Call to Order

Lassner called the meeting to order at 8:27 a.m. and again welcomed the newest directors to the board.

Approval of Consent Agenda

- Lassner asked Oblinger to review the items on the consent agenda.
- Oblinger noted that the association’s priorities as indicated on the consent agenda were consistent with the board’s discussion of priorities at its October meeting.
- Regenstein moved that the board approve the consent agenda; Maier seconded the motion; the board briefly discussed the priorities and agreed to amend one item from “leadership” to “lead.”
- Lassner called a vote and the board approved the consent agenda unanimously, including the amendment to the EDUCAUSE priorities document proposed by Wheeler.

President’s Report

- Oblinger opened the president’s report by welcoming Susan Grajek as the new EDUCAUSE Vice President for Data, Research, and Analytics. Oblinger stated that Grajek’s hiring reflects the board’s emphasis on further developing the association’s research and analysis function.
- Oblinger reviewed the status of the association’s strategic directions, noting relevant projects that had been implemented, including a rebranding project; ongoing planning and development to improve the member experience at the annual conference; a corporate strategy; and the redesign of the Core Data Service.
- On the redesign of the annual conference experience, Oblinger indicated that the process would remain one of continuous improvement, involving a staff annual conference core team established for that purpose. Proposed tactics for the EDUCAUSE 2011 Annual Conference that have emerged from the core team thus far include increasing the participation of and support for constituent groups, expanding the presence of professionally designed learning spaces, and creating short-term mentoring opportunities that connect chief information officers (CIOs) with those aspiring to the role.
• Board members shared the very positive feedback on the EDUCAUSE 2010 Annual Conference experience that they had personally received from conference attendees.

• In response to a question, Jordan identified two areas for further improvement that staff had identified following the EDUCAUSE 2010 Annual Conference:
  ○ Given the popularity of the CIO Lounge, staff decided to dedicate more space to it at future annual conferences.
  ○ Feedback indicated that the “CIO only” exhibit hall hour piloted at the 2010 conference did not add value to the CIO conference experience, so the EDUCAUSE staff plans to pilot an informal “cocktail hour” for corporate representatives and CIOs at EDUCAUSE 2011.
  ○ Jordan noted those were just two examples; the team would continue identifying and evaluating areas for improvement.

• Little discussed efforts the Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development (TLPD) team is considering to try to help annual conference presenters move beyond traditional PowerPoint presentations to more adult education–focused activities.

• Little remarked that many presenters who submitted proposals for EDUCAUSE 2011 tried to characterize their sessions as CIO-focused so they could have their session included in the CIO track. She indicated that TLPD staff members are helping presenters consider how best to target their sessions to the appropriate audience, whether it is the CIO community or another EDUCAUSE segment.

• Wheeler discussed the importance of the CIO Experience at the annual conference as a significant step in helping to restore the association’s mindshare within the CIO community. He noted that this effort and others like it would help EDUCAUSE continue to increase its relevance to research university CIOs.

• Jordan reported that the association’s experience with the online annual conference and other online events had led staff to conclude that EDUCAUSE should explore other platforms for conducting large-scale online events. He indicated that staff were in the process of evaluating options and hoped to find an appropriate alternative in the near future.

• A question was raised as to whether responses to the formal annual conference evaluations confirmed the anecdotal evidence of member support for recent innovations. Little indicated that the evaluation results reinforced the anecdotal evidence of member support for the improvements made in the annual conference.

• Little noted that the EDUCAUSE staff are looking for ways to incentivize annual conference participants to submit conference evaluations. Board members suggested ways to approach the evaluation process to enhance response, such as providing access to evaluation forms via mobile devices.

• Oblinger briefly reviewed the current status of the EDUCAUSE 2011 Annual Conference call for proposals (CFP) and highlighted the general session speakers secured for the conference.

• Oblinger discussed the current status of the association’s corporate strategy, noting the increased corporate sponsorship revenue generated as a result of the strategy.

• Oblinger reported that continuing implementation of the corporate strategy in 2011 would include reviewing and restructuring the Partnership Forum, with input from corporate partners; she noted
this might involve scheduling the forum at a different time of year, apart from the annual conference. Another project Oblinger mentioned would entail reviewing and potentially revising the Corporate Partner Program to better align it with the needs and interests of companies and institutional members.

- Oblinger discussed the progress of the Core Data Service (CDS) redesign.
  - She reviewed the context for the redesign as well as current outcomes from the project, such as the implementation of a modular survey design.
  - She highlighted the calendar for the implementation and launch of the redesigned survey and data-access processes.
  - Oblinger noted current and planned efforts at member engagement around the CDS redesign, such as regular blog postings, webinars, and presentations at EDUCAUSE regional conferences.
  - Board members expressed support for the redesign process and suggested areas for continuing to improve CDS in the future, such as looking for opportunities to further simplify the survey and data access as well as working with participants to improve data quality.
  - Board members expressed appreciation for staff efforts to plan for the potential integration of CDS into a more developed EDUCAUSE research and analysis function.

- Oblinger provided an update on the Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC) program, walking the board through the current status of its first two stages or “waves,” as well as the timetable for development of the third stage.
  - She reviewed the demographics of applicants for Wave I, both by grant category and organizational type, reporting that over 600 pre-proposals were submitted for Wave I, involving over 1,000 institutions. She noted the consistency of this with the program’s emphasis on fostering multiorganizational collaborations.
  - She also discussed community-building efforts to keep institutions and organizations engaged in the program even if their pre-proposals were not accepted.
  - It was suggested that successful grantees should be required to submit their content and resources to an open repository to ensure long-term, open access. Oblinger indicated that the program staff are actively considering how to address that issue.
  - In response to a board question, Oblinger reported that the more than 600 pre-proposals were scaled down to 50 finalists who were invited to submit full proposals, with the program expecting to ultimately award 32 Wave I grants.
  - In response to another question, Oblinger noted that there were a significant number of corporate-institutional partnerships that submitted Wave I pre-proposals, which is consistent with the program’s emphasis on fostering new relationships or collaborative models to attract innovation from all corners.
  - She then discussed the Wave II timetable and grant competition process, highlighting the Wave II grant structure and near-term process dates.
  - In discussing the pending initiation of planning for Wave III, Oblinger reviewed the design criteria for grant competitions under the program, which include targeting major barriers to college readiness and completion and identifying promising areas from which technological solutions might emerge.
Oblinger highlighted the pending implementation of a new online career center on the EDUCAUSE website, which the association had outsourced to a firm specializing in such sites. Staff research had found that outsourcing the career center function would provide members with better service and resources, but it did require instituting a fee to users for submitting position openings.

- In response to a board question, Jordan noted that the staff are looking at differential pricing for members versus nonmembers.
- Board members discussed the potential for EDUCAUSE to possibly grow the service over time to support members in conducting CIO and other senior position searches.

Oblinger reviewed changes in the EDUCAUSE Awards Program for 2011, highlighting implementation of the new “Rising Star” award to recognize members earlier in their careers.

- She also indicated that staff would bring the Catalyst Award nominees to the board for consideration of whether the award should be given in 2011.
- Oblinger discussed the board nominations process, noting the increased size of the nomination pool this year resulting from board-recommended outreach efforts. She presented the demographics of the pool by institutional category and other characteristics.

**Financial Report**

- Oblinger invited McIrvin to provide the financial report.
  - McIrvin noted that she would review the current unaudited statements of financial position, unaudited statements of activity, and the investment portfolio status.
  - Regarding the unaudited statements of financial position, McIrvin reported a $3 million increase in net income from last year. She reviewed year-to-year assets and liabilities, noting they were consistent with those of previous years, with a few exceptions (e.g., the introduction of NGLC program funds, which were not originally part of the 2010 budget; revenue from advanced sales of annual conference booth spaces, which EDUCAUSE made possible for the first time at the 2010 annual conference).
  - In terms of the unaudited statements of activities (budget-to-actual comparison), McIrvin noted that income was $2 million in excess of the originally budgeted amount while expenses had been held $1 million below budgeted levels. Variances highlighted included nearly $900,000 in investment gains and an over $700,000 increase in event revenues.
  - Regarding the unaudited statements of activities (two-year comparative), McIrvin reported the year-to-year variance in net income was roughly $120,000, with much of the year-to-year increase in expenses related to the launch of NGLC, whose unbudgeted costs were covered by grant funding.
  - Before moving into a discussion of the reserves, Lassner noted that the board conducts a more in-depth review of the association’s financials at its annual conference meeting.
  - Board members suggested the addition of page numbers and line numbers to the statements to facilitate review of them during the board meeting. McIrvin agreed to provide those in future financial reports to the board.
  - On reserves, McIrvin noted that the current reserves statement reflects an increase in operating reserves from a 6-month level to a 7.5-month level per the board-approved policy instituted last year, while the levels of all other reserve funds are also consistent with that policy.
In response to a board question, McIrvin reported that the increase in the capital equipment reserve reflected the need to address life-cycle maintenance on the new phone systems purchased for the Boulder and Washington offices; new computers and servers purchased to support association operations; and software purchased to support the CDS redesign.

- McIrvin noted that the detailed information provided on the investment portfolio comes directly from the association’s investment management firm and highlights where the association’s reserves are currently invested. She stated that the current portfolio structure is consistent with the board-approved investment policy.

### Data, Research, and Analytics: Initial Thinking

- Oblinger invited Grajek to describe her initial thoughts on the EDUCAUSE data, research, and analytics function.

- Grajek highlighted the importance she places on EDUCAUSE adapting its data, research, and analytics efforts to provide actionable intelligence to members, with the goal of establishing EDUCAUSE as the authoritative voice on higher education IT from a research and analysis perspective. She then reviewed her perspective on the research architecture of the association as well as its possible research agenda.

- She indicated that she wanted to fully inventory EDUCAUSE’s current research products and activities to look for opportunities to augment them through partnerships, which would allow EDUCAUSE to focus its research efforts where they can have the most impact.

- She discussed the possibilities for various research projects, such as engaging with other associations to develop survey and data activities that contribute to the IT profession as well as other professional/operational areas in higher education. She also indicated she wanted to initiate an exploration of benchmarking and key performance indicator processes with members.

- Grajek discussed her interest in identifying ways that the research function can become more agile, producing more just-in-time research products like simple, quick-response surveys that enable rapid turnaround of results for members.

- Grajek discussed Regenstein’s pending work on a workforce development and leadership survey for the EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR), as well as the input Regenstein had provided on conducting and developing best practices research.

- Grajek expressed her intention to implement better planning and faster implementation of major research studies, as well as to reduce survey fatigue and improve the association’s research methodologies.

- She noted the importance of improving how research findings and results are communicated through placing a greater emphasis on data visualization and options for user-directed exploration of data.

- Grajek discussed the need to create formal communications plans to promote research and analysis findings, reports, and so forth to increase their impact on the knowledge and practice of the EDUCAUSE community. She mentioned that this could include presentations and webinars linked to ECAR research products, for example.

- Grajek stressed the importance of restructuring the way data and research access is presented on the ECAR and EDUCAUSE sites, emphasizing the need to highlight issues and content, not the forms in which data and research are presented.
• She highlighted the necessity of the association’s becoming more transparent about how it sets its research agenda, which includes involving members in that process.

• Grajek discussed the pending restructuring of the ECAR Fellow model, as well as the need to think through the revenue model for supporting ECAR and EDUCAUSE research activities.

• Grajek indicated that she is currently engaging with staff and members to get up-to-speed with the plans and efforts she discussed.

• She reported that planning for the next ECAR Symposium is under way, which includes shifting the timing of the event from late in the year to this coming summer.

• Board members stressed the importance of relating research efforts and products to appropriate audiences in the EDUCAUSE community, as well as of identifying our major target audiences for data, research, and analytics efforts generally.

• It was noted that EDUCAUSE might pursue other senior higher education leadership audiences as target audiences for data, research, and analytics products and services, which would expand their understanding of our field and elevate EDUCAUSE as the authoritative source of higher education IT information.

• Grajek indicated that the breadth of EDUCAUSE’s higher education membership positions the association well to establish itself as the authoritative voice on IT in higher education; board members generally agreed, but indicated the need to target products and services at key leadership audiences in order to achieve that goal.

• In trying to reach chief financial officers, for example, the importance of providing key performance and financial indicators as well as integrated data and reports that cross over relevant areas of higher education was highlighted.

• It was indicated that restructuring the funding model for the EDUCAUSE data, research, and analytics function might help open access to knowledge and resources that could increase EDUCAUSE membership in currently underrepresented areas.

• It was also suggested that the Harvard Business Review and Sloan Management Review might serve as models for EDUCAUSE research publications for broader leadership audiences.

• Board members asked whether the association might achieve some economies of scale through cooperation between its research and content operations. Grajek indicated that such conversations were already under way; for example, she noted initial discussions she had held with other staff about making better use of the EDUCAUSE Review as a distribution vehicle for EDUCAUSE research and analysis findings and recommendations.

• Board members indicated that exceptional editing capabilities were essential to the effective development and ultimate market penetration of EDUCAUSE research and analysis products.

• Board members expressed an openness to considering other funding models for the data, research, and analytics function that would allow it to meet the needs of the broader membership.
Web Presence Redesign Funding Request

- Oblinger reviewed the context for the request to the board for reserve funds to support a comprehensive redesign of the EDUCAUSE web presence.

- She highlighted the member and staff input processes that were conducted to inform the planning for the redesign, including staff and member interviews, a member survey, and peer site evaluations. Findings from those processes indicated that members are satisfied with EDUCAUSE overall, but do not find the EDUCAUSE website to be as useful as they would like, particularly in terms of facilitating access to information and resources.

- Oblinger noted the priorities for the redesign that had emerged from the various input processes included:
  - Making it easy to find and discover relevant content
  - Better engaging the higher education IT community
  - Enhancing accessibility and portability for users
  - Implementing online revenue opportunities

- Oblinger presented a request for board approval of the use of $1.4 million in reserve funds as initial financing for the web presence redesign.

- Board members asked for a brief review of the major spending categories involved in the project. Jordan noted that the initial phase of the project would involve evaluation of content management systems, data and information structures, the development of web governance processes, and other steps to lay the groundwork for redeveloping the web presence. The next stage would entail defining specific technical and process requirements, leading to subsequent stages of public launch and integrating additional functionality.

- Jordan stated that roughly two-thirds of the funds requested would support contract services for the planning and implementation of the new web presence; the remaining funding would pay for specialized services to address specific design and development needs.

- He indicated that the funding request would not cover the cost of applications licenses for content management and other related functionality.

- Jordan reported that the redesign process entails establishing organizational mechanisms for regular review, maintenance, and upgrade of the web presence design and functionality. In response to a question, Jordan indicated that ongoing development, maintenance, and upgrade of the web presence would probably lead to a line item for that purpose being added to the association budget.

- It was noted that the board-approved funds could come from either strategic or capital reserves at the board’s discretion.

- Board members agreed with the need to pursue the project, especially given the importance of making the web presence effectively accessible via mobile devices.

- Regenstein made a motion that the board approve the resolution to allow for the use of reserve funds to support the web presence redesign project; Maier seconded the motion, after which the board continued its discussion of the project plan and redesign process.

- The board asked for regular updates on the project, to which Jordan and Oblinger agreed.
Lassner called a vote on the motion made by Regenstein and seconded by Maier; the board approved the motion by unanimous consent.

2011 EDUCAUSE Membership Plan

Oblinger welcomed Cathy Hafkus to the meeting to present the membership plan discussion. She highlighted Hafkus’s role as the market manager for the EDUCAUSE general membership segment.

Hafkus began by reviewing progress on planning for the membership segment to date, which included evaluation of the membership purchasing experience, awareness of member benefits and EDUCAUSE fee-supported programs, the communication model around membership, and so forth.

She noted that working on these issues led to an overriding question: How would a membership growth strategy impact the association’s influence in the higher education IT community?

Hafkus indicated that the basis of associations’ growth is typically personal contact between member representatives and their colleagues.

She indicated that EDUCAUSE growth efforts going forward would not have a major impact on revenue, given the extent to which EDUCAUSE has already penetrated the higher education market. She suggested, however, that growth in the association’s major fee-supported initiatives could conceivably produce revenue impacts.

Hafkus presented three growth strategies for discussion:

- **Growth Strategy 1 (GS1):** Growing the number of EDUCAUSE member institutions.
- **Growth Strategy 2 (GS2):** Growing the number of institutions participating in the association’s major initiative programs—the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative (ELI), ECAR, and the Advanced Core Technologies Initiative (ACTI).
- **Growth Strategy 3 (GS3):** Growing the number of individual participants in EDUCAUSE from any given member institution

It was suggested that a fourth strategy, or a tactic under the third strategy, might be growing the association’s online events and services for members.

On GS1, Hafkus asked if the number of institutional members impacts the association’s influence in the profession and whether the types of institutions participating are important to engaging the profession and enhancing EDUCAUSE influence.

On GS2, she noted that similar questions apply (e.g., How important is it to grow the number of institutions? How important is the mix of institutions participating in the major initiative programs?).

On GS3, Hafkus identified the key questions as addressing the relative importance of the number and mix of individuals participating from any given institution.

Hafkus indicated that the overriding question concerned whether EDUCAUSE should dedicate specific efforts toward further growth.

It was suggested that EDUCAUSE does need a growth strategy, and that the strategy should emphasize GS1, GS3, and GS2, in that order. It was proposed that, relative to GS1, EDUCAUSE would need more market research to determine how much it should try to increase its membership in various institutional categories.
The importance of reaching the broader campus community without placing the CIO or primary representative in a gatekeeping role was also discussed. Board members noted that CIOs do not want to be barriers to communication and engagement with EDUCAUSE due to their busy schedules and that many of their staff and other campus professionals could directly benefit from such communication and engagement.

It was further suggested that EDUCAUSE should look for opportunities to increase outreach to other institutional leadership audiences as part of GS3.

Given the ongoing impacts of the poor economy, it was noted that member institutions are increasingly evaluating their organizational memberships to determine if they are receiving maximum value from them. On that basis, it was argued that further penetration into the institution would allow EDUCAUSE to demonstrate greater value and possibly improve member retention and growth.

The need for EDUCAUSE to conduct market research on the needs and interests of institutional categories in which it may want to grow was reiterated. This was seen as central to ensuring that the association understands the value propositions for those categories and how it might effectively meet them.

Board members agreed that the association’s influence does relate directly to the size of its membership, so looking for ways to increase the membership makes sense.

It was particularly noted that outreach to the community college sector should be an important part of the association’s membership strategy. Board members highlighted ongoing state and federal efforts to increase support for the community college sector, as well as the needs of that sector in relation to the knowledge, resources, and services EDUCAUSE provides.

Oblinger reported that EDUCAUSE’s ongoing efforts to increase engagement with the community college sector indicate that further penetration into the segment will be challenging, given its unique interests and needs; however, she highlighted an agreement between EDUCAUSE and the League for Innovation in the Community College to develop a joint EDUCAUSE Quarterly issue on college completion as another step in that direction.

In relation to GS3, it was suggested that EDUCAUSE think about how to modify its membership model to facilitate greater penetration on member campuses; likewise, the need to develop targeted messaging, resources, and services for various campus communities was noted.

In thinking through outreach to community colleges, it was suggested that a very practical, needs-oriented approach might maximize chances for success.

Board members indicated that highlighting existing collaborations between universities and community colleges might help demonstrate for the community college sector the value and relevance of greater participation in the EDUCAUSE community. It was also suggested that developing research and analytics resources or vehicles targeting the sector might also help demonstrate the association’s value to community colleges.

On GS3, Hafkus asked how far EDUCAUSE should try to penetrate into the institution if the CIO was not placed in a gatekeeper role. In response, it was suggested that staff might work with the CIOs to manage such outreach in partnership with them. Other suggestions included asking EDUCAUSE primary representatives to identify communications leads for their campuses and providing the primary representatives with a list identifying the institutional representatives they had directed to the association (as compared to those who had engaged with EDUCAUSE on their own).
• Hafkus asked how important it would be for primary representatives to know who is engaged with EDUCAUSE. Board members generally agreed that it would be helpful for primary representatives to have access to basic information about the people from their institutions who are participating in EDUCAUSE, but concern was expressed that only limited individually identifiable information be made available to avoid privacy concerns.

• It was suggested that encouraging institutional representatives to use their EDUCAUSE member profiles to identify areas of interest would help primary representatives work with EDUCAUSE to channel information to general institutional representatives based on their expressed interests.

• Hafkus asked board members to indicate which campus leaders/communities the association should target in pursuing GS3. In response, board members suggested that EDUCAUSE might try to develop value propositions that the primary representatives and/or their staffs could share with specific campus audiences to get them interested in EDUCAUSE.

• It was noted that potential audiences for greater outreach on campus should include institutional research leaders and professionals.

• Hafkus asked the board to consider GS2, which would entail attempts to grow the membership of the major initiative programs. She asked the board for feedback on the best paths for outreach and engagement at member institutions in relation to the major initiatives (ELI, ECAR, and ACTI).

• In discussing ELI, it was suggested that having the teaching and learning program as a separate, fee-supported program may not fit well with teaching and learning being at the core of the higher education mission.

• The point was raised that the lack of a cyberinfrastructure/research computing program may be a gap in the association’s offerings; however, it was noted that ACTI has a highly active cyberinfrastructure group.

• Board members asked what the financial impact of folding the program fee revenue into the general membership dues would be. Staff noted that it would require a substantial increase in membership dues to move the major initiative programs from a fee-supported model.

• Jordan noted that staff would present analyses at the May board meeting on the financial implications of pursuing the membership growth strategies, including anticipated impacts on the membership dues structure.

• It was suggested that it might make sense to consider ELI and ACTI differently from ECAR in thinking about integrating fee-supported programs into the membership dues structure. It was noted, for example, that ECAR membership emphasizes subscription for research products, whereas the other two programs emphasize fostering communities of practice and networking around issues of core interest to the larger EDUCAUSE community.

• The point was made that the energy and focus of the programs must be considered and maintained if broader access were enabled.

• It was suggested that other revenue-generating opportunities might be explored to offset integration of major initiative programs into the standard dues structure, such as making more EDUCAUSE publications and resources available for purchase by members and nonmembers.

• Board members noted the importance of determining what the barriers to greater participation by different institutional categories are in pursuing a growth strategy; it was also suggested that the
association emphasize institutional categories of particular strategic importance, such as community colleges.

- It was suggested that a growth strategy might consider increasing penetration among some institutional categories where participation might be moderate to high, for example, but not as prevalent as in the research university segment.

- Board members also pointed to the need to identify opportunities that might arise from looking at institutions not just in terms of Carnegie classification but also in light of other defining institutional characteristics (e.g., urban versus rural institutions).

EDUCAUSE International Collaboration

- Lassner invited Northam to initiate a board discussion on international collaboration.

- Northam noted that, as the managing director of the Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology (CAUDIT), he formally dedicates a percentage of his time to international engagement.

- In discussing the benefits of international engagement from the CAUDIT experience, Northam noted that international engagement has enabled CAUDIT to learn from experiences in other parts of the world, which includes identifying innovations Australian institutions might adopt. It has also allowed them to identify new pools of talent that they might recruit to Australia.

- CAUDIT has broadened the value of its existing services to members through benchmarking across international boundaries; likewise, engagement with EDUCAUSE around the EDUCAUSE Management/Leadership Institutes has allowed CAUDIT to bring faculty from those institutes to Australia to conduct similar professional development events.

- Northam noted that CAUDIT has found that technology corporations are more likely to listen and take notice when they hear a consistent message from higher education around the world; for example, CAUDIT has found that when higher education communities in different parts of the world share the terms and conditions that companies are trying to implement in different regions, those facing difficult terms and conditions can push back effectively.

- Northam highlighted the extent to which different higher education IT communities around the world face similar issues, and thus can learn from each other in addressing those problems; as an example, he illustrated the consistency between the annual EDUCAUSE and CAUDIT Top 10 IT Issues lists, which he noted are derived in different ways.

- In terms of challenges, Northam noted that holding teleconferences across time zones presents significant problems in some cases. He also discussed the higher overhead costs associated with facilitating distributed collaboration.

- Northam indicated that cross-cultural issues can be significant challenges as well; he cited language barriers, differing norms of debate and engagement, and the need for face-to-face meetings versus virtual meetings as key issues.

- Northam indicated that generating a return on the organizational investment in working with other groups around the world can take years, with significant initial costs. He also highlighted the importance of educating members to help them understand the benefits of international collaboration to the organization and themselves.
• Northam reported that, in his experience, the heads of other organizations around the world generally have few if any responsibilities for international engagement included in their formal position requirements.

• Northam provided the board with an overview of various higher education IT organizations around the world to set the context for their unique challenges and capabilities.

• Northam suggested some discussion questions for the board to consider in thinking about EDUCAUSE and international collaboration.

• It was noted that, in the United States, most higher education institutions are still trying to absorb the capacity of networking to facilitate collaboration at scale. It was suggested that the same issue applies internationally as well, leading to the question: “How do U.S. higher education institutions capitalize on the ability of the network to foster collaboration on IT and higher education internationally?”

• The point was made that some risk aversion among higher education institutions and technology organizations around the world may be the factor limiting international collaboration via the network or other means. Overcoming that risk aversion may require the development of personal relationships and networks at the institutional level, which would then allow relationships between international higher education and IT organizations to evolve.

• Board members discussed the importance of demonstrating the value to members from international collaboration efforts; it was argued that doing so may require having very specific goals and metrics for evaluation.

• The point was made that EDUCAUSE should seriously consider pursuing well-defined international collaborations with organizations in countries/regions where a reasonable level of alignment is likely to exist.

• It was noted that the president of the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) produced a brief this year committing CLIR to focusing on macrosolutions: regional coalitions, sharing resources, and volitional dependence, which means establishing the basis for true, long-lasting partnership. It was suggested that the thinking presented in the brief illustrates the vital importance of solutions at scale, which is something that the U.S. higher education IT community and EDUCAUSE should consider pursuing.

• The point was made that potential collaborative solutions to institutional IT needs may not emerge from collaboration between international IT organizations, but that those organizations might help bring international IT communities together to identify possible solutions and international partners for developing them.

• It was noted that we must include in the conversation the efforts EDUCAUSE is already making to foster connections between higher education leaders and professionals internationally. It was also suggested that EDUCAUSE consider the level of effort required to seriously pursue international collaborations and the ramifications of investing those resources in that effort as opposed to existing or other endeavors.

• The point was made that EDUCAUSE may not have been particularly open to international engagement in the past, but that the board and leadership may have a new view on that issue. The website should be updated to show that EDUCAUSE is open to international engagement.

• Oblinger referred to a previous collaboration between the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) of the United Kingdom, the SURFfoundation of the Netherlands, CAUDIT, and the Canadian
University Council of CIOs (CUCCIO) as possibly having established the groundwork for further collaborative efforts among those organizations.

- Northam suggested that simply providing some administrative support for member groups interested in exploring issues across international organizations may allow for the evolution of the relationships that could lead to broader, more formal collaborations.

- It was suggested that further development of international relationships around the Core Data Service, which the new modular structure of the survey may facilitate, might be a good place to start building relationships and finding other opportunities to collaborate. Similarly, the point was made that EDUCAUSE should evaluate its events, services, and resources in light of international considerations to identify the opportunities for and implications of increasing international collaboration.

- It was noted that EDUCAUSE should also make a more significant, sustained effort to better highlight what it is already doing in the international arena.

- The question was asked about the value of the EDUCAUSE brand in terms of co-branding events, services, resources, and so forth with other organizations around the world. Northam noted that as international organizations mature, the value of leveraging the EDUCAUSE brand to support their efforts via co-branding becomes more and more limited.

- Board members agreed that EDUCAUSE should inventory what it is already doing in the international space, look for opportunities to foster collaboration with international organizations and members where alignment has already been established, and use opportunities for engagement to gather knowledge and data that might inform future collaborative efforts.

- Northam noted that associations in more developed countries and regions must carefully consider the extent to which they can afford to assist organizations in less developed countries or regions in establishing or developing themselves further. He indicated that most requests from such organizations revolve around accessing expertise, which requires the dedication of member and staff time.

- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE might once again consider developing and promoting a study tour, which might be pursued in conjunction with CAUDIT.

- Northam noted that international study tours along the lines suggested are great opportunities to foster that institution-to-institution relationship building that was previously cited as a major benefit of collaboration between international organizations.

- The point was made that EDUCAUSE should be opportunistic in looking at the international context, which requires consistently monitoring what is taking place in that space. It was further suggested that EDUCAUSE might do this by leveraging existing member institutions’ international relationships.

- In response to a question, Oblinger highlighted current international engagement efforts around the annual conference, which include an international focus group session, direct conversations with SURFfoundation representatives around their participation in the conference, and participation of an international member on the program committee each year.

- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE might consider a social event at the annual conference to bring together U.S. member institutions engaged in international activities with representatives from international institutions attending the conference.
• Little also discussed the opportunities and challenges of scheduling the online annual conference to facilitate international participation.

**EDUCAUSE Policy Topics for 2011**

• Lassner invited Jackson to initiate the discussion of possible policy topics for 2011.

• Jackson introduced Steve Worona, senior policy director, and Rodney Petersen, senior government relations officer and managing director of the EDUCAUSE Washington Office, to the board, noting they were invited to join the meeting at this time to listen to the board’s feedback on the possible policy topics under discussion.

• Jackson noted that the Washington office would most likely develop two documents to accompany each policy topic identified for focus—a three-paragraph explanation and a slightly longer brief explaining EDUCAUSE’s position on the topic. For high-priority topics, Jackson indicated that white papers to explore those issues in greater depth might also be developed.

• Jackson discussed the government relations functions of the office, reviewing a number of federal agencies with which it interfaces; he also highlighted office efforts to engage member institutions on policy topics and support them in addressing the implications of various policy developments.

• He then provided a brief overview of a range of policy topics or areas with significant policy implications on which the office could conceivably focus in 2011, such as peer-to-peer networking and its copyright implications, breach response, identity management, network neutrality, outsourcing and cloud computing, accessibility, and higher education access and affordability.

• Jackson then asked the board for its input on which issues the Washington office should focus and what topics it might consider adding to the list.

• It was suggested that the national broadband plan should be on the list.

• The point was made that there might be some topics that largely entail responding to regulatory requirements, while others might involve shaping policy development, and still others might fall into a third category around enabling the development of higher education practice.

• Jackson noted that the Washington office, when fully staffed, will have sufficient staff resources to manage an array of topics, as long as it is careful not to let day-to-day fire fighting obscure larger trends and issues.

• Another way of looking at the range of issues was suggested, based around preventing detrimental policies from being imposed; ensuring higher education’s interests are appropriately reflected in policies taking shape; and supporting the development of appropriate campus policy. In that context, it was suggested that the Washington office’s primary focus should be tracking and informing the community about federal policy concerns and opportunities.

• The point was made that the rewrite of the e-Rate program should be on the policy topics list as well. Worona noted that, as part of the rewrite, the basis for assessing the tax that funds the e-Rate program could change from phone lines to phone lines and broadband connections or the number of telephone numbers allocated, with different implications for institutions based on what is ultimately chosen.

• It was noted that accessibility is rapidly emerging as a pressing concern, based on the way the interpretation of “reasonable accommodation” may be evolving. Board members highlighted the
importance to the membership of the Washington office engaging in constructive discussions with relevant organizations to shape this evolution and the development of relevant policy. The further point was made that the association must proactively anticipate and engage with legislators and agencies on issues of this type to influence the policy debate as early as possible. The concern was expressed that in the past the office may have been too reactive in its approach, which made positively impacting the policy debate extremely difficult.

- Under the topic of counterterrorism, it was noted that export control laws must be addressed, as they have significant implications for colleges and universities with an international presence. Petersen highlighted how the office is working with the Council on Government Relations and other relevant organizations to ensure higher education technology issues are represented in this policy arena.

- It was noted that the next iteration of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA 2), as well as the rewriting of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, should be considered for inclusion on the policy topics list. Petersen noted that no draft legislation has been forthcoming on CALEA 2, which has led EDUCAUSE and other organizations to submit statements of concern to the relevant agencies to try to inform the law’s initial development.

- Jackson highlighted the degree to which the office engages in coalitions with other associations to try to proactively impact legislative developments, such that EDUCAUSE’s voice can amplify those with greater focus in specific areas.

- Petersen indicated that, in addition to the federal agencies with which the office works, EDUCAUSE policy staff also engage with a range of legislative committees and caucuses, which complicates the government relations picture.

- In response to a question, Jackson stated that the office is sufficiently staffed to address the normal array of issues, but that it would have to rely on coordinating and working with members to respond to extraordinary policy developments. However, he noted that approach is appropriate from a resource perspective and given the nature of the EDUCAUSE community.

- Board members indicated that the office should not hesitate to engage with them and other CIOs to leverage their contacts with other associations, legislators, and so forth to advance higher education’s interests.

- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE might not be best resourced or positioned to help members address issues in which states may try to assert control over institutional or system IT operations.

- Petersen noted that the office is trying to expand its contacts with state policy operations at member institutions as a way of learning about state policy developments that might migrate to other states and/or the federal level.

- He also highlighted how different higher education constituencies may have different views on different policy issues, requiring EDUCAUSE to look for areas of convergence and balance in relation to higher education IT concerns.

### Board Meeting Scheduling and Planning

- As an addition to the agenda, Oblinger asked the board to consider a range of issues related to its meetings.
- She noted that questions had arisen about whether the board needs to hold four meetings per year, and if it does, whether they all need to be conducted face-to-face. Oblinger also mentioned that a suggestion had been made about possibly holding some board meetings on board member campuses.

- A question was raised about whether the board meeting at the annual conference is ill-timed, given the staff’s focus on the launch of the conference and the other conference-related activities in which board members might want to participate.

- Northam suggested that it might make sense to disaggregate the meetings, such that normal reporting could be conducted remotely while in-person meetings would be reserved for discussions in which face-to-face contact adds value.

- The view was expressed that holding meetings at the Boulder and Washington offices is not a problem and that having the opportunity to interact with the EDUCAUSE staff is beneficial for the staff and the board.

- It was suggested that using remote meetings to reduce the number of face-to-face meetings to three a year, and having those face-to-face meetings scheduled for longer periods of time, may better capitalize on the value of the board’s face-to-face interactions.

- Board members generally agreed that three meetings a year was workable, but that less than three would be a problem.

- Some support was expressed for taking a fresh look at the board meeting calendar and seeing if it might make sense to move the fall board meeting away from the annual conference.

- The board members generally agreed with the view that having some of their meetings at the EDUCAUSE offices to allow for board-staff interaction is a good idea.

- The point was made that moving to three meetings, but moving a meeting away from the annual conference, would not actually save the board members any time.

- It was also suggested that having the board get together at the annual conference, even if not for a full day’s board meeting, would make sense to facilitate coordination and communication with each other and with staff in relation to the conference.

- A contrary perspective was presented on the importance of holding the board meetings at EDUCAUSE offices to allow for interaction between the board and staff; it was suggested that this may invite undue board interference in association operations.

- The perspective was advanced that making better use of the board in terms of the types of interactions members have with staff around the board meetings (e.g., state of the field presentations as opposed to informal dialogue) might heighten the value of those interactions, and thus of holding the meetings at the EDUCAUSE offices.

- It was also suggested that board members could use greater guidance on how to engage more effectively in the annual conference as representatives of the board.

- Some support was expressed for holding board meetings at member campuses, not strictly at the EDUCAUSE offices or the annual conference site.

- It was noted that board members could visit the EDUCAUSE offices individually, as opposed to visiting as part of a board meeting, to hold seminars or formal discussions with the staff to enhance board-staff relations as well as to educate the staff on community needs and issues.
• The point was made that EDUCAUSE now has a large contingent of remote staff, such that planning for board-staff interactions would need to take that into account.

• Northam stated that CAUDIT moves its board meetings to different locations and hosts a dinner between the board and area CIOs to facilitate board-community interaction; he indicated his board and members highly value those opportunities for interaction.

• It was noted that the opportunity to engage local institutional leaders was another potential value of holding board meetings on member campuses.

• Oblinger closed the discussion by indicating that staff would consider the feedback provided and present the board with potential options for altering its meeting schedule and sites.

Lassner called the board into executive session at 3:10 p.m. EST and adjourned the board meeting at 3:50 p.m.