ATTENDANCE

- **Board members attending.** *Online:* Debra Allison (Chair), Diana Oblinger (President and CEO), Joy Hatch, Bill Hogue, Bruce Maas (Treasurer), Susan Metros (Vice Chair), Laura Patterson, Tracy Schroeder, Justin Sipher (Secretary). *From the EDUCAUSE office:* Kara Freeman, Richard Northam, Randy Stiles, Brian Voss
- **Staff attending.** *Online:* Joanne Dehoney, Susan Grajek, Julie Little, Thad Lurie, Stacy Ruwe

CALL TO ORDER

Allison convened the meeting at 10:04 a.m. (ET). Oblinger acknowledged Laura Patterson’s recognition by *Government Technology* as one of the top-25 technology leaders in the nation.

CONSENT AGENDA

Voss called for a motion to approve of the consent agenda; Sipher seconded. The motion to approve the consent agenda was carried by unanimous agreement.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Oblinger updated the board on association activities for the prior trimester.

- The three keynote presenters for the 2014 annual conference have been confirmed: Clay Christensen, Doris Kearns Goodwin, and Nancy Zimpher.
- **EDUCAUSE Connect,** the redesign of the regional conference model to be highly participatory, was launched in February in Portland, Oregon.
  - Two hundred seventy-one participants and 171 institutions were represented.
  - Interactive activities were included in every session.
  - Metros closed the Portland event. Metros reported that people were engaged, connected, and paying attention. She congratulated Julie Little for taking the risk to transform the regional conference model.
  - Little reported that the evaluations show 80% satisfaction. She observed that attendees have to learn how to be active participants and that speakers have to learn how to facilitate and encourage dialogue. In response to a question, Little noted that there was a call for proposals and that the TLPD team worked with selected presenters to develop the session interactivity so that the ratio of presentation to interaction time was 1:3.
- The ELI Annual meeting was also in February.
  - Participation in the face-to-face meeting was up from 2013, with 594 registrations.
• Innovations included a video competition based on the Horizon Report, expanded badging, and remote participation via robot. Northam suggested taking the video competition concept into the annual conference.
• The virtual conference numbers were lower than anticipated, possibly because of a competing online event.

• The ECAR annual meeting was held in January in Tempe, Arizona, with a focus on research computing.

  ▪ Participation was up 19% from the last ECAR meeting, with 86 attendees.
  ▪ Grajek reported that the meeting topic and location were a good formula and that the ECAR team will be working to improve logistics at the next meeting.

• Oblinger introduced the topic of EDUCAUSE investment in policy activities to be discussed later.

• She noted that NGLC has made progress on a number of fronts.

  ▪ It received another wave of K–12 grants to expand the breakthrough schools model and build regional incubators for new models.
  ▪ The 2013 Breakthrough Models Incubator focus was on business models and return on investment (ROI). The new business model focus was introduced to the cohort in a webinar, and then individual teams received coaching and support to apply financial analysis to their projects.

• Oblinger reported that a new transmedia content format is under development to integrate story and video. Metros and several other board members showed support for the new format direction.

**FINANCIAL REPORT**

Oblinger introduced Stacy Ruwe, chief finance officer.

• Ruwe reported a positive variance of $2.6 million at 2013 budget close, due largely to salary savings and investment gains. She further noted that the association did not draw down reserves 2013 as budgeted.

  ▪ In response to the report on positive budget flow, Northam commented that we should think about messaging to the membership about increases in member fees in a climate where our reserves are healthy and increasing.
  ▪ Oblinger commented that we follow industry standards in determining membership fee increases. EDUCAUSE is following board policy by increasing reserves to our targeted level.

• Providing additional updates, Ruwe:

  ▪ Noted that she is working closely with the board treasurer, Bruce Maas.
  ▪ Directed the board’s attention to the Finance and Investments Section of the board book, noting that it includes a new report that integrates budget-to-actual and year-over-year comparisons. The purpose of the report is to better track the seasonal nature of our cash flows, which vary greatly throughout the year due to the impact of the annual conference.
  ▪ Informed the board that she has launched an effort to develop a new chart of accounts that will be rolled out in time to plan for the 2015 budget this summer.
  ▪ Reported that the fiduciary committee met. The committee adopted the IPS-investment policy statement as well as a new TIAA-CREF retirement choice platform with a much richer and broader set of asset classes
and lower overall fees. She noted that the committee is investigating evolving our program to be a safe harbor plan to eliminate some of the 5500 discrimination testing currently required.

**POLICY DISCUSSION**

Oblinger introduced a new item to the agenda: the community perception of EDUCAUSE’s ongoing and new policy activities and whether it was positive or negative. She opened the floor for discussion on the topic.

- Schroeder asked if members were made aware of the net neutrality activities. Oblinger responded that they will be reported in the policy newsletter, but were not broadcast in advance. She clarified that because policy activities are of interest to a narrower group, they often do not make it to the CIO listserv.

- Grajek described the sensitive question as the perception that EDUCAUSE has closed its “Policy Office,” when in fact it has shifted policy efforts from just staff in D.C. to a more distributed model.

- Several board members concurred that they are hearing interest in GRC and not negative messages about policy activities.

Oblinger asked if we should be more proactive.

- Voss suggested reinforcing and communicating regularly about what we are doing.

- Maas suggested a low-key Q&A approach with links to GRC on the website. Freeman, Patterson, and Hogue agreed with Maas.

- Sipher commented that the association’s policy activities and actions will speak for themselves. He suggested perhaps focusing more directly on communicating with leaders about the policy issues of strategic importance.

**GRANT ACTIVITY**

Oblinger introduced the topic of EDUCAUSE grant activity. She explained that since distributing the board book, the Gates Foundation has expressed renewed interest in pursuing an expanded postsecondary program. She reminded the board that the original goal of NGLC was to improve college readiness and completion with activities across both secondary and postsecondary education.

- Maas mentioned that Zimpher is an advocate for pre-K through postsecondary planning and suggested leveraging her keynote at EDUCAUSE 2014 as an opportunity to shine a light on the important issues spanning both sectors. He noted that the disconnect between sectors is an ongoing challenge and missed opportunity.

Oblinger highlighted the strategies for sharing information learned in the grants and in multiplying the impact of the grants and noted the similarity of those strategies to the core EDUCAUSE mission.

- Maas commented that schools of education have a role to play in the issues connected to bridging K–12 and college.

- Metros mentioned that students entering college can experience the higher education classroom as a step backwards in the use of technology. Northam and Maas concurred.
Maas and Patterson noted that engaging colleges of education is a strategy for understanding and bridging the transition issues. Patterson observed that the school of education at her institution also has been significantly engaged with K–12 on issues related to college transitions and completion.

Oblínger requested discussion about two issues, the relationship between NGLC and EDUCAUSE from a brand perspective, and how EDUCAUSE should think about the K–12 granting element if further resources are not forthcoming for the postsecondary side of NGLC.

Metros noted that it is a somewhat false line between K–12 and postsecondary, and that there are opportunities to work across the boundary. She cited examples of high school students engaging in college coursework and participating in university-sponsored programming.

Maas commented that the opportunities to work more closely with the secondary community are tremendous. He noted that NGLC has created connections to EDUCAUSE for faculty and faculty leaders, so in this way has helped brand at his institution.

Stiles observed that in higher education business models, the bridge to K–12 is critical, so it makes sense that the bridge be supported with work in the IT space.

Northam commented that the concept of lifelong learning is very strongly endorsed and supported in Australia.

Metros suggested that EDUCAUSE may have an opportunity to target school district CIOs and IT professionals as a new demographic.

Hatch commented that community colleges in general are very active with K–12—in areas such as dual enrollment and ensuring that the students get the best education they can. In fact, in Virginia all dual enrollment courses must be taught by community colleges.

Patterson mentioned that at her institution they are beginning to strategize about the lifelong learner life cycle and the pathway. She noted that the NGLC structure is strategic in that it provides entrée into both sectors.

In response to Patterson, Schroeder asked if there is a way to reshape the solid structure by recasting the grants toward the “lifelong” aspect of learning.

In response to a question from Maas, Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE materials are consumed by K–12, especially 7 Things briefs.

Schroeder asked how we can explicitly shape NGLC into something more holistic. Oblinger noted that we have not been shaping the Gates Foundation strategy, but work to shape the program within Gates-defined priority areas like breakthrough models. Schroeder commented that this might be relevant to the idea of pursuing the grants we want to do instead of the grants that are there.

In response to a question from Northam, Oblinger noted that our evidence of brand confusion between EDUCAUSE, ELI, and NGLC is anecdotal.

Hatch commented that the NGLC relationship has been positive and through the grants has raised awareness of EDUCAUSE in new sectors.
• In response to a question from Metros, Oblinger noted that the big foundations decide their directions on philanthropy and choose where they want advisement.

• Metros requested clarification on redefining the modern learning system, one of the areas in which NGLC may further engage with Gates on the postsecondary side. Oblinger responded that as an approach to transforming the technology environment for learning in higher education, Gates is seeing the potential for redefining the LMS or catalyzing the market to redefine the tool.

• Oblinger summarized the board discussion—that NGLC is a positive activity for EDUCAUSE and that the K–12 aspect is also strategic and positive.

• Sipher suggested evaluating whether involvement on the NGLC secondary side impacts EDUCAUSE capacity for higher education or higher education IT issues. He noted that if the secondary-focused activities do not undermine the association’s ability to address the needs in these traditional areas, then, in his view, contributing our expertise to the NGLC secondary portfolio is a value-add.

• In response to Sipher, Oblinger observed that in some ways NGLC augments the capacity of EDUCAUSE and in other ways it is a challenge, but she concurs with his assessment and that of the board.

---

IT INVESTMENTS

Oblinger opened discussion of IT investments in the association. She introduced Thad Lurie, the new chief operating officer, and introduced the topic of how EDUCAUSE operations will be proceeding with IT system planning, investments, and activities.

Lurie described his discovery process in investigating EDUCAUSE operations and specifically the state of IT systems and services in the association. He highlighted four areas of opportunity to automate and improve usability: in member services, in marketing, in finance, and on the website.

• In response to a question from Schroeder, Lurie confirmed that background processes relying on e-mail occur in an encrypted format.

• Metros mentioned that of all the various activities, the website is of the highest priority.

Lurie described the project to replace iMIS, the current association management system, with a more modern application system to improve event registration and processing, relationship management, secure financial integrations, and self-service. Lurie described the website project, noting that investments in Drupal 7 were not yielding the results needed and expected, and that for this reason the website project would be completely reevaluated.

• In response to a question from Freeman about timelines for the series of projects, Lurie said that the current estimates may change in early June after we have produced detailed requirements.

• Patterson suggested that the website should be reevaluated as a portal, noting that it is the front door to transactions that will occur on back-end systems.

• Board members cited web issues to be addressed as speed, search capabilities, outdated look-and-feel, and incompatibility with mobile, noting that ongoing problems with the website are frustrating and embarrassing, considering that we are a technology association. In response to a question from Oblinger, several board members concurred that the slow speed of the site was the biggest problem.
In response to a question from Stiles, Oblinger noted that we will develop a plan for communicating the web improvement plan to members.

Sipher asked if it would be possible to have a highly responsive conference web presence for the 2014 annual conference and noted that it will be detrimental to the association brand to go through another annual conference without significant progress.

Schroeder suggested parsing out the annual conference website into its own project. Lurie responded that while this idea is one under consideration, it currently appears that in the time frame, we may be more successful building the 2014 site in Drupal.

In response to a question about mobile, Lurie mentioned that we will be redesigning the web with a “mobile first” methodology.

In response to a question from Northam, Lurie confirmed that we may be outsourcing events registration to a dedicated provider.

In response to a question from Maas, Oblinger opened the question to the board of how best to achieve appropriate transparency and communication with members about the website.

Maas commented that we need a story that describes what we learned, the new path, and what brought us here. He suggested that perhaps the requirements-based approach may be a door into the communication, noting that a well-considered approach will acknowledge that certain issues have not been resolved satisfactorily at this time.

Voss suggested that we should wait until the plan is more concrete before communicating.

Allison suggested that a first part of the eventual communication would be to begin stating the overall principles that everyone can agree on to set a positive basis for the rest of the communication, and to remind members of the strategic focus.

Metros suggested that an internal case study could be useful to the community, and that the lessons learned are of value more broadly. She also suggested that if the site is redesigned, and not just made faster, the project will be more impactful and easier for the community to accept. She suggested that a design-thinking approach would also be a useful learning opportunity for the community at large.

Stiles suggested that the communication focus on the process improvements, not necessarily reconceptualization.

In response to a question from Schroeder about the risk associated with parallel projects, Lurie mentioned that this is another factor that will be fully decided after requirements gathering is complete.

Metros stressed the importance of a stabilization staffing plan once the website is completed—especially if the consultants hold the knowledge around the project.

Oblinger summarized by noting that the board is in general agreement with the proposed directions, with specific advisement that additional attention be given to project process and communications with members.

Oblinger introduced the topic of the association’s InCommon implementation. Lurie described the technical and resource challenges presented by InCommon.
• Maas noted that this is a data-driven decision, which is appropriate, and suggested that we need targeted communications to the affected members of the community.

• Northam asked if perhaps InCommon could be prevailed upon to delay the SAML v1 deprecation to provide more time for EDUCAUSE to develop its transition path and manage its messaging.

• Patterson suggested that the affected community members will be vocal—that InCommon is strategic for the community and that, given the ongoing challenges with the website, also dropping InCommon may create an overall impression of general technical incompetence in the association.

• Northam asked if InCommon would perhaps provide assistance, given how important the involvement of EDUCAUSE may be to them.

• Voss suggested that in communications, we should emphasize a temporary hiatus and that if the intention is to permanently leave InCommon, that is a different discussion. He recommended talking to Jack Seuss as a first step. Patterson concurred with Voss.

• In response to Voss, Maas noted that Seuss could be counted on to use discretion. He observed that it is well understood by IT leaders that in winding through multiple critical projects, sometimes you do have to put certain aspects on hold. He concurred with Patterson that to permanently walk back from InCommon would be a different matter, requiring deeper scrutiny.

• Sipher concurred with Patterson that the combination of the security incident, website issues, and not being able to execute on InCommon could create a negative view of the association as not being able to manage its own technology.

• Oblinger summarized the discussion that the board recognizes the challenge and acknowledges that the communication will be difficult, but suggests consulting Jack Seuss and asking InCommon to delay deprecating SAML v1.

### METATRENDS AFFECTING HIGHER EDUCATION IT

Oblinger reviewed five trends that are influencing CIOs in business and industry: challenges of scale; analytics; how technology changes work; how business value trumps IT services; and competition and control. She asked the board to discuss whether the trends are relevant to higher education and how EDUCAUSE can make the concepts relevant to members.

• Hogue observed that all the items pertain to higher education as a whole, not just IT, and influence institutions’ future.

• Voss concurred, noting that the trends may affect IT but will be more useful if framed in terms of the whole institution.

• Stiles suggested cross-checking the trends with the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) list of the top challenges for higher education.

• Schroeder suggested that the idea of CIOs having to be able to demonstrate business value describes the current state at her institution.
• Metros observed that the themes will be most valuable if expressed in terms of outcomes for higher education.

• Freeman concurred with Voss, noting that if the trends are to be useful as a communication tool with upper administration, that—while presidents do need to know about technology—the discussion has to be framed without focusing on technology.

• Maas observed that the most important function of this kind of thematic approach is to develop the community understanding of how IT aligns with the mission. He concurred that connecting themes to the AGB issues could be useful.

• Northam noted the similarity to the “Making the Case” discussion from 2011. Oblinger described the making the case framework as one that matches the top institutional challenges to potential IT strategies for addressing them.

• Schroeder noted that the material is relevant to developing CIOs, and that it could be improved by creating a context that related the grand challenges to IT enablers. She noted that a challenge is avoiding a defensive posture toward preserving the status quo.

• Oblinger summarized by saying we need to keep things in an institutional context that connects how IT can solve specific problems.

• Hogue observed that current high-level, internal assessments at institutions might include looking at, or even expanding aggressively into, new markets. He posed the question whether the CIOs should be at the table for these kinds of conversations.

• In response to Hogue, Patterson said that CIOs do need to be part of such conversations. She noted that higher education is facing the same scale of disruption as other sectors—like the recording industry and newspapers—with the paradigms for instruction and research changing. She described the central challenge as how to drive costs out while innovating how the mission is delivered.

• Hatch concurred with Patterson, noting that her institution has been “rethinking” the way to do business for the last three years and has recognized the reality that in order to do more and to be more efficient, technology is the major player.

• Oblinger said that one of the takeaways is the need to continue to press on how to have conversations with leadership and that the real value is understanding the big picture.

• Patterson said that on a personal level, she is participating in more strategic conversations as leadership has begun to recognize that technology is always part of the equation in addressing the institutional mission.

Oblinger asked the board to consider the idea of a digital engagement strategy as a tangible concept that could help convey how technology will reshape the way that people work together and the growing importance of the analytics that flow from the digital view of the campus.

• Maas responded that digital strategies often relate to scaling strategies, whether in administrative systems or for learning support, which if done right can allow funding to be channeled back into mission-based activities.
• Northam suggested that the most important role for EDUCAUSE is helping our members have a meaningful, mission-focused conversation with their leadership in a way that gets them invited back to the leadership table.

• Oblinger described a toolkit under development aimed at leaders that describes a strategic area, the forward-looking contributions of IT, and questions for leaders to consider.

• The board generally concurred that this approach could be valuable.

• Northam observed that you have just a few minutes to get your message across and that members need help developing this communication skill. He also suggested helping members build mentoring relationships with people outside IT.

• Stiles noted that the strategic topics can tie the campus together and that IT has to be at the table.

• Metros said that in general, and particularly in IT shops, there is a lack of clarity about how academia works from the admissions processes to a true understanding of the communities served by institutions, and that helping to explicate may be another area where EDUCAUSE could contribute value to members.

• Sipher described an invitation from Apple to institutional leadership that included text specifically advising leadership not to bring the CIO. He cited this as an example of how the CIO role may be perceived as not relevant or even blocking institutional strategic change.

• Oblinger thanked the board for their input, noting that we will bring forward the activities focused on providing tools directed toward leaders for explaining IT’s role in meeting the most pressing campus challenges.

### BOARD TRANSITIONS

Allison introduced the topic of the need to replace Brian Voss on the board due to his retirement. Allison thanked Brian for his excellent contributions to the board. The board members joined Allison in thanking and recognizing Brian, and Oblinger added a personal thanks to Brian for his help as an advisor and as a supportive advocate.

Allison reported that the executive committee suggests Marc Hoit of North Carolina State University as a replacement for Voss. She noted that as a nominee who stood for election in 2013, Hoit had been vetted by the board nominations committee, and further that Hoit was nearly elected in the 2013 cycle.

• In response to a question from Allison, Oblinger reminded the board that all board members can stand for reelection after a one-year wait period at the end of their current term.

• Patterson and Voss both strongly recommended Hoit.

• Allison put the motion for Hoit to replace Voss to the floor for a vote; Voss seconded. The motion to appoint Hoit to the board was carried by unanimous agreement.

The business meeting adjourned at 2:13 pm (ET).

The executive session adjourned at 2:21 pm (ET).