meetings range from thrice a year 2.5 hour evening sessions at Temple to bi-annual 1.5 day retreats at Alabama.

Setting agendas and influencing the resulting action items is challenging. For example, some academics will push to discuss a new research initiative, while others propose a new student mentoring program. Industry executives, facing short term hiring challenges will get pressure from HR to increase visibility
with students, even though they are more interested in discussing IT strategies with other members. Finally, the office of development may want to discuss donations for a scholarship fund. It is difficult to optimize the value proposition for all the stakeholders. We recommend clearly establishing the line of authority for setting agendas. The board chair is the most logical authority, however, at Alabama, the board itself collaboratively sets meeting agendas.

To summarize, the following five principles will ensure meeting success:

1. Regular meetings are important for maintaining continuity. Establish firm dates a year in advance.

2. Create a culture of adhering to the agenda. Members will appreciate the discipline involved in moving to the next topic even when they are intensely discussing the current item. Discuss the status of action items from the prior meeting. It is important that members know that what they have to contribute counts.

3. Senior executives are by definition articulate individuals with strong opinions. To retain interest, meetings should primarily focus on discussion involving all members and avoid lengthy structured presentations. This is particularly important for partner and mentor boards, whose members have an intrinsic interest in engagement.

4. Distribute minutes and action items quickly to ensure follow-through and retain mindshare. The board chair is responsible for minutes because the content is too nuanced to outsource to an administrative assistant.

5. Establish policies and strategies on the following common questions:
   
   A. Can conference calls substitute for physical attendance? Physical attendance is recommended because the social and informal aspects are just as important as the formal goals. Allowing one member to dial-in at the last minute will ‘open the dam’ for others. Ceremonial boards are most likely to face this challenge.

   B. How many meetings can a member miss? We recommend a ‘2 out of 3’ policy in which members can miss one out of three consecutive meetings. The policy balances schedule challenges with the need for continuity. Forum boards can relax this policy since they tend to have a large number of members.

   C. Are substitutes acceptable? Given the above, executives may ‘solve the problem’ by sending a substitute. This can negatively impact meeting dynamics and lead to similar behavior by others. We recommend allowing substitutes only if they are colleagues at the same level.

6.3 THE BOARD MEMBER AND THEIR EMPLOYER

The accomplishments, influence, and stature of individual board members is an important criterion for long-term success. Yet, it is normal to expect that the parent firm of the individual is also an important contributor and beneficiary (e.g., placement, resources, etc.). Most members expect this duality: As a practitioner, I enjoy providing insight from industry that influences curriculum, research, programs, and
ultimately the capability and marketability of our graduates. My company benefits from insights I gain from the exposure to new ideas, research, and student projects.

The size of firms is a factor: Larger firms have more resources, tend to follow through on commitments, and may even formally support board memberships. Smaller firms have fewer resources, often need to respond to last minute challenges but make decisions faster, and are more willing to try out new things including sharing knowledge and working on research projects. In contrast, the decision making processes of larger firms can rival university bureaucracies. It is also harder to scope out and manage projects with large firms, and personnel changes are frequent.

The HR function in large firms plays a major role in university relationships. HR is usually the only unit that has a budget line item for university support. Senior executives with multi-million dollar signature authority may need HR’s support to finance or justify involvement. Involving HR can also provide access to personnel dedicated to servicing university relationships. However, the relationship with HR is not always positive. For example, if a relationship already exists with another university, then resistance may emerge on adding a new institution, regardless of quality considerations. Another drawback is that the conversation inevitably shifts to tactical recruiting rather than strategic issues such as career paths.

The above discussion underlies a larger question: Is board membership an individual or firm-level commitment? Firm level relationships are more likely to survive personnel turnover and resources are easier to allocate. Yet, individual commitment is a pre-requisite for success because academic-industry relationships are not contractual and require regular executive championship. Corporate commitment is however, an important attribute for sustaining and enhancing the relationship.

Relationship management of executives and their firms varies across the case study institutions:

Temple: The model mixes corporate ‘sponsored’ members and individual appointments. A fee-based corporate membership offered by the associated Institute for Business and Information Technology includes the opportunity to nominate members, in addition to other benefits such as event sponsorship, corporate training, student or research projects, and recruiting assistance. The board chair retains final authority for approving nominees and selecting members. Individuals are also appointed directly by the chair, such members are typically selected for a specific valuable attribute (e.g., an IT news editor who brings value in his broad understanding of the industry).

Arizona State: The model is similarly mixed. The associated Center for Advancing Business through Information Technology (CABIT) offers fee-based corporate membership which typically includes sponsoring student projects. The Center also focuses on research projects. With the shift to the partner archetype, individuals can serve in both CABIT and the advisory board. The leaders of regional information systems professional associations also invited to sit on the board. For example, the presidents of the Arizona chapter of the Society for Information Management (SIM), the Arizona chapter of the Project Management Association (PMA), and the Arizona Information Systems Audit and Control Association (ISACA) are members.

Florida State: The model was based on relationships, each member had a connection with the chair. Board creation formalized the relationships with executives who had been engaged for many years with the department. The goal was also to eventually involve the firm of each member.
Alabama: The model is directly focused on firms. Membership and commitment is instituted at both the individual and corporate level. Membership is offered exclusively to firms with IS hiring needs matching the program’s focus. An executive from the firm must commit to the board for at least two years. Current members vet the candidate to ensure there is a common mindset.

The mixed Temple and Arizona model expands the pool of potential board members. However, significant coordination is needed to align all the value propositions. A full-time director at Temple manages IBIT membership. Further, when membership criteria is mixed, it can dilute the board if members of different stature are selected, and confuse and irritate prospective members, especially ones who are not selected. In contrast, Alabama provides clear policies for selection and involvement of firms and individuals.

6.4 Turnover and Renewal
Boards inevitably experience change: members move, retire, change career paths, get too busy, or hand-off membership to a colleague. As part of governance, boards should have a structure to address turnover. For example, the chair evaluates replacement members to ensure value proposition alignment.

Board members looking for a new job can present challenges if they opt to leverage board time for self-promotion. It is not in the best interest of the institution to offend a member that has contributed in the past and may later join a high profile firm. Therefore, it is important to address such cases quickly with sensitivity to the individual and the board culture. One strategy is to offer a temporary break from meeting attendance and connection to one or two members for mentorship.

Member terms and renewal processes are also a delicate balancing act. Institutions can document expectations, size, term, composition, review process, and even create bylaws. Yet, formality requires balance with extenuating circumstances (e.g., retaining a very valuable member), and realization that volunteers expect a certain level of flexibility as recognition for service. We recommend that institutions avoid over-formalization at the start and over-time establish turnover and renewal practices that are mutually agreed upon and reinforced with peer pressure.

7 Summary and Best Practices
We integrate our experiences of creating and managing four different advisory boards into 10 best practices. The best practices in Table 8 are listed roughly in order of creation to management to value generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Best practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Create a simple mission statement and select the most obvious archetype.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delegate authority of board member selection to the chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3  Tell the story about the board to stakeholders.
4  Plan regular meetings with interesting topics.
5  Provide opportunities to socialize.
6  Act on advice that is sought and given to sustain interest and commitment.
7  Manage differences in perspectives between faculty and board members.
8  Make transparent the expectations and use of board generated resources.
9  Address at least one specific value proposition item for each member.
10 Engage students - interest in students is a constant across all boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Create a simple mission statement and select the most obvious archetype: Keep the mission statement simple to allow the board room to mutually align value propositions over time. Apply the most obvious and comfortable archetype to initially set membership, size, and structure. Ceremonial is a good first choice because the board can evolve organically, there is little to gain in selecting the perfect archetype at the outset. The process of value proposition alignment is itself a critical step in coalescing board identity.

Delegate authority of board member selection to the chair: For prospective members, titles and prestige of firms are important; however, in the long run personal relationships are critical. The ideal board member brings both organizational and personal commitment. Without the first, programs are left with great ideas that are difficult to implement with limited resources. Without the second, programs face resource rich boards that have no direction. Committees or others (e.g., dean’s office) that are not directly engaged with prospective members will find it difficult to assess commitment and therefore it is important for chairs to dominate member selection.

Tell the story about the board to stakeholders: Tell the story on the departmental website, college publications, and other media. This establishes the value of the board and the importance of each member’s contribution to the sponsoring firm and university. It is also important to tell the story frequently to affirm agreed upon value propositions.

Plan regular meetings with interesting topics and provide opportunities to socialize: Regular planned meetings with vibrant discussion topics are important in aligning values. Increase pressure on members to attend by setting dates a year in advance. Socialization is important to create goodwill and generate a sense of shared purpose so avoid the temptation to pack the agenda.

Act on advice that is sought and given to sustain interest and commitment: Departments cannot always implement board recommendations. For example, members may insist on integrating two courses into the curriculum when there is room for only one because of university, general education, college, and departmental constraints. Executives will tend to ignore such constraints. Yet, even if it is difficult, the board should be kept apprised of progress, the detailed constraints, and the short term changes that will partially address proposed changes. This is important because if members conclude that their voices are not being heard, participation and energy will quickly disappear.
Manage differences in perspectives between faculty and board members: Faculty should expect differences of opinion, especially when the topic is research. The value system and traditions of evidence and justification are very different between academia and industry. At some point in the discussion, it may become obvious that views are set and will not change – it is then the role of the chair to manage the process. Resolving such differences is a multi-year mutual education process with no shortcuts.

Make transparent the expectations and use of board generated resources: Resource allocation in a university is challenging given the differing goals of actors (e.g., undergraduate program chair, PhD advisor, Dean’s office, Development office). Allocating board generated resources transparently with clear expectations about use will avoid later conflict. For example, a board generated scholarship fund is more likely to continue to receive support if the allocation is transparent, and involves input from members. Transparency will also insulate the chair from competing internal forces.

Address at least one specific value proposition item for each member: Long term success is dependent on each member having a personal stake in the board and associated programs. Incorporating value propositions that are of direct interest to each member is the best way to achieve such a stake. This will take several years and interests will change so it is critical to persist and continue value proposition alignment with each board member. In addition, to sustain commitment, encourage members to self-identify interests because they can bring exciting new initiatives to the table.

Engage students - interest in students is a constant across all boards: For practitioners, the most tangible product of a university is the student; programs and research are important but they are the ‘business’ aspect of the relationship, and will always pale in comparison to a smart personable digital native who represents the future and is perceived to be very different from the rest of the workforce. Therefore, interaction with students (e.g., mentoring or project review) is an enduring incentive for active participation. Yet, the interaction calls for careful control so that members are not overwhelmed. For example, at Temple, members mentor and evaluate students’ capstone projects but there is no document review or written feedback. The member meets her team to provide instant verbal feedback and follows-up with a one line email ‘sign-off’ to the instructor.

8 Conclusion

Industry-academic collaboration is a strategic necessity in today’s fragmented and turbulent economy. These relationships can address the human capital and knowledge challenges facing IS practitioners and academics, and both groups can likely do a better job demonstrating value to their parent institutions by leveraging such relationships. Advisory boards can help achieve the knowledge creation, dissemination, and human capital mission of the modern university. Yet, advisory boards are complex entities that require significant management. In this paper, based on our experiences with four different advisory boards, we define the departmental board, outline value proposition issues, present four different canonical archetypes, discuss mission and objectives, governance, recruitment, selection, and role of board members and employers, and finally summarize best practices. We hope that the paper will encourage colleagues in academia and industry to create and participate in sustained and valuable industry-academic collaboration.
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APPENDIX A — LIST OF BOARD MEMBERS

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, FOX SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, IT ADVISORY BOARD

Andrea Anania, Retired VP & CIO, CIGNA
Atish Banerjea, EVP & CIO, NBCUniversal
Michael Bradshaw, VP & CIO, Lockheed Martin
Jonathan A. Brassington, CEO, LiquidHub, Inc.
Rich Cohen, Managing Director, Deloitte
Craig Conway, CTO, Livingston International
Larry Dignan, Editor-in-Chief, ZDnet & SmartPlanet
Bruce Fadem (Chair), Retired VP & CIO, Wyeth

Jeff Hamilton, SVP Business Technology, Pfizer
Ben-Saba Hasan, Senior VP, IT, Walmart
George Llado, VP - IT, Merck & Co.
Tim O’Rourke, VP & CIO, Temple University
Niraj Patel, Chief Strategy Officer, Elsag North America
Kent Seinfeld, Retired Senior VP & CIO, Commerce Bank
Joseph Spagnoletti, Senior VP & CIO, Campbell Soup Co.
Joe Weiss, Chairman, Electronic Ink

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, CULVERHOUSE COLLEGE OF COMMERCE, MIS EXECUTIVE FORUM

Mike Anderson, IT Executive, GM
Karl Bedwell, VP, Walmart
Zack Bishop, EVP & CIO, Renasant Bank
Linda Bohan, VP, Hewlett Packard
Danny Branch, CIO, Atlanta Falcons
Lance Cook, VP, Lowe’s
Brad C randall, VP, Service Master
Sydney Crisp, VP, Unum
Cy Fenton, President, Books-a-Million.com
Ron Griffin, EVP and CIO, AutoZone
Ken Grodner, Managing Director, PWC
Monty Hamilton, CEO, Rural Sourcing
Steve Huth, VP, The Home Depot
Denise Jefferies, Sr. VP, Regions Financial Corp.
Pat Kern, Director, Procter and Gamble
Dale Langley, IT Executive, General Motors

Larry Lilley, CEO, CTS Consulting
Andy Lindsey, Partner, Accenture
Lynn Lovelady, VP & CIO, Energen
John McGowan, Vice Provost & CIO, UA
Laura Lee Nunnerley, Partner, Accenture
Carl Owen, EVP and CIO, SterneAgee
Tim Pennekamp, Director, dunnhumbyUSA
Dan Staley, Principal, PWC Advisory
George Tarbox, Managing Director, CGI
Diane Tarvardian, Director, Procter & Gamble
Robert Trotter, Managing Director, EY
Bernie Wedge, Partner, EY
Brunson White, Secretary of IT, State of Alabama
Rob Whitesell, Sr. VP, Bentley Systems
Jeff Wilgus, CEO, Workflow Health
Jim Wood, VP, AT&T

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, W. P. CAREY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, IS EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

Marit Ayers, Manager, Intel
Alex Baar, Director, Sogeti USA
Mark Becicka, Assistant VP, State Farm
Cindy Berger, CIO, APS
Thomas Buckingham, VP - IT, USAA
Ken De Blassie, Director, Derive
Aaron Carpenter, VP, Meridian Bank
Jaime Casap, Project Manager, Google
Marc Chesley, CTO, Infusionsoft
Bharat Chitnavis, VP, Business Analytics Partners, LLC
Todd Christy, VP, American Airlines

Steve Chenard, CIO, General Dynamics
George Colliat, Senior VP, Oracle
Aaron Cook, President, ISACA
Deborah DeCorrevont, IT Strategic Planner, SRP
Allan Dunn, Managing Director, MDI Group
Rakesh Duttagupta, Manager, Deloitte
Alex Deshuk, Manager, City of Mesa AZ
Chris Elliott, VP, ProNet Solutions
Jay Ennesser, VP, IBM
Bruce Erickson, VP of IT, Trivita
Chris Filandro, VP & CIO, Meritage Homes
Mark Geninatti, Former CIO (retired), JDA Software Group
Martin Goslar, Principal Investigative Analyst, GainVision
Cindy Grossman, VP, IBM
Rudy Hacker, Manager, Intel
Mary Harris, Manager, Intel
Peter Harries, PricewaterhouseCoopers
Kevin Haskew, CIO, On Semiconductor
Vaughn Hazen, CISO, Freeport-McMoRan
Eben Hewitt, CTO, Choice Hotels International
David Jarvis, VP & CIO, Honeywell
Nathan Johnson, Senior VP & CIO, PortsAmerica
Pete Jorgenson, VP - IS, PetSmart
Joe Killalea, Account Manager, ExxonMobil
Brian Knapp, EVP, MDI IT Workforce Solutions
Rebecca Knight, Project Manager, SkyTouch
Michele Landess, VP, Wells Fargo
Margaret Mitchell, VP, American Express
Paula Mattingly, CIO, Arizona Department of Health Services
David McEldowney, VP & CIO, The Evogi Group
Mark McKeever, COO, MicroAge
Kevin Nielson, CTO, SRP
Michael Nyman, Senior Manager, CliftonLarsonAllen
Chintan Patadia, National Director, Neudesic
Steve Phillips, CIO, Avnet
Howard Porche, Jr., Manager, Massively Parallel
Kamlesh Porwal, Director, Hardline Consulting
Mike Ruchensky, CIO, Swift Transportation
Seth Rudin, Director, TekLink Intl, Inc.
Gary Slama, VP, Eldorado Computing
Diane Smigel, President, Palladium IT Advisors
Michael Spandau, CIO, Fender
Michael Suba, Partner, KPMG LLP
Isabelle Theisen, CISO, Western Alliance Bancorp
Ron Thompson, Director, Kantar
Matt Towers, Senior Director, Avanade Inc.
Michael Warden, VP & CIO, Banner Health
Deanna Wise, EVP and CIO, Dignity Health
Chris Welch, Senior IT Manager, General Motors
Adam Wright, Senior Manager, Ernst & Young
Michael Wolf, President, Lobodos Ventures
Scott Yost, Geographic VP, Sogeti USA

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, INDUSTRY ADVISORY COUNCIL FOUNDING MEMBERS*

Amy Anderson, Keane Inc.
Chuck Davis, Keane Inc.
Glenda Diaz, Price Waterhouse
Greg Foster, The Summit Group
Samuel Gibson, Alltel
Jose Gonzalez, KnowledgeSource
Harold Gubnitzky, Cambridge Technology Partners
Al Horner, Florida Power & Light

* Company names as they were in 1998