EDUCAUSE Board Meeting

July 21, 2011
Boulder, CO

Attending

- Board Members: David Lassner (Chair), Pattie Orr (Vice Chair; participated via teleconference until 11:00 a.m., mountain daylight time [MDT]), Joel Cooper (Secretary), Brad Wheeler (Treasurer), Diana Oblinger (President and CEO), Debi Allison, Ted Dodds, James Hilton, Tom Maier, Richard Northam, Carrie Regenstein, Vernon Smith, Randy Stiles
- Staff: Joanne Dehoney, Susan Grajek, Greg Jackson, Garth Jordan, Julie Little, Michelle McIrvin (for the financial report)
- Staff member Jarret Cummings and consultants Pete Boyle and Jennifer Dusenberry (for the Making the Case discussion, via videoconference)

Call to Order

- Lassner called the meeting to order at 7:57 a.m. (MDT).
- Wheeler commented that the new format for dinner was an improvement.
- Lassner asked for comments on the consent agenda.
- Stiles moved to approve the consent agenda; Cooper seconded. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent at approximately 8:00 a.m. (MDT).

President’s Report

Annual Conference Overview

- Oblinger noted that the annual conference is EDUCAUSE’s most widely recognized event. She introduced the new badges for board members and the smaller nametag holders for attendees.
- Oblinger cited the E11 registration goal of 3,500 attendees and stated that, as of July 15, we are 46% ahead in registrations and have reached 60% of budgeted revenue.
- Maier asked whether we have a plan for closing out the conference if it gets too large. Oblinger responded that the major constraint is the general session, but that we could be above our numbers and accommodate using the overflow areas and the CIO Lounge.
- Oblinger pointed out a number of enhancements to the conference website, including a new organizational scheme and new search functions, and noted that the expanded online program has opened.
- Wheeler suggested that Lassner send a note to the CIO list to attract participation by highlighting what is new and attractive about the conference.
• Oblinger mentioned that as part of our strategy to build in meeting opportunities and spaces, Julie Little and Catherine Yang spent many person-hours creating neighborhoods so that when people come out of sessions they find their colleagues and peers. Dodds and Regenstein noted that the term “neighborhood” is a good one and helps the conference seem less intimidating. Oblinger cited other changes such as lunchtime constituent group sessions with opportunities to capture output and an international welcome lounge.

Oblinger reviewed the Corporate Forum/Partnership Forum, which in past years hasn’t worked as well as it could at the conference, noting that corporate partners want more opportunities to engage directly with EDUCAUSE staff and campus leaders. Rather than the Corporate Forum, two webinars will be produced this summer and fall. In addition, platinum partners will be invited to the recognition reception. Wheeler observed that corporate representatives won’t talk in front of each other and voiced support for the idea of extending an invitation to platinum partners to attend the reception.

In response to a question from Regenstein, Oblinger discussed an alternative idea of hosting a discussion with corporate partners focused on a specific topic, concluding that it was not as strong an approach as the proposed invitation to the recognition reception. Regenstein noted that starting the webcasts in August would lead into the conference and explain the lack of the partners’ forum event at the conference.

**Other Updates**

• Oblinger mentioned that this year’s Frye Leadership Program garnered high satisfaction from participants in all evaluation categories. Participants value the network and support group they form while at Frye. The new curriculum extends project opportunities to engage after the summer institute concludes.

• Oblinger showed new products that TLPD has developed to help people match their needs to appropriate professional development opportunities offered by EDUCAUSE.

• Oblinger introduced the new IT Issues Panel. She first reminded the group of the Current Issues Committee and commented that its annual survey top-10 list is problematic in that it is neither current nor does it change much from year to year. As an alternative, Susan Grajek and Greg Jackson have put into place a panel of community members that will let EDUCAUSE go quickly to the community to understand what is top of mind. The panel will be representative of EDUCAUSE membership, will have a short rotation schedule, and will include active members, not all of whom will be “visible” members (e.g., the “usual suspects”). Oblinger observed that for the first time, we will decommission a committee when Current Issues sunsets. In response to a question from Allison, Oblinger stated that EDUCAUSE will still publish a top-10–style report, but will create it in a new way. Dodds concurred that it is a good idea but noted that the IT Issues Panel will take more management. Regenstein commented that, as a benefit, the new method will result in one less survey for member response.

• Oblinger announced that Teddy Diggs recently won another five awards for EDUCAUSE Review.

• Oblinger introduced the topic of changes to the EDUCAUSE magazines, EDUCAUSE Quarterly and EDUCAUSE Review, noting that brand confusion is endemic among both authors and consumers. The proposed solution is to merge them into a flagship publication that will include rich media online and will also be published in a print edition. She concluded by stating that Catherine Yang and her team are currently engaged in a serious redesign effort that targets a March to May 2012 launch date.
Oblinger next introduced two policy highlights:

- The ACTI meeting in Boston was planned to coincide with the GENI meeting, which proved to be a successful strategy. Wheeler explained that GENI is an NSF next-generation Internet program that is gaining momentum. Dodds commented that he attended both, and it was good to have them together.

- The new policy digest has launched. An embedded question indicated that readers would prefer to see it weekly. As this exceeds our capacity, we will publish on a biweekly schedule. Jackson commented that the “open rate” on the e-mail was higher than usual, leading him to conclude that people recognize something is new. Two hundred people have opted to receive the digest.

Oblinger announced that EDUCAUSE just received $17M for Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC) Wave III from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. In response to a question, Oblinger explained that Wave II grants have been awarded and that they mainly support grades 6–9. She explained that Wave III will be quite different from past waves, with an enhanced focus on planning grants and a single, large, multimillion-dollar award.

Oblinger concluded the president’s report by reminding the board that the Boulder office is relocating in March, making this the last meeting in the Walnut Street office.

Financial Report

- McIrvin indicated that EDUCAUSE is in a favorable financial position. She stated that we are operating within our investment policy and targets. In response to a question from Regenstein, McIrvin noted that NGLC funds appear to have a substantial impact on the financial numbers but basically net out. McIrvin noted that while expenses are currently running below budget, she anticipates that they will increase as we draw closer to the annual conference and new staff members come on board.

- Dodds mentioned that he appreciates the simple increase and decrease display and additionally commented on the 10% increase in revenue apparent in the report.

EDUCAUSE Form 990 Review and Approval

- Lassner introduced the Form 990 review process by reminding the board that it is an important fiduciary responsibility and asking for comments.

- Wheeler noted a blank in the form that McIrvin explained the preparer had suggested was appropriate for N/A items. After a brief discussion, McIrvin agreed to fill blanks with the term “N/A.”

- In response to a question from Regenstein, Jordan explained that all Form 990s are publically available through www.guidestar.org.

- Regenstein offered a motion to approve the EDUCAUSE Form 990. Cooper seconded the motion. The Form 990 was approved by unanimous consent at approximately 8:49 a.m. (MDT).

- Maier asked about building reserves, given that NGLC funds inflate EDUCAUSE assets. Dodds concurred with the question, asking if NGLC is included in the calculation. McIrvin confirmed that it is not.
Appointment of a Director-at-Large

- Oblinger opened the discussion of an at-large board director appointment by explaining the nature and purpose of the at-large director and later nominated Kara Freeman, vice president of administration and chief information officer at the American Council on Education (ACE). Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE has worked with Freeman on the “Making the Case” program and has found her to be easy-going while able to take a stand, collegial and responsible, and that importantly, she has a background as a CIO.

- Stiles commented that the link to ACE is a strong recommendation. Dodds added that the CIO background is another plus and that this will help ensure a good fit with the EDUCAUSE board culture. Maier commented that the upcoming agenda item involving a partnership with ACE indicates the relevance of the choice. In response to a question from Allison about Freeman’s availability, Oblinger responded that while she hasn’t spoken with Freeman, she anticipates her availability and willingness to accept the position.

- Oblinger asked for other suggestions. Lassner recalled that Molly Broad couldn’t serve on the I2 Board as a matter of ACE policy and suggested that having another name approved would expedite filling the position should Freeman be unavailable. Maier voiced support for using the position to engage other associations. Cooper suggested NACUBO or AIR. Oblinger concluded that she would provide other names if necessary.

- Maier moved to approve the invitation to Freeman as EDUCAUSE director-at-large and was seconded by Regenstein. The motion passed by unanimous consent at approximately 8:59 a.m. (MDT).

Institute for Computer Policy and Law (ICPL)

- Oblinger directed the board’s attention to the plan in the board materials for changes to ICPL and noted that the task before the group would be to review and discuss the changes.

- Jackson reviewed the genesis and history of ICPL, noting that its principle activity has always been the annual seminar, which attracts two audiences: a) policy experts and b) people who realize they have to learn something about policy. He noted that in addition, ICPL has sponsored a very active mailing list that serves as a resource for sharing solutions to policy issues and problems. Looking forward, Tracy Mitrano, Steve Worona, and others identified five elements to include in a revised set of services and activities:
  1. Continue the seminar.
  2. Implement virtual and in-person workshops – beginning with three a year.
  3. Move the listserv to a more sophisticated collaboration platform.
  4. Develop “commentaries,” a searchable repository of policy resources.
  5. Develop and promote “sessions,” presentations that to be used in other venues such as the AACRAO conference.

- Smith commented that the attention to ICPL is timely with such issues on the horizon as state authorization, accessibility and the growth of longitudinal data systems.
• Oblinger asked if the changes move us in the correct direction and received general approval from the board. Jackson noted that he will direct ICPL in the near term with the expectation that the anticipated new hire will move into the role.

**Benchmarking and Analytics**

• Oblinger asked that the board provide input for a proposed plan on an analytics center, noting that the proposed project entails two phases:
  ○ Phase I, EDUCAUSE builds an analytics center for higher education IT.
  ○ Phase II, EDUCAUSE federates with other associations to provide cross-functional analytics capabilities.

• Hilton asked how quickly EDUCAUSE could position benchmarks and models for service- and mission-based costs, as the University of Virginia (UVa) will soon be engaging Gartner for similar work. Grajek estimated that it will take 18 months to get the project to the point of a critical mass, noting that we would first bootstrap a framework across HE IT in reference to existing standards and would then include the model in Core Data Service collection in the winter, having results by April 2012.

• In response to Hilton’s comment that the service should be an orthogonal framework that produces reliable and valid data, Grajek noted that the baseline will comprise factors any institution can measure and that above the baseline will be additional measures of complexity that would apply less universally. She stated the goal of the center as producing measures that can really be used to measure, monitor, and improve work.

• Stiles recommended that the first step would be to pick a couple of critical areas that are widely shared and to do a great job with those.

• In response to a question from Dodds, Grajek noted that the framework would include a working definition of each service to be benchmarked.

• Wheeler commented that in the CIC, merely benchmarking the cost of Microsoft Exchange was difficult; Hilton concurred, noting that it is hard to define common terms. Northam commented that when CAUDIT went down a similar path it led to a new project about service catalogues. He noted that CAUDIT never did get people to standardize on a service catalog; instead, a third-party company called Clear Cost bridges service catalogs. Northam commented that the CAUDIT project began with service desk and networking, and that he supports the idea of creating a wireframe of the full framework.

• Dodds commented that a pristine framework is unlikely and that the goal should be to develop one that is good enough to encourage adoption. Hilton agreed and added that he would prefer to use IU’s already established brand on cost models, working with EDUCAUSE to translate it for UVa. Wheeler commented that his system uses activity-based costing in the budget model that requires one FTE to manage.

• Smith observed that it would be useful to be able to disaggregate the results by sector. In response, Grajek asked how we might identify best practice and adapt for other sectors. Wheeler suggested that if only a handful of organization would work together it would move virally from there.

• Maier suggested that the work should move forward aggressively, adding that it will not be valuable if delayed. Wheeler concurred, adding that if investment would help move the project faster, it
should be pursued. He cautioned that the “slower safer path” could lead to credible results but likely too late for impact.

- Grajek proposed that the work could move both deliberately and aggressively: deliberately by doing a business plan, and aggressively by adopting the IU model immediately.

- Northam encouraged finding institutions willing to contribute resources and pursuing them to structure a demonstration project. Regenstein noted that we could start by identifying and working with people who are currently engaged in comparable internal projects. Stiles mentioned a relevant precedent in the Consortium of Liberal Arts Colleges (CLAC), which has a history of implementing collaborative and cost-shared projects. Grajek summarized that participants might include CLAC, UVa, Cornell, and Indiana University and inquired about engaging community colleges.

- Wheeler reinforced the idea of beginning the effort with known frameworks, citing Kuali as an example of a project that began with a known and proven system, and then ported and scaled it. He recommended identifying as many known models as possible and organizing them around a coherent platform.

- Northam commented that there is time to build the project, because just maturing data collection processes on campuses is a somewhat lengthy process.

- Grajek said that the project would aim toward developing a framework that will work sufficiently for most members. Dodds added that the framework can be based in the case studies, and Hilton added that the important message about the framework is about positioning CIOs for an internal conversation about cost accounting.

- Grajek proposed a teleconference within a couple of weeks with Wheeler, Hilton, and Dodds to begin discussing the demonstration project, with parallel efforts to look at CLAC as another potential partner.

- Orr voiced support for the proposed path and added that integrated IT and library organizations have trouble reporting to the Core Data Service and using the information. She encouraged bringing in integrated systems examples, and volunteered to work with Grajek to identify potential partners.

- Regenstein noted that we should give close consideration to what aspect of the framework is highest priority. Allison concurred, asking whether the focus of the demonstration project would be analytics overall or only financials. Grajek responded that the initial focus would be financials plus service metrics, noting that the calculated variables and interrelationships are complex and will require additional in-house infrastructure to support. Stiles added that the focus on benefits and evidence of impact as well as costs will be crucial to project success.

- Hilton commented that the proposed strategy mitigates risk by engaging partners in a contractor-like way with EDUCAUSE mediating.

Oblinger commented that the group’s direction was toward starting the analytics center sooner rather than later and then opened the floor to discussion.

- Hilton indicated that he would start conversations with his staff to identify resources to recruit into the effort. He suggested that agreeing on a conceptual model would be a first step, followed by determining the cost of the model. He commented that while it will be difficult to develop a model that is generally appreciated, the need for benchmarks and transparency is undeniable. Lassner predicted that people who don’t want to make their costs transparent will not participate.
• Wheeler recommended an agile-style project approach and noted that the project cannot rely solely on EDUCAUSE internal resources. He suggested that the project requires leadership from someone with “start-up” experience.

• Allison suggested that a critical component is a brief charter to define scope and come to agreement about project deliverables.

• Dodds confirmed that he and Hilton are aligned on the time frame and proposed that the project should do as much as possible as quickly as possible. He advised breaking the project in to small chunks and cautioned against looking for perfection.

• Allison volunteered that an aggressive business intelligence project is under way at her institution and that it may be relevant to the proposed Analytics Center.

• Wheeler cited the “90 Days or Else” article as resource worth consulting.

• Regenstein observed that the proposed “agile” method could help inform the staff search.

• Lassner summarized the conversation as a call to expend all resources necessary to move quickly on the Analytics Center, even if the business model is not fully in place. In response, Oblinger confirmed the plan to pursue the business model in parallel. The group expressed general agreement.

• Dodds queried the group to identify flaws in the plan. Smith observed in response that the pilot project does not immediately address the difficult issue of where the reporting and analytics capacity should reside in institutions, referencing sessions at the recent AIR conference. He suggested the need to engage institutional research (IR) colleagues early to avoid later conflict over roles. In response, Lassner observed that the IT community will prove itself by getting its own domain analyzed and pinned down. Grajek mentioned that developing the analytics infrastructure is also on the critical path to collaborating effectively with IR. Dodds noted that this is a Phase 2 risk that we can start mitigating now, and asserted that there is not any argument about the ownership of the Phase 1 tasks and content.

• Returning to the issue of data being identified by institution in the system, Grajek asked whether requiring such transparency will discourage participation. Northam said it is crucial to be able to benchmark against peers and worth the potential loss of participation to set openness as a standard. Wheeler commented that institutions benefit from having their own data, irrespective of whether they can benchmark. Hilton suggested tiered pricing, where there is an additional cost for keeping data private, as part of the strategy.

• Oblinger noted that the more complicated picture as suggested by Smith is the next phase, where we link and develop new data sources, and suggested that specifying the products is complex. She asked the group to consider ways EDUCAUSE might fund the Analytics Center, citing corporate sponsorship and using reserves as two examples.

• Regenstein replied that corporations should be avoided as a first source. Wheeler concurred, noting that it is expensive capital. Lassner predicted that other associations would be interested in collaborating with EDUCAUSE on the project. Smith noted that analytics is on the national agenda as well, and that funding sources may exist there, mentioning Gates. Oblinger responded that EDUCAUSE has approached Gates and is cautiously optimistic that support may result, but added that the earliest funds from that source would be available is November.

• Wheeler cited the value of mentioning the proposed institutional collaboration to strengthen the Gates proposal.
• Grajek discussed possible revenue generation approaches, including consulting, licensing aggregated, de-identified data, selling reports, and sponsoring professional development opportunities where campuses learn to collect and manage data.

• Hilton asserted that institutions are already spending substantial sums on related work, and suggested that the project ought to be able to capture some of those resources. Wheeler mentioned that the project could produce VRIN (valuable, rare, inimitable, nonsubstitutable) goods and services, and noted that if so, it will be successful. He further suggested using the strategic initiative fund and speculated that even if EDUCAUSE decides not to continue the center long-term, that the asset could have value on the market if we want to sell in a few years.

• Wheeler suggested that we should be shrewd about licensing, noting that if we have the data, we can manage what relationships are established for which services. Regenstein queried whether corporations purchase the data. Grajek responded that they could, for example, access a block of data that we give them under defined terms such as de-identification and with limitations on how it can be used.

• Dodds reiterated that the first place to seek cost recovery is through the community.

• Oblinger observed that the board was suggesting that it would be acceptable to lose money for a few years while starting the center. Hilton replied that the board suggests spending strategic initiatives fund, and Wheeler reiterated that if delayed a year, the project will lose value. Lassner clarified that the board is suggesting that the project should proceed at full speed with or without external funding.

• Regenstein asked whether or not formal processes must be followed to access the strategic fund. Oblinger replied that board approval was required.

• Oblinger asked that the board approve the $200,000 expenditures Grajek requested and noted that, should the need to go into reserves develop, she would return to the board with an appropriate motion that could be considered by phone or e-mail.

• Regenstein moved to approve $200,000 in funding for the Analytics Center project.

• Wheeler noted that the authorization should be larger.

• Lassner proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to approve up to $500,000 in funding. Allison seconded. The motion was passed by unanimous consent at approximately 11:40 a.m. (MDT).

• Grajek asked the group to send her any suggestions for individuals who might lead the project.

**Enterprise Resource Planning**

• Oblinger noted that the EDUCAUSE Executive Team would like the board’s guidance on prioritizing potential ERP activities.

• Allison asked if the ERP projects would compete with internal resources for any of the other initiatives under discussion, to which Oblinger replied that they would directly compete.

• Regenstein observed that the proposed ERP study should be on the list for discussion at ECAR.

• Maier expressed concern about moving the ERP projects forward if they compete with the previously discussed analytics work, and noted that the ERP work could perhaps be a later extension of the analytics work.
• In reference to the proposed licensing work, Northam cautioned that higher education represents a tiny fraction of the total revenue of the targeted corporations and predicted that it would be hard to get their attention, no matter how strong the project.

• Wheeler stated that everything else discussed previously is more important. He went on to describe the Elsevier study that used the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to get access to expenditures on journals and discovered huge variability in the contracts. He noted that while it is important to do a similar study with ERP technologies, it is not an appropriate EDUCAUSE initiative; he would recommend taking the ERP study off the table.

• Northam commented that CAUDIT does share contracts within its membership and that this levels the playing field.

• Dodds noted that proposals were good ones and that, given the opportunity, they would be worth pursuing, but not at the expense of the analytics work.

• Regenstein expressed doubts that EDUCAUSE or the community has the capacity to do both.

• Allison noted that 14 CIOs in Ohio tried to develop a statewide deal with Oracle but that the terms and conditions were so onerous that the project was unsustainable.

• Oblinger summarized the discussion, saying that the conversations indicated that the ERP work was not the highest priority at this time. The board concurred.

Making the Case (MTC) Project

• Jarret Cummings of EDUCAUSE and Pete Boyle and Jennifer Dusenberry of Lipman Hearne, a marketing and communications firm specializing in the nonprofit, joined by teleconference.

• Oblinger described the MTC project as a collaboration led by EDUCAUSE with ACE and Internet2, with the goal that presidents be open to conversations about IT and supportive of funding efforts. She described the project as laying the groundwork for above-campus and across-campus collaboration and providing a general framework for how we might talk about IT-based strategic concerns of presidents. She cited the major project activities as collecting evidence, designing a strategy for engaging most effectively with presidents, and rolling out the project at the ACE annual conference.

• Pete Boyle described the discovery process used by Lipman Hearne to develop messaging for key audiences.

• Hilton noted that leadership at all levels at UVa assume that technology will deliver more degrees at lower cost and with the same or less effort. Smith responded that a parallel assumption within the academy is that quality suffers through technology mediation of instruction. Cooper also responded, noting that in liberal arts colleges, efficiency is not discussed; the conversations center on effectiveness.

• Lassner asked where the concept of “accountability” played into the project, noting that accountability is part of the state and national dialogue. Cummings responded that accountability and transparency is implicit.

In response to the “What Is Our Audience Hearing?” slide:

• Regenstein observed that at her institution [Carnegie Mellon], the president is highly aware of and concerned about ERP costs. Maier added that another point of contention is what people say versus
what they do, frequently citing academic programs as most important, but flowing budgets to administrative systems.

- Hilton provided an example of the scholarly institute in digital humanities on his campus, where technology was first sold as an investment that would reap cost savings. The better conversation proved to be around “humanities in the digital age.” The parallel message for this project may be “education in the digital age.”

In response to the “Insights” slides:

- Dodds noted that at his university [Cornell], they do have the expectation that technology will be involved with controlling cost. Regenstein clarified the expectation is both that technology will be provided cost-efficiently and that technology solutions will help control costs across the enterprise. Dusenberry responded that their research indicates that presidents are concerned about budget, but that national organizations are not linking technology to controlling costs.

- Wheeler observed that presidents and provosts often have immature understandings of IT governance and what constitutes value and potential impact in IT.

- Stiles offered the reaction that generalizing higher education with statements such as those provided as “insights” by Lipman Hearne seems dangerous for segments such as liberal arts colleges. In response to Maier’s observation that we have a risk-averse environment, Allison suggested that IT has a role to play in promoting a change toward less risk aversion.

- Smith mentioned that presidents may rely on anecdotal data and that concerns may emerge when they contrast day-to-day technology interactions with the technology available on their campuses. Cooper elaborated, saying that a concern is that the president’s own institution will fall behind. Maier provided the phrase “an arms race” to describe this scenario.

- Lassner asserted that a key to pulling off the MTC project is to take it around from the anecdotal evidence to why technology matters and how it links to accountability, cost, and completion. He suggested that when presidents are initially attracted by a technology’s glitz factor, it is an opportunity to explain the technology’s importance in terms of increased student engagement or other impacts.

- Hilton recommended a focus on deeply embedded technology, noting that when the technology is really fundamental it creates important change. He suggested that an extreme but relevant statement might be that the world has changed and higher education has not. Scholars will say technology hasn’t affected their world, but we know that the scholarly record is now largely digital.

- Dodds recommended that there might be lessons to be harvested from the apparently sustainable success of the for-profit sector, which uses technology as the core of the student experience. Lassner concurred, noting that for-profits have set their goals and figured out how to reach them using technology, including lowering costs.

- Wheeler observed that as opposed to the Current Issues Survey top-10 list, the issues outlined in the MTC brief are what should be the basis of discussion among members of the EDUCAUSE community. Regenstein concurred, observing in addition that the measurement of impact on the mission, and in particular teaching and learning, has not been mapped well to higher education. She noted that a challenge for the CIO is that the academy may not see us as having the expertise or authority to talk about the “why.”
Oblinger asked the board to consider how best to attract the attention of college and university presidents on the role of IT in addressing strategic problems.

- Allison, citing a successful project at her institution, suggested the phase “Imagine a university where...”
- Wheeler responded that we must challenge the belief function, noting that presidents might believe that impactful technology will develop without much attention from them, leading them to minimize IT investment as a priority.
- Regenstein asked if the target audience should potentially be provosts not presidents, noting that provosts typically run the academic enterprise.
- Lassner observed that stimulating local economies is a priority not represented in the slides. He suggested that IT becomes a crucial partner when presidents understand the need for large-scale, not incremental, change.
- Dodds noted that while degree completion may be a strategic goal, at his institution, general knowledge, skills, and abilities about teaching and learning with technology are 10–15 years out of date.
- Maier suggested telling a story that resonates with leaders. He cited Harvard as a place where new leadership is reengineering how IT fits into the institution and changes the dynamics.
- Smith suggested finding out what presidents’ greatest felt needs are and explaining how technology, deeply embedded, can help.
- Wheeler noted that it is important to talk in terms of capacity (for example, the capacity to generate money). He suggested framing the conversation so that it cuts across cyberinfrastructure, teaching and learning, etc., in terms such as, “IT can expand your institutional capacity, which increases your ability to do the things you want to do.”
- Stiles noted that at his campus, many conversations are about financial aid and the discount rate. He also observed that trustees are an important audience who want to push the administration and faculty to be responsive.
- Hilton expressed concern that the project is not clearly specifying deliverables. He suggested that the audience might partition into the group that doesn’t believe that higher education requires radical change and the group that thinks dramatic change is on the horizon. For the latter, a premise might be that the fabric of inquiry and knowledge discovery has already been completely transformed by technology and that analytics is the coming wave. He cited a possible pitfall that ERPs are funded on the promise of data-driven decision making when in reality universities do not make decisions that way.
- Smith noted that California is turning away 350,000 students who are locked out from higher education right now, observing that this increases the urgency of identifying methods to improve access while controlling costs.
- Cooper observed that if presidents don’t perceive a direct threat in the IT arena, it will be harder to capture their attention.
- Dodds noted that the project may fill a void in that there is a lack of sources that university presidents can access to have a productive bilateral conversations about technology. Wheeler concurred, observing that the topics on the CIO listserv speak volumes to this point.
Oblinger concluded the conversation by noting that the project is in its formative stages and that we will keep the board apprised as it develops.

The business meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m. (MDT).

The board went into executive session at 2:00 p.m. (MDT).

The executive session ended at 2:32 p.m. (MDT).