Call to Order

Lassner called the meeting to order at approximately 8:16 a.m., eastern daylight time (EDT). He asked the board to join him in welcoming Vernon Smith to the board.

• The board discussed options for scheduling board meetings on a different basis, e.g., having one board meeting a year via videoconference/teleconference or scheduling only three meetings a year instead of four.

• Oblinger discussed the possibility of having three meetings per year, including the annual conference meeting, and then having subcommittees of the board working on issues between meetings and reporting back to the full board at a regular meeting.

• Oblinger noted that the early February board meeting generally doesn’t allow enough time between the annual conference meeting and the first board meeting of the year for many projects to advance sufficiently for fresh reporting and input.

• Dodds suggested that moving to three board meetings a year made sense, with the option for having more special-purpose meetings between full board meetings.

• Smith suggested that the board hold four meeting dates to make sure the dates are available if needed, but then cancel one of the meetings when it’s clearly not needed.

• The board agreed that staff should look at a board calendar based on three in-person meetings per year, with the dates reallocated to different times of the year as makes sense to facilitate board participation.

• Oblinger asked the board to reconfirm the October board meeting date and time; she noted that the earlier proposal to hold the annual conference board meeting on the Tuesday the conference starts versus the Monday before the official start of the conference posed some problems for board members who might lead or participate in preconference workshops.

• Oblinger indicated that she would circulate a note to the board members offline asking them to identify any potential conflicts with holding the October (annual conference) board meeting on the Tuesday the conference starts.
Consent Agenda

- Lassner made a motion for the board to approve the consent agenda. Maier seconded the motion and the board approved the minutes via unanimous consent.

President’s Report

- Oblinger began the president’s report by discussing the recent Mobile Sprint project. She noted that:
  - A pre-event survey with 700 respondents guided the development of the event.
  - The Sprint was a five-day event with daily activities/webcasts and summaries provided to participants. It had the feel of a mini-annual conference.
  - It included daily webcasts with locally hosted participant activities and discussions, a lively Twitter presence, and IdeaScale—a tool that allows participants to vote for contributions they found most compelling.
  - Based on community participation and feedback as well as staff impressions, EDUCAUSE considers the event a success.
  - EDUCAUSE will publish a summary in May.
  - The Sprint represents a kick-off of general EDUCAUSE focus on the topic of mobility, with input and ideas generated during the Sprint providing information and direction for future programming and research activities.
  - An important lesson from the Sprint process was that a five-day event may be too much; three days might be a better time frame for sustaining active membership participation and staff resources.

- Oblinger identified the following key outcomes from the Sprint, that EDUCAUSE:
  - Responded to community needs in timely manner
  - Convened community dialogue and learning experience around a hot topic; dug deeper into mobile computing issues
  - Established an information hub and body of work on mobile computing
  - Experimented with rapid project and product creation
  - Designed a format that can be reused to meet emergent community needs
  - Engaged in extensive internal collaboration and coordination

- Orr suggested that if the Sprint moved to a three-day format, it would be an opportunity to leverage the hosting kits so that campuses can provide the important face-to-face components locally.

- Dodds said that staff on his campus appreciated the use of IdeaScale; he identified the value of the Sprint model in rapidly responding to community needs from identifying those needs to getting an event or resources to market.

- Dodds asked what the capacity to conduct Sprints would be—one a year, two a year, or more? Oblinger responded that the staff team that conducted the Sprint, led by Catherine Yang, would meet soon to review the process and discuss how many are feasible each year. Jordan said that developing the initial Sprint required significant dedication of staff resources for approximately six weeks, but it’s not clear yet how much of that initial time allocation is due to the pilot nature of this first offering.
Oblinger noted that a rough staff estimate at this point is that EDUCAUSE might be able to conduct three Sprints a year, but that further staff review and discussion would be needed before an actual schedule could be established.

• Wheeler suggested that the Mobile Sprint was potentially a helpful model in sharing ideas and understanding around a major topic that could then foster greater community collaboration. He suggested that facilitating that collective dialogue and opportunity for collaboration might be a further area for improvement of the Sprint model.

• Wheeler also suggested that the next Sprint focus on analytics, and that it be conducted soon. Maier agreed, noting that the membership could be asked to respond to a brief poll or survey to confirm member interest in a Sprint on the topic.

• Hilton indicated that a key message EDUCAUSE should incorporate into its guidance on major issues would be that institutions not only need to do certain things in the mobility space, but that they probably shouldn’t try to do them individually—instead, the focus should be on fostering collective response that leverages resources for greater efficiency and effect. Wheeler supported this point, noting that identifying the inefficiency of individual responses in the case of mobility could help the community realize the importance of collective response on future major issues. Oblinger asked the board members to share thoughts or information about processes for effectively and quickly fostering collaboration and partnership models across multiple institutions.

• Lassner suggested that EDUCAUSE analyze the Mobile Sprint for lessons learned that could be fed back to the membership, focusing both on what institutions might do individually and what they might do collectively. He indicated that the same analysis could apply to the board’s consideration of what EDUCAUSE is doing and needs to do.

• Maier indicated that this discussion would also be helpful in understanding how EDUCAUSE might foster demand aggregation across its community.

• Grajek indicated that a possible ECAR research outcome from the Mobile Sprint might be an in-depth qualitative research project to identify the key considerations, frameworks, and processes for fostering the development of mobility across campuses.

• Smith suggested that EDUCAUSE look at various organizations, such as ASTD, that have already developed mobility models for benchmarking purposes.

• Oblinger opened a discussion of the annual conference, noting that the board would soon receive information about its participation in E11. Oblinger:
  o Reviewed the history of the annual conference and recent innovations in the member experience.
  o Listed the E11 general session speakers, Godin, boyd, and McRobbie.
  o Highlighted the restructuring of the general sessions, noting that the awards presentation would now be integrated into the first general session, which will allow for a 10% increase in time for other track sessions.
  o Reviewed the planning taking place for an international lounge to mirror the CIO lounge pioneered at E10.
  o Described an outside firm that will come into E11 to develop a summary and synthesis of conference sessions/tracks to supplement the in-person experience participants are able to derive from the conference.
• Oblinger noted additional experimentation planned for E11 as well as additional innovations to foster participant engagement, including a virtual exhibit hall, on-site participant interviews, and webcams in the central and exhibit hall.

• Oblinger discussed the continuing evolution of the CIO Experience at the annual conference, clustering content into chunks to facilitate CIO access to it (e.g., data, research, and analytics sessions).

• She also highlighted plans to keep some open space available in the conference schedule to facilitate CIO networking and dialogue.

• Wheeler highlighted a local version of the TED conference; he suggested that staff look at the TED conference model to see if its approach to gathering people in conference for dialogue and interaction might be useful. He indicated he would report back to staff on what he learns from participating in the local TED event.

• Oblinger provided a brief update on the Core Data Service:
  - Data collection for the current survey is underway. Analysis begins this summer.
  - Innovations developed during the redesign of the survey and CDS service include the modular format and specific international module.
  - EDUCAUSE will greatly increase its marketing of CDS to highlight its value to the community. Oblinger noted that the CDS database represents a major community resource that has been underrepresented in EDUCAUSE publications, materials, webcasts, etc.
  - Orr suggested that EDUCAUSE might conduct an annual conference session highlighting what CDS has to offer CIOs and how they might use it; Northam suggested the event be supplemented with CIOs speaking to how they have used CDS to improve their business.

• Wheeler suggested that EDUCAUSE specifically focus on how CDS is newly relevant to individual CIOs given the redesign, seconding the emphasis suggested by Northam, and suggesting that PR and programming efforts should potentially take into account that CDS may be perceived by some as a negative brand. Cooper agreed, noting that testimonials from skeptics might be useful.

• Oblinger discussed the data service phase of the relaunch of CDS, noting the ability of participants to download data for local statistical analysis. She also mentioned that annual conference sessions would be conducted to highlight CDS and that she thought this would be an emphasis at regional conferences in 2012 as well.

• Oblinger reported on plans for relocating the Boulder office in 2012 to a new office center in the Boulder area that would have much easier access to the interstate highway. She reported that the new location will:
  - Represent the same commute time, on average, for employees
  - Be designed for EDUCAUSE needs, based on an open floor plan
  - Have greater access to hotels and restaurants as well as other local amenities for staff and visitors
  - Cost significantly less than our current space, in part due to lower tax rates

• Oblinger then turned to the subject of important collaborations, noting that as follow-up to the session led by Northam at the February board meeting on international engagement, her participation in the CAUDIT conference this year had facilitated new contacts with other international
associations, particularly ASAUDIT. She also mentioned the pending posting of revised international membership pages.

- Oblinger reported on new engagement with AACC, noting that the AACC president had agreed to:
  - Jointly promoting CDS
  - Developing a “State of IT in the Community College” survey
  - Including EDUCAUSE in the presidential leadership development programs of AACC
  - Jointly promoting/sponsoring webcasts
  - Exploring the possibility of special EDUCAUSE membership opportunities for AACC members

- Oblinger also noted the co-sponsoring of an issue of EQ on college completion with the League for Innovation, based on EDUCAUSE’s partnership with the League around NGLC.

- Oblinger noted these activities would advance EDUCAUSE outreach to the community college sector; board members agreed that such outreach was important, given the needs of community colleges for the knowledge and information the EDUCAUSE community can provide and the potential of increasing EDUCAUSE participation in the community college sector.

- In response to a question, Oblinger indicated that NGLC might provide some opportunities for further outreach to the community college sector, given that a number of community colleges received NGLC grants, but that most of the engagement through NGLC was with community college faculty, not community college IT leaders, which is where EDUCAUSE would really need to make connections.

- Smith discussed the presidential leadership programs of AACC; Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE would begin working with AACC on integrating EDUCAUSE input into those programs starting in 2012.

- Board members revisited the discussion of mobility, noting the individual expenditures and plans of institutions on mobility as well as the development of mobility applications by JASIG and others.

**Financial Report**

- As treasurer, Wheeler reported on the work of the Audit Committee, noting that the process went smoothly and the auditors found no issues. Wheeler:
  - Asked McIrvin to distribute the minutes of the Audit Committee to the full board.
  - Asked if the board had any questions about the audited financial reports. There were none.
  - Reminded the board that Debra Allison and Joel Cooper were the other members of the Audit Committee.

- Smith moved that the board accept the audit financial statements, Northam seconded, and the board approved the motion by unanimous consent.

- Oblinger then asked McIrvin to review the financial report for the board meeting.

- McIrvin noted that the financial outlook for EDUCAUSE is positive with a net income of $226K at the end of first quarter—approximately $1M ahead of budget and $36K higher than first quarter last year.
  - Most of the variance from budget is due to gains in investments and salary savings.
  - Some is due to profitable conferences.
There was a $3.6M increase in investments year over year.

- Dodds asked if the significant increase in EDUCAUSE investment accounts had allowed the association to recover its losses from 2008. McIrvin noted that EDUCAUSE had actually recovered its losses from 2008 in 2009; Wheeler noted that the association had fully recovered its earlier investment losses and was well positioned in terms of the contributions of investment income to the association’s operating income.

- Wheeler noted that changes in the way the association has managed its expenses in the last few years, during one of the worst economic environments in recent times, have greatly increased the operating margin for the association, which is a credit to the EDUCAUSE management team. It was noted that continued success in this area might allow the association to pursue further innovations and activities on behalf of the membership.

- McIrvin noted that the association has mostly positive variances at this point, meaning that it is either running ahead of projections on revenue or below budget in terms of expenses.

- McIrvin noted that ELI has experienced significant increases in membership and general income this year.

- McIrvin noted that the NGLC income and expenses were essentially a wash; excluding NGLC from the general financial picture allows one to see clearly that EDUCAUSE is performing largely on budget and in line with previous years.

- McIrvin reported on the investment policy, highlighting the breakdown in the different investment areas and parameters it contains.

- McIrvin highlighted the current investment portfolio evaluation, which shows how the EDUCAUSE investment portfolio compares to increases in various stock indices. She noted that the comparisons are generally positive, with the EDUCAUSE investment portfolio outperforming its comparison indices.

- McIrvin noted that the current policy allows for manageable fluctuations in market valuation from year-to-year, and that it allows for an acceptable level of risk while meeting both short- and long-term objectives.

- Oblinger indicated that the board needed to reconfirm its acceptance of the current investment policy.

- Stiles moved to reapprove the current investment policy, with Orr seconding; the board voted to approve the current investment policy by unanimous consent.

- In response to a question, McIrvin noted that NGLC funds were held in separate investment funds, with any interest earned applied directly to support the grant program.

**Membership Policy Revisions**

*Action: Approve or revise the recommendations of the board’s Executive Committee on membership policy changes*

- Lassner opened the discussion of possible membership policy revisions, noting the review by the board executive committee of staff proposals, which the executive committee accepted and recommended for approval by the full board.
• Oblinger reviewed the relevant issues, noting the need to clarify membership status because it affects who is eligible to stand for election to the board.

• Oblinger noted the membership categorization issues concerned the need to treat like institutional or organizational types similarly. The main proposed change in this area would be to clarify that Regular Membership applies to accredited higher education institutions and system/district offices that govern the same.

• Oblinger also highlighted the proposed clarification to the parameters for Member Representative status that individuals would have to have their primary employment with a Regular Member. She noted that this clarification helps to address the status of outsourced IT staff as well as individuals with courtesy appointments, neither of whom are eligible for board appointment.

• Oblinger noted that the clarification of Regular and Associate Membership status for regional education networks would lead to all of the regional education networks being classified as Associate (nonvoting) Members. In response to a question, Oblinger indicated that she was unsure if regional network organizations would consider this a problem, but that EDUCAUSE was actively engaging regional network organizations and providing them with a variety of avenues for engaging with EDUCAUSE.

• Hilton noted that the proposed clarification on the membership status of regional education networks would be helpful in clarifying the difference between EDUCAUSE and Internet2.

• In response to a question, Lassner noted that the board executive committee was bringing forward the recommended changes with the understanding that they would not impact the status of any potential nominee for board election currently under consideration.

• In response to a question, it was noted that any primary employee of a Regular Member would be eligible for Member Representative Status, with accredited for-profit institutions being eligible for Regular Membership.

• In response to a question, it was noted that the reassignment of some organizations to Associate Membership status under the proposed changes would impact approximately 20 organizations out of a membership of 2300-plus organizations.

Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE did not anticipate significant issues with the changes in membership that would result from the proposed policy and bylaws clarification and reminded those present that the membership resolutions reflect the board executive committee’s feedback.

• Maier moved to accept the resolutions as presented, with Lassner seconding and the board approving on unanimous consent. Maier also suggested that the board make a point of revisiting the membership policy issues on a regular basis given the potential for changes over time.

**EDUCAUSE 2011 Board Election Slate**

**Nominations Committee Report**

*Action: Finalize the 2011 board election slate based on the recommendations of the Nominations Committee*

• Lassner reminded those present that board nomination discussions are confidential.
Jackson reviewed the Nominations Committee process leading to the committee’s recommendations. He noted that:

- The process entailed greater outreach for potential nominees this year, which generated a significant increase in the number of potential nominees surfaced. Eighty-one individuals were nominated for consideration, representing over a 100% increase from the number of nominees suggested in 2010.

- Seven of the suggested nominees were excluded as ineligible, with a few others requiring review given various issues around membership and member representative status. From the remaining pool, the committee reviewed each portfolio and developed a short list of 14. Jackson noted that some withdrew from consideration for a variety of reasons, leading to the pool of 14 being reduced to 9.

- The committee performed reference checks on the remaining nominees, ultimately selecting seven potential nominees for the board to consider for the four available slots on the 2011 board election slate.

- Jackson reviewed the demographic breakdown of the nominations pool.

- Dodds highlighted the importance of the initial nominations letter submitted to introduce an individual into the process, noting how key that letter is to effective consideration of a nomination. Jackson commented that in fact this year the solicitation process had emphasized the important role the nomination materials play in selection.

- Committee Chair Dave Smallen joined the meeting via teleconference at approximately 10:10 AM, EDT, to discuss the Nominations Committee’s recommendations for the 2011 board election slate.

- Smallen praised Jackson and Aisha Moore for their exceptional support of the Nominations Committee process.

- Smallen noted that this year’s pool of potential nominees was among the strongest he has seen in his time working with the Nominations Committee; he particularly noted the extensive experience and contributions to EDUCAUSE of the seven candidates recommended to the board for further consideration.

- Smallen reviewed the qualifications and experience of the seven candidates from which the board would select four nominees for the 2011 board election.

- Lassner thanked Smallen and the committee for its hard work and effective review, which had produced a solid set of nominees for the board election slate. The board members in seconded Lassner’s praise for the committee, with Orr particularly praising the committee’s work as the board’s liaison to the Nominations Committee.

- Wheeler expressed the importance of candid board discussion about the potential nominees, particularly about the board’s needs for experience in specific areas.

- Lassner noted that Hilton, Maier, and Regenstein would rotate off the board at the end of this year, and suggested this change as a factor to consider in evaluating the fit of potential candidates.

- Oblinger indicated that Regenstein had provided input to her on potential nominees for her to share with the board; Oblinger also noted that she had discussed the Nominations Committee recommendations with EDUCAUSE senior staff for any input the board might find useful in its deliberations.
• After discussing the potential nominees identified by the Nominations Committee in detail, the board selected the following individuals for the 2011 board election slate; Orr made a motion for the selection of the following, with Maier seconding and the board approving by unanimous consent:
  o David Dodd, Xavier University
  o Susan Metros, University of Southern California
  o Pete Siegel, University of California at Davis
  o Brian Voss, Louisiana State University

Future Focus of EDUCAUSE Data, Research, and Analytics

Action: Provide guidance on the evolution of the association’s data, research, and analytics capacity

• Lassner invited Grajek to discuss proposals for the development of the EDUCAUSE Data, Research, and Analytics (DRA) function.

• Grajek set the stage by:
  o Referencing the two pieces on this topic distributed as part of the board materials—one being the rationale for taking the data, research, and analytics function in a new direction, and the other presenting options for doing so.
  o Noting that the options piece presents three different models for the evolution of the DRA function, based on an analysis of the research functions of other relevant organizations, as well as the implications of each model for the association.

• She reviewed the pending revisions to the way in which ECAR presents its research results online, using the soon-to-be released identity management study as an example. She described the revised approach as one that lets users engage in and interact with data as they want through multiple entries including video with expert commentary, compelling visuals, interactive infographics, PowerPoint slides for use by community members, links to data tables.

• Grajek highlighted the need to focus the association’s DRA efforts given the limited resources available and the universe of potential opportunities. She also noted the value of a focused approach in building the association’s research brand through a cohesive product line.

• She described three models for consideration:
  o Issue-focused model: The association would thoroughly and carefully explore and analyze a few carefully selected issues; she noted that the Pew Foundation would be an exemplar of this model.

  o Analytics and benchmark-focused: This model would emphasize the development of metrics, benchmarks, and data-driven research models to support analytics and decision making; pursuing this model would emphasize the development of a data store as well as alignment and sharing with other relevant data sources across higher education.

  o Model-focused: This model would emphasis practice-based issues and considerations, highlighting case studies and best practices on exemplary higher education IT practice (identification and assessment of models of IT service provision).

• Grajek then applied a series of factors to each model to highlight comparisons—what the EDUCAUSE reputation would be, what the association would possess as a result of adopting a given model, what EDUCAUSE might possess on that basis, and what it clearly would not possess given the choice of a
particular model. She then discussed how these factors might express themselves using the specific topic of mobility to further compare and contrast the models.

- She then reviewed how the different research models might potentially impact existing EDUCAUSE research programs and activities, such as the Core Data Service and ECAR. Grajek noted that current issues research and the publication of research bulletins would continue regardless of the model chosen for the overall evolution of the DRA function.

- Grajek noted that, at its February meeting, the board indicated an interest in EDUCAUSE developing some consultative capabilities as part of the evolution of the DRA function; she reviewed how such capabilities might take shape under the models proposed for consideration.

- In reviewing the possible distribution of the EDUCAUSE research portfolio under the different models, Grajek discussed rough estimates for the shape the distribution would take under each. She also responded to a question by noting that potential consultative services would probably be heightened under the analytics and benchmarking model as compared to the issues and model-focused models.

- On another question, Grajek indicated that EDUCAUSE probably had more of an issues-focused orientation in its research efforts at the moment. Wheeler suggested that EDUCAUSE has lagged in the timeliness of its issue-focused efforts to this point, which impacts EDUCAUSE’s ability to contribute to the leadership capability of CIOs and higher education IT professionals generally. He further noted that more timely research and DRA services might help CIOs and higher education IT leaders influence developments at their institutions more effectively, and thus enhance their leadership status.

- Stiles noted that analytics has an important role to play for IT professionals at all levels: in addressing strategic imperatives of campus leadership, in assessment of teaching and learning, and in infrastructure management.

- Hilton suggested that the analytics and benchmark model would best position EDUCAUSE as a leading-edge contributor to higher education leadership and management issues. He highlighted, for example, the need for common cost models for higher education IT across institutions, which an analytics and benchmarking emphasis might help EDUCAUSE establish.

- Orr also expressed support for moving in the analytics and benchmark direction, given the need for CIOs to have access to objective data and research with which to respond to institutional needs and demands. She also noted the complexity of effectively pursuing the analytics and benchmark model. Orr suggested a member advisory group support EDUCAUSE developments in this area. Smith suggested this would be helpful in considering potential revenue-generation models around DRA as well.

- Northam indicated that the analytics and benchmark model would help with pursuing issues and model-focused research as well. He also suggested that it would help the community as a whole to expand its maturity in data collection processes and accountability generally. He noted that Australian institutions are similarly facing increased demands for information around college completion, creating a clear need for IT to demonstrate its contribution to supporting institutions’ college completion agendas.

- In supporting the comments on analytics and benchmarking expressed by his colleagues, Dodds expressed appreciation for plans to address all three models to some extent in EDUCAUSE research efforts, but noted that having a definite emphasis on analytics and benchmarking would best ground
the value of such efforts to EDUCAUSE members. He reviewed the relative strengths and weaknesses of the proposed models in terms of member value to highlight his points.

• Dodds also noted CAUDIT’s work in analytics and benchmarking as validating a possible move into analytics and benchmarking by EDUCAUSE, seeing the success achieved by a smaller set of institutions working collectively as indicative of what EDUCAUSE might achieve on a greater scale.

• Stiles noted that the value of such data efforts would extend beyond IT at the institutional level by positioning the CIO to engage other institutional leaders on the need and value of data-driven decision making generally.

• Allison noted that this discussion highlights the strategic importance to EDUCAUSE and the community generally of analytics and benchmarking given the dearth of high-quality data to support decision making from either higher education or corporate sources.

• Maier also noted the value of pursuing research efforts across all three models, but emphasized the analytics and benchmarking model as important to establishing IT’s relevance to the broader issues facing higher education, such as college completion.

• Lassner praised Grajek for a superior presentation on the DRA issues and options facing the association, highlighting the value of looking at the potential efforts from a portfolio perspective. Noting the consensus of the board in favor of analytics and benchmarking, Lassner asked Grajek what she requires to launch the effort. Grajek indicated that, in addition to possible resource needs, she would appreciate the board’s input on how quickly to move the evolution of DRA and what the business model to support it should be, given the current business model for ECAR and other existing DRA activities. She also suggested that EDUCAUSE would need to explore other resource-generating opportunities to advance the association’s overall DRA development, but that would require board support.

• Oblinger discussed other revenue-generation models for research activities. She then asked the board if it would support expanding the resources available for DRA evolution, or if the board would want EDUCAUSE to pursue the evolution primarily through reallocating existing research resources.

• Lassner advocated for EDUCAUSE to pursue the DRA development as quickly as possible without concern for negatively impacting existing models, utilizing the association resources reasonably available to advance the overall process.

• Cooper encouraged staff to develop a bold, aggressive plan for the evolution of an analytics and benchmarking research model, which other board members supported.

• Northam supported the points made about EDUCAUSE moving quickly in investing in and developing an analytics and benchmarking capability, but noted that the degree to which members can reasonably respond to new analytics tools and resources has to be taken into consideration in determining how far and fast the EDUCAUSE DRA function can develop.

• Hilton suggested that EDUCAUSE could benefit members greatly by developing the capacity to help members rapidly assess their IT cost structures on an objective basis, which would fit within potential consultative services under an analytics and benchmarking model. Also, he cautioned against business models that lock out institutions upon which we would be dependent for data.

• The board discussed the complexity of developing a common costing framework for IT in higher education, especially given the distribution of centralized versus decentralized IT cost structures within institutions and across higher education.
• Orr suggested that the development of relevant higher education IT data stores would position EDUCAUSE for revenue generation to support further DRA development.

• The board members agreed that the development of a DRA function based on an analytics and benchmarking model was worth additional investment by the association as necessary, with development of the overall business model to accompany proposals for such investment.

• Wheeler noted that it is more important than ever to benchmark against world-class performance for comparable operations from any business sector—not just higher education. He noted also that moving at speed on developing a DRA function as proposed would require significant initial investment to accomplish successfully.

• Maier commented on Wheeler’s previous observation about benchmarking, noting that higher education needs decision-making models for IT based on assumptions and data relevant to higher education. Consulting firms coming from the corporate sector often apply inappropriate data and assumptions that can lead to analyses of limited utility when it comes time to operationalize.

• Grajek noted that she heard the direction from the board is to develop a bold but prudent plan to move quickly in the development of analytics and benchmarking-based research organization. She asked for the board’s input on where best to focus initial steps to establish a measurable impact from EDUCAUSE efforts quickly.

• Stiles cited the importance of establishing effective collaborations with other higher education groups that have relevant data stores and are likely to understand the overall necessity of data-driven decision making in higher education.

• Northam suggested focusing initially on the questions that need to be answered and then developing data and research efforts to respond to them.

• Grajek asked if the key initial focus should be the cost of higher education IT as opposed to service quality. Northam recommended a focus on quality and Stiles suggested that the appropriate framework is accountability for higher education IT costs, quality, and volume of services delivered.

• Smith suggested that end-user satisfaction with service provision as well as alignment with the emerging national college completion agenda are key parameters for higher education IT accountability and data/research efforts.

• Maier suggested helping members improve transparency about the cost of campus IT services, resources and functions would be a valuable EDUCAUSE service. He suggested that measured outcomes as opposed to service quality might provide a more concrete framing for establishing accountability.

• Stiles mentioned trends in demand for IT services and resources as a valuable metric.

**Membership Dues and Program Fees**

*Action: Explore the impact on EDUCAUSE dues of incorporating initiative program fees into general membership dues and indicate preferences*

• Lassner asked Jordan to discuss the evaluation of the impact of options for integrating initiative program (e.g., ELI, ECAR, ACTI) fees into overall membership dues.

• Jordan noted that any move to integrate program fees into overall membership dues would have an outsized impact on membership dues, leading to two-thirds of members seeing sizable increases in
their dues while the one-third of members currently paying initiative program fees would see decreases in their overall EDUCAUSE expenditures.

- Another key consideration in possibly integrating initiative program fees into membership dues would be the needed increase in program capacity to support an influx of new participants, especially if the integration was pursued on revenue-neutral basis overall.

- Jordan highlighted the following discussion questions for board consideration:
  - How much of a dues increase might members be willing to absorb if they received additional services?
  - Is the value or perception of programs such as ACTI, ECAR, or ELI undercut if it is merged into EDUCAUSE?
  - Is EDUCAUSE willing to consider other options besides a dues increase to support initiative programs?
  - Are specific sources of nondues revenue on or off the table for EDUCAUSE (e.g., revenue generation around DRA efforts, fee-based consulting services, selling access to resources or services rather than to general subscription approaches)?

- Jordan asked the board to focus on suggestions it might have for appropriate resource/service/revenue models, as well as whether it would put any options out of bounds.

- Dodds noted that the analysis of the impact of integrating program fees with overall membership dues shows that such integration would likely be counterproductive. He suggested, though, highlighting the availability of program options, with a clear distinction between what is covered by the membership fee as opposed to the individual program fees.

- In response to a question, Jordan noted that EDUCAUSE membership dues range from a few hundred to several thousand dollars, based on size and Carnegie classification. It was also noted that the timing of billing for initiative programs currently isn’t fully synchronized with the general membership dues billing cycle, which is something that EDUCAUSE is likely to address in consolidating the member billing experience, if not the different fees used to support individual fee-based programs.

- Lassner suggested that seeking to expand revenue from corporate sources to support member services would be viable; for example, providing fee-based access to aggregate data on higher education IT might be a successful and appropriate revenue generator. He went on to observe that member need and interest in ELI continues to grow, such that finding revenue to expand its services to the general membership would be helpful. On the other hand, ACTI may be serving an important niche by remaining small. Likewise, revisiting the ECAR business model as part of the overall DRA evolution might change overall revenue generation options.

- Wheeler pointed out that it is important to move the basis of the EDUCAUSE DRA function from the ECAR subscription model to a broader base if EDUCAUSE is going to sustain the strategically important expansion of its DRA efforts.

- For the Core Data Service, Grajek suggested that EDUCAUSE might provide a discount on membership dues to institutions that participate in Core Data as a way of expanding overall CDS participation and thus the value of the CDS data store.

- Smith noted that the Core Data survey might include additional questions from different groups or organizations for a fee, which would help generate resources to support CDS.
• Wheeler noted that broad participation in DRA studies results in better data quality and so enhances the value of DRA activities. Given these dependencies and the core role analytics has in the EDUCAUSE mission, we should be looking for ways to lower barriers to participation. He also noted that we may not yet know the steady state costs of ECAR since we are seeing efficiency gains through better management.

• The point was made that the development of consultative services based on DRA efforts might still be pursued on a fee-for-service basis—the emphasis would be on lowering barriers to DRA participation and research/information while charging for specific expertise in its interpretation and application at the individual institutional level.

• Dodds asked how to rationalize the existing ECAR program with an expanded DRA function. Grajek responded by noting plans to move ECAR into more of a rapid response research service, which might better fit with a subscription-based service.

• Grajek mentioned that it might be time to shift from ECAR as a brand to a new “EDUCAUSE Research Center” (ERC), where the rapid response research service would be one of a portfolio of services or resources supported by varying revenue streams.

• Lassner noted that part of the value of keeping some services under an ERC as subscription-based might be allowing subscribers to have particular input in setting the research agenda for that service.

• Oblinger asked for the board’s input on different levels of possible consulting services, where the range might extend from “how-to” support for using different types of data and research products to subject-matter experts conducting direct consultation with individual institutions.

• Stiles suggested a peer-review/accreditation model by which EDUCAUSE helps institutions analyze, benchmark, and develop improvement plans for IT services.

• Lassner suggested that data analytics be part of the core EDUCAUSE benefit, with Issues and Models available by subscription (or pay to play).

• Dodds proposed that it could be a revenue-generation opportunity to invite institutional members to collectively sponsor different research projects based on their needs and interests. Oblinger remarked this is a similar model to that used by APQC.

• Wheeler mentioned another option for EDUCAUSE engagement with consulting that would be similar to the Kuali Commercial Affiliates program: a “good housekeeping seal” for various consulting organizations, which would indicate that EDUCAUSE had validated the quality and effectiveness of their services models. On the other hand, Hilton suggested that EDUCAUSE might be better served by taking a more active hand in directly providing relevant consulting services.

• It was proposed that the ECAR brand be replaced with an “EDUCAUSE Research Institute,” with tiered research access where some research is publicly available, available only to EDUCAUSE members, and available only to subscribers of particular services.

• The question was asked about whether corporate underwriting of a research project, where the company would not influence the nature of the research activity, would be acceptable to EDUCAUSE. This was compared against a corporate sponsorship model, where the sponsor might be understood to have a direct hand in the nature of and approach to the research. Hilton suggested that the potential validity of a corporate underwritten study would be very much context dependent.

• Oblinger summarized the discussion by noting that the board seemed to have consensus around exploring the potential for consulting services; providing some research activities and products as
core parts of EDUCAUSE membership, with others supported through various revenue-generating approaches; and rebranding ECAR at an appropriate time in line with an expanded business model for the EDUCAUSE DRA function, which would include ECAR services (perhaps still on a subscription basis).

• It was suggested that the July ECAR symposium would provide a good opportunity to begin road-testing different options for an expanded EDUCAUSE DRA function.

• Orr noted the need for professional development for higher education IT staff on how to effectively analyze and use data appropriately. Grajek noted that preconference seminars will be conducted at E11 to pilot professional development along the suggested lines, with the thought that they would be expanded to the regional conferences if successful. Orr suggested that having webcasts on the topic would be helpful as well.

• EDUCAUSE was encouraged to try to get the initial plan for revamping ECAR in the context of an overall EDUCAUSE DRA function developed in time for discussion at the ECAR July symposium. Wheeler proposed that the discussion could be presented as a prelaunch opportunity for input, with ECAR identified as a clear part of the intended evolution.

• Jordan asked if the board would support consideration of paid access by corporations to EDUCAUSE data and research findings on an appropriately secure basis. The board generally supported further exploration of opportunities in that area.

• Oblinger also noted that EDUCAUSE might take a more active hand in sharing EDUCAUSE data and research with the media as a way of building its credibility as a source for data and information.

• Oblinger also asked if the board would support consideration of specific ideas and opportunities between meetings. The board agreed that such an approach would make sense in allowing for timely action.

• In response to a question, Oblinger noted that the Chronicle of Higher Education is still pursuing its CIO Roundtable program; she also mentioned that the Chronicle was soon to announce a co-sponsored research study on presidential views with the Pew Foundation.

• These developments were cited as another reason for EDUCAUSE to invest resources to rapidly expand its DRA function.

**Catalyst Award Decision**

*Action: Consider the results of board member brainstorming about potential Catalyst Award winners and decide whether to award the honor for 2011*

• Lassner noted that the day’s discussion on the Catalyst Award was a continuation of a board teleconference on whether the association would award the honor in 2011.

• He noted that the previous board discussion had indicated that the board was not ready to eliminate the Catalyst Award, but that neither it nor the Recognitions Committee felt the 2011 nominees were appropriate for the award.

• Lassner indicated that the board members participating in the April teleconference had agreed to brainstorm about possible nominees to see if the board could identify an appropriate awardee for 2011.
He reviewed the history of previous Catalyst Award winners to help board members understand the potential characteristics of a qualified award winner, noting the historical emphasis of the award on recognizing IT developments in higher education that had a major strategic impact.

Oblinger added that there has been a historic tension between the emphasis of the Catalyst Award in recognizing a major strategic development with the stage presence of individuals involved in that development; she also discussed problems with identifying the honor as an award, given the normal understanding of an award as something given to an individual or organization.

Dodds argued that the level of struggle involved in identifying appropriate nominees for the award on an annual basis might suggest that the Catalyst Award should be retired. However, a counter-argument was made that EDUCAUSE should retain an award for collective or collaborative development, given the importance of highlighting the value of collaboration to the community’s overall success.

Wheeler suggested that it is precisely the wrong time to move away from the award. If we were to cancel it, we would be left only recognizing individual efforts at a time we’re trying to promote cooperative and collaborative development efforts. However, he saw no need to make the award annually.

Possible nominees for 2011 included community source and JSTOR/digital library development.

Smith cited the example of the “customer astonishment award,” a community-focused award offered by Rio Salado that emphasizes the community development and process by which it was achieved, with individuals who contributed to the development being invited to contribute brief videos highlighting their contribution.

Orr suggested that the fact that the existing nominations process was not generating a sufficient number of appropriate nominees indicates that the association is not effectively explaining to the community the nature and value of the award.

It was suggested that changing the name to recast it as something other than an award might help as well.

Wheeler and Hilton argued that the emergence of the community source model for higher education applications development would rise to the level of broad, strategic impact unique to higher education IT and as such would qualify as a development for the Catalyst Award. They further noted that community source represents a new business model for higher education IT, which supports its qualifications for the Catalyst Award.

Lassner noted the need to publicly stipulate that the Catalyst Award will not be an annual award, but rather something that is awarded as justified, and that, given the highly conceptual, community-based nature of the award, bestowing it should be a board function.

Dodds recommended that the board adopt a process for making the award that would provide for a 30-minute initial brainstorming session for possible nominees, at the end of which the process would end for that year without an award being made if one or more clear options did not emerge.

Oblinger asked if, rather than recognizing a major innovation or development with an award, it might make more sense to have a dedicated set of sessions at the annual conference to highlight and celebrate community achievement in that space. She suggested that this approach would fit with an emerging model for the association of having a focused theme for each year, which would include
having webcasts, publications, and conference sessions, all of which highlight a given innovation or development.

• The board discussed the pros and cons of mobility falling under the Catalyst concept, noting that it may be too general and without clear higher education ownership or contribution at this point.

• Little asked whether the move to a theme to highlight or celebrate as opposed to a Catalyst Award would allow the association to try to highlight potential future catalysts. Views were expressed that the difficulty of forecasting the future made such an approach potentially difficult.

• Oblinger asked the individual board members to each express their recommendation on the Catalyst Award. The board did not achieve consensus on the approach to take, so it decided not to award the Catalyst Award this year. However, the board agreed to appoint a subcommittee of the board to work with Little to reexamine the issue.

• Oblinger also noted that the association continues to work on revising its overall award structure, and thus the key elements of the Catalyst concept might be better addressed through that process in the form of one or more other awards.

• Maier noted that a key problem that needs to be addressed is the lack of clarity around the goals the association intends to achieve by something like the Catalyst Award.

• Oblinger suggested that the major problem might be with highlighting broad, strategic community innovations or developments via an award, when their impact might be better addressed in the form of an annual theme for focused attention via programming, publications, and so forth.

**Executive Session**

• The board went into executive session at 2:25 p.m. (EDT).

• The board approved the annual performance evaluation process for the EDUCAUSE President and CEO.

• The board adjourned at 2:28 p.m. (EDT).