EDUCAUSE BOARD MEETING

OCTOBER 14, 2013—ANAHEIM, CA

ATTENDANCE

• Board members attending: Debra Allison (Chair), Diana Oblinger (President and CEO), Kara Freeman, Joy Hatch, Bill Hogue, David Lassner (Vice Chair), Bruce Maas (Treasurer), Susan Metros (Secretary), Richard Northam, Pattie Orr (by voice conference), Laura Patterson, Tracy Schroeder, Justin Sipher, Vernon Smith, Randy Stiles, Brian Voss

• Staff attending: Joanne Dehoney, Susan Grajek, Julie Little, Stacy Ruwe (afternoon only); Joanna Grama (for GRC discussions); Michelle McIrvin (for financial discussions)

CALL TO ORDER

Allison convened the meeting at 8:37 a.m. (PT).

CONSENT AGENDA

Allison called for a motion to approve the consent agenda; Sipher seconded. The consent agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

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

• The EDUCAUSE annual conference:
  ▪ Had exceeded its attendance and revenue goals.
  ▪ The Hawkins Leadership Roundtable and the CIO coaching program are “sold out.”
  ▪ The 2012 virtual conference received an award; it will reach thousands of people this year.
  ▪ Learning theater competitions include the Breakthrough Models Competition and other high-energy events.
  ▪ The conference is becoming a destination for other conferences (conference within a conference), relieving pressure on travel: SURF Foundation, AXIES, and Internet2 are examples this year.
  ▪ Corporate presence at the conference has grown to 270 exhibitors this year. Oblinger noted that while the exhibit hall is the most profitable piece of conference, the association strives to achieve the correct balance of corporate participation.

• Little reported on the Breakthrough Models Academy, in which 12 cross-institutional teams have been developing new programs and service models for a competition that will take place at the conference. Up to three teams will be awarded cash and educational opportunities.
• Oblinger described “higher education in the connected age” activities for 2013, noting that Tracy Schroeder was a 2013 Sprint speaker—our biggest online event ever. She commented that other groups are adopting approaches that we have pioneered, like digital visual recording at this year’s Sprint.
• Oblinger reported on the Future of Administrative IT projects, which began this trimester with an expert panel and the launch of a joint EDUCAUSE/National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) working group.
• Oblinger provided an update on the association’s grant activities, noting the recently received Lumina grant to develop our portfolio on institutional productivity. She observed that our funding derives from multiple foundations and that these relationships increase EDUCAUSE’s access to thought leaders from diverse sectors and our ability to bring those connections back to the membership.
• Oblinger informed the board that EDUCAUSE is partnering with the SecuriCORE initiative, and that our initial contribution will be one FTE for one year.
• Maas provided a report on behalf of the audit committee.
  - The audit committee reported that Quatt Associates prepared an executive compensation benchmarking report, which recommended that EDUCAUSE not exceed 75% of market for executive compensation.
    - The audit committee recommended that the board endorse and approve the proposed Quatt guidelines.
    - Maas moved to approve the Quatt framework; Smith seconded. Allison called for discussion.
    - In response to questions, Oblinger clarified that the cat recommendation pertains to full compensation, including benefits, and that EDUCAUSE is currently within the guideline. She also noted that if a situation arose concerning compensation outside the guidelines, the executive committee of the board would be consulted in advance. She clarified that EDUCAUSE does not have a pay-for-performance compensation methodology in place.
    - Freeman observed that the Quatt framework is consistent with what she sees on other boards.
    - Allison called for a vote; the motion passed by unanimous consent.
• The audit committee reported on an aspect of the results of the 5500 audit.
  - The management letter includes a “significant deficiency” based on the fact that the audit firm created aspects of the financial report that serves as input to the audit process, instead of EDUCAUSE or a third party fully preparing the report. The audit committee recommends that EDUCAUSE prepare the materials for the next 5500 audit.
  - Next year, the audit committee will request that the audit firm prepare a report and review it with the audit committee in advance of issuing final letters.
• The audit committee noted that this is the first time that the current committee has served together and observed that because the issues are complex, continuity of service is valuable.

In response to a question, McIrvin clarified that to respond to the matter raised in the 5500 audit report, EDUCAUSE could use a third party to prepare the financial report, as long as it was not connected to the auditing firm.
Oblinger introduced a resolution to form a retirement investment plan committee. She explained that McIrvin has been the interface to the association’s retirement plan offering, but that it should be overseen by a committee established for the purpose, typically consisting of the CEO, treasurer, director of finance or CFO, and human resources manager. Oblinger noted that the language in the resolution would be amended to reflect that the roles cited were recommended, not required.

- Maas supported the idea of the board treasurer participating.
- Schroeder noted that at her institution they are changing their governance of retirement options and consolidating options, and asked if this group would be providing comparable oversight functions. McIrvin responded that this would be the case, in conjunction with a third-party firm that specializes in such matters.
- Voss requested that the language resolution be clarified to indicate that fiduciary responsibility lies with the board. The board concurred.
- Voss moved that with the proposed amendments to clarify committee membership and board fiduciary responsibility, the resolution be approved. Northam seconded. The resolution was approved by unanimous consent.

**2014 PRIORITIES**

Oblinger opened the discussion on the topic of priorities by clarifying that the priorities relate to innovation and change, and that the majority of the association’s ongoing work in conferences and content continues.

- She described the first two priority areas for 2014 as:
  
  - Building the Profession, including building the reputation of the profession, building the effectiveness of the profession with necessary data and analysis tools, and providing professional development such as resources to support the CIO pipeline.
  - IT as a Game Changer, including continuing development of the idea of higher education in the connected age, a focus on new business models, and the future of administrative systems.

Oblinger requested discussion.

- Schroeder proposed terminology in the Game Changers priority such as “building awareness of new models and the ability to enable them.” Oblinger concurred.
- In a brief conversation about messaging, Stiles supported the focus on competency-based models and IT as an enabler. Allison responded that the challenge is finding language that expresses the proactive nature of the initiative, noting that “enabler” is too soft and “driving demand” is too aggressive. Schroeder added that the word “partnership” is perhaps overused and suggested the term “co-create.” Sipher observed the importance of communicating appropriately so that expectations are set neither too high nor too low, with attention to fit and alignment of what campuses and in particular IT leaders could or should do. Stiles recommended that EDUCAUSE review the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) material on strategic issues facing higher education for sample language. Oblinger added that another angle to consider is how we collaborate with other organizations like the American Council on Education (ACE) and NACUBO.

Oblinger described the third strategic area, “Foundations,” as encompassing internal continuous improvement efforts designed to gain efficiency and quality in association functions. She cited a number of related activities,
including a continuing focus on speedily connecting members to resources, expanding membership, becoming a data-led organization, and diversifying revenue sources.

- Hogue observed that if EDUCAUSE models the process of becoming a data-led organization, it will be useful to the member institutions as they evolve toward data-informed decision making and away from anecdotal decision making based narrowly in personal experience. In response, Stiles mentioned that EDUCAUSE analytics resources have been useful to him in communicating with campus leaders, and further cited Sloan as a source of helpful resources.
- Metros commented on the continued focus on the EDUCAUSE website, suggesting that it should include continual evaluation of content as well as navigation improvements.
- Northam suggested that the Foundations objective to expand membership could be reworded to focus on member value rather than on the marketing aspect of expanding membership. Oblinger added that both are important, as EDUCAUSE can improve its communication of member value through outreach. Schroeder suggested combining concepts with wording such as “campaigns that broaden member awareness of member value.” Smith noted that the task concerns explaining both who EDUCAUSE is and why institutions should engage.
- Responding to Metros, Schroeder commented that the best navigation is arguably good search and that perfecting information architecture can be time-consuming.
- Hogue returned to the membership conversation, noting that there is growth for EDUCAUSE in other areas of the college/university, such as student affairs and faculty. Schroeder suggested that faculty could be a potential audience for the conference within a conference approach. Stiles added that EDUCAUSE brings cross-sector value through programs like ELI and the Future of Administrative IT (FAIT) that appeal to cabinet members and trustees.

Voss moved that the board endorse the strategic directions. Sipher seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

### BUDGET

Oblinger opened discussion of the proposed 2014 budget. She noted that the budget is consistent with past EDUCAUSE budgets. As in the past, it includes a proposed 2% dues increase for institutional and corporate members.

- Freeman confirmed that this increase is consistent with other associations. The board discussed the proposed dues increase and recommended a 2% increase for institutional members and a 4% increase for corporate members.

Oblinger reported that membership dues for ELI and ECAR will not increase. Also, conference registration fees will rise 1.5% (to 3%), consistent with the market.

- Grajek commented that in 2014, ECAR will begin leveraging the foundation built over the past three years. New products and services will include maturity indices and deployment indices related to measuring outputs, customized benchmarking reports, and custom data analysis.
- Maas suggested that providing a wide range of value-add services enhances the EDUCAUSE reputation as the place to go for answers related to the strategic value of IT.
Little reported that ELI membership is increasing 6–8% year over year, with an 8% increase this year. In 2014, ELI will focus on helping CIOs understand and communicate teaching and learning issues. As the impacts and results from NGLC investment emerge, ELI will translate and disseminate them.

Oblinger summarized the 2014 budgeted expenses, noting that:

- Salaries and benefits are within association best practice at approximately 50% of budgeted expenses. Budgeted expenses include a 3% merit pool increase for staff.
- The association is proposing 2.5 new positions to support the administrative computing project and the move to a modern customer relationship management system.
- Expenses include a budgeted loss of $1.5 million, primarily due to $1.1M in depreciation for the Louisville office and the website. The association will cover the loss from the reserves if necessary, although EDUCAUSE will strive to make up the budgeted loss operationally, and has succeeded in this for several years.
  - Maas confirmed that EDUCAUSE budgets extremely conservatively. In response, Oblinger observed that the association has been consistently increasing its operational reserves to the board-approved goal after adjusting the goal after the 2008 economic downturn. Stiles clarified that the board can approve measures to spend reserves if warranted.

Oblinger concluded the overview of the 2014 budget by highlighting a proposed capital budget for IT equipment.

Northam motioned to approve the budget with the recommended change to raise corporate dues to 4%; Stiles seconded. Allison asked for final discussion.

- In response to a question from Sipher, Oblinger clarified that we are not making a specific budget request related to the website now, but may come forward with a plan next year.

The motion to approve the budget was approved unanimously.

**BOARD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELECTIONS**

The board elected the 2014 officers:

- Debi Allison—President
- Susan Metros—Vice Chair
- Bruce Maas—Treasurer
- Justin Sipher—Secretary
Oblinger introduced the topic of the system membership category and its terms and provisions related to voting in board elections.

- Oblinger summarized the history, benefits, and participation in the “system membership” option. Institutions within a state system, community college district, or multicampus system that choose to join under a system membership receive member discounts (e.g., for conferences) as constituent institutions of the system. However, the membership is held by the system office, not the constituent institutions.
- She explained that under the terms of the bylaws, only a member institution, in this case the system, not individual constituent institutions under a system, can vote in board elections. She noted that every year one or two members ask about this provision.
- Oblinger speculated that the confusion arises because EDUCAUSE extends member discounts (e.g., registering at the member rate for the annual conference versus registering at the nonmember rate) to constituent institutions within a system. Another factor may be that at the request of system members, EDUCAUSE bills constituent institutions directly for their portion of the system membership dues.
- Oblinger described options including allowing all constituent members to vote, removing the system discount, prorating votes for systems, or leaving the current system in place.

Oblinger opened the floor for discussion.

- In response to a question from Smith, Oblinger clarified that any institution currently part of a system may choose to join as an individual member with full voting rights.
- Smith observed that from the perspective of his prior experience at Maricopa Community College District, with the available remedy of individual membership in place, the time required to redo the system membership option would not be warranted.
- Voss agreed with Smith, adding that when you start to unravel the membership options, it becomes more complex, and that he doubts extensive analysis would help. He further suggested that if voting is a strong priority, the additional cost is not that significant.
- Hatch agreed with Voss that redoing the system membership option is not a priority, noting that the current system membership option does provide value to many institutions that would not join at all were it not for the reduced costs of system membership.

Lassner moved that EDUCAUSE should not pursue the idea of changing the dues structure and voting rights. Patterson seconded. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

- Schroeder commented that as a member of a large private institution, she supports the idea of public institutions having access to a discount. She concurred that further attention to this matter would produce no strategic benefit.
- Voss recommended that as questions from members about voting rights of system members emerge, they be forwarded to the board chair.
Oblinger introduced a discussion of the proposed plan for the Governance, Risk, and Compliance (GRC) program.

Grajek introduced Joanna Grama, the EDUCAUSE staff person leading the GRC program. Grajek described the vision for the program as positioning EDUCAUSE as the go-to place for higher education IT GRC.

Grama reported that the plan for building the program includes two strands, one a set of quick wins to be accomplished within the existing resource base and the other building out the program long term. She noted that EDUCAUSE will not be asking for new resources in 2014 as we plan and determine what’s needed. She mentioned a number of GRC deliverables for 2014, including:

- Releasing a major research study
- Devoting an issue of EDUCAUSE Review to GRC
- Expanding the focus of the current EDUCAUSE Policy newsletter to include GRC topics
- Organizing existing resources for discoverability
- Creating new discussion groups
- Identifying role models for IT governance
- Forming an advisory group
- Publishing ECAR research bulletins
- Creating an IT governance maturity index

Grama cited IT governance as an identified gap area that will form the initial focus of the program, followed by an attention to risk management frameworks. She noted that the proposed 2014 deliverables are the minimum, and that there are other opportunities; for example, mapping GRC models to higher education from other sectors.

Oblinger opened the topic for discussion.

- Metros observed that at her institution, the GRC organization and staff are not located in the IT area and that part of the challenge will be integrating with campus GRC efforts. Grama added that IT staff sometimes do not understand the campus environment, and GRC teams sometimes do not understand the significant IT risks. EDUCAUSE will partner with groups such as the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA) as one approach.
- Stiles observed that risk is a hot topic on presidential radars at both Colorado College and Grinnell College, and recommended a book on GRC and data protection by David Hill.
- Sipher recommended addressing the business aspects of the program up front to be sure it is sustainable, but with an eye toward access and equity. In response to Sipher, Grajek asked the board for feedback on the idea of a content access model similar to ECAR or ELI.
  - Sipher commented that while it is not ideal for good resources to be held back, a sustainable business model is crucial.
  - Hatch commented that institutions require GRC capability to avoid critical failure. She advocated offering an openly available resource to provide a consistent baseline of knowledge, and suggested that services could be fee-based.

- Patterson observed that in the Leadership Institute this year, a surprising number of participants came from campuses without a chief information security officer, and that many are overwhelmed just meeting minimum
security, risk, and governance practices. She concurred on the need for a base set of resources and suggested that a shared services model could be another opportunity to explore.

- In response to a question from Voss, Grajek noted that CDS currently does not track governance structures.
- Schroeder suggested producing an infographic in 2014 to educate people on GRC basics, such as how enterprise risk management and GRC relate to IT security, including technology solutions.
- Oblinger observed that the education effort would likely span other campus constituents as well.
- Maas agreed with Schroeder, noting that it is difficult to move the conversation beyond IT security and that there is an opportunity to partner with NACUA and NACUBO to develop definitive resources. He commented that if staff can quantify risk better, it helps him garner support for their programs.
- Patterson identified the concept of privacy as a potentially important component of the program. Hogue concurred that privacy is an important topic and observed that positioning it as a superset or subset of compliance is a question. Stiles highlighted the interconnections among privacy risks, cloud computing, and analytics. Grama acknowledged the complexities, observing that privacy and also information security (infosec) fit in all three areas, saying that GRC encompasses infosec, privacy, and more.
- Lassner suggested the desirability of the EDUCAUSE IT GRC recommendations becoming the accepted gold standard methodology for how IT is handled in the context of enterprise GRC. He recommended growing the program within the budget and existing resources until ready to spin off, and concurred with Patterson that the spin-off could involve a shared service.
- Sipher noted that trustees often come from the corporate world, where risk definitions are different, and suggested the value of providing a higher education context for them.
- Voss observed that in security risk and compliance regulations drive standards, but that governance depends on general institutional culture, so it may be more particular. Grajek responded that an approach might be to identify multiple models while providing context for understanding success for the models.

Oblinger summarized the discussion of the plan, noting general board agreement with the proposal and the suggestions to revisit the positioning of security and privacy, and to define the framework with an infographic. She concurred with the principle of keeping the program and resources as affordable as possible to members, and asked the board to further consider possible business models.

- Smith suggested that a first basic tier be available, but to be credentialed, there would be a fee.
- Schroeder suggested that a group of founding members with more advanced practice could perhaps help fund, noting benefits to the founding members would be reputational, but would have to be defined further. Smith extended Schroeder’s suggestion, observing that institutions on the ground floor of defining a standard mitigate their own risks by influencing the standard.
- Stiles suggested that a regional accreditation model could pertain. Schroeder suggested a related possibility for EDUCAUSE could be performing a matchmaker function for peer review.

Oblinger asked the board to consider international implications.

- Northam responded that the same issues impact at least the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand. He suggested that there could be value in exploring the accreditation/peer review idea with UK partners. Maas concurred that the UK in particular has potentially relevant experience setting up standards.
- Grajek commented that the community needs standards and certification and that maybe GRC can be an initial test of related business models for the association.
- Northam suggested that the program team review the model provided by Skills Frame for the Information Age (SFIA).
Oblinger asked the board to consider whether Governance, Risk, and Compliance—GRC—is the best name for the program.

- Maas observed that using accepted terms is always a good choice. Schroeder concurred, observing that Enterprise Risk Management is too high, information security is too low, and that GRC is appropriately in the middle.
- Northam suggested one change, to “IT GRC.”

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR EDUCAUSE

Oblinger introduced the first in a series of discussions on future directions for EDUCAUSE. She framed the discussion by reviewing association growth in terms of indicators the association monitors, including:

- **Membership**—highlighting community college, international, and corporate growth. Oblinger commented that the association currently does not work toward specified membership growth targets.
- **Conferences and events**—number of events and participation numbers, and the shift from onsite to online events.
- **The EDUCAUSE Annual Conference**—which continues to grow in participation, revenue, and profit.
- **Overall fiscal growth**—highlighting the rapid growth in grant funding.
- **Content and publications**—growth, innovation, and move toward video and multimedia.

All these factors have trended positively since 2007. She also provided a five-year view of the growth of innovation in the association, including major initiatives like Next Generation Learning Challenges, the Connect events, growth in data and analytics services for members, and numerous improvements to the annual conference.

Oblinger posed questions for board discussion:

- Does EDUCAUSE need to move beyond its current business model, which currently relies on dues, conferences, and corporate support? Will those dollars continue?
- What do we want to be known for? She noted that our strengths are currently conferences and content, not services.
- What needs should catalyze new service offerings?

She observed that depending on the analysis, EDUCAUSE may be on the line between leading and being considered middle of the pack. She suggested that possibilities for new models include service models, customization, or credentialing.

- Sipher recommended that in planning for the future, a focus on what the profession needs would ultimately benefit members. Northam agreed.
- Stiles suggested that the current website organization around ELI, infrastructure, policy, and security is a strong model for future areas of attention and also that data, research, and analytics cut across all three domains. He supported all three potential new lines of service Oblinger cited, and suggested that the association look into models for accrediting institutional IT services. He noted that all campuses perform external reviews and that the opportunity may be to formalize and give a home in EDUCAUSE for relevant review processes. Northam concurred, adding that it is important to be the body that both sets standards and evaluates against standards.
• Schroeder supported the strategy of advancing the profession. She suggested the association look into developing a shared standard for an ITIL service catalog for higher education, noting that nothing is gained by each campus inventing its own and that the resource could provide a useful foundation for CDS, metrics, and benchmarking. She also suggested that another opportunity could be developing a data model and data dictionary for higher education, noting that each institution is developing its own and that it is a long and costly process. Grajek clarified that CDS has based its domains on a review of campus IT service models.

• Northam commented that CAUDIT spent five to six years developing a reference IT service catalog, so the endeavor does require a long-term view. He noted that ITIL provides a common language, which is valuable. He added that there is a related business opportunity in consulting, as it is hard to find ITIL practitioners that know higher education.

• Northam cautioned that in general in considering new business models, EDUCAUSE should take into account membership’s appetite for the pace of change.
  
  ▪ Oblinger asked if the board thought the level of change and innovation within the association was already close to the border of member appetite for change.
  ▪ Metros noted that she prefers to focus on the concept of evolution and unmet needs rather than change. She recommended that the association focus on penetrating more deeply into institutions, suggesting that students, faculty, and deans could all benefit.

• Voss suggested that EDUCAUSE is known today for real expertise and that he would like to see this expertise recognized by boards, presidents, and provosts. He would like senior academic leaders to turn to EDUCAUSE for insight, as an external and credible source of expertise. He offered a vision for EDUCAUSE of being known in three to five years as much for being the authoritative voice about IT issues as for conferences and content.

• Smith concurred with Voss, adding that we have to move beyond content and conferences because of the needs of the profession. He observed that an essential component of professionalization is creating standards and credentials. He noted that EDUCAUSE is already authoritative and has natural infrastructure components for credentialing already in place, like badging. He noted the importance of relationships with other bodies that can recognize EDUCAUSE’s authority, such as NACUBO. Smith stated that in three to five years, he would like the EDUCAUSE stamp of approval to be a recognized standard, and he suggested moving forward initially with standards and certifications.

• Freeman added that through her work with the American Council on Education (ACE), she hears from presidents that they don’t know who to go to for information about IT. She noted that opportunities exist related to personal professional development. In response, Smith suggested that demand for training and certification in EDUCAUSE domain areas may exist among non-IT personnel, for example faculty.

• Sipher mentioned that EDUCAUSE is trusted as a “community of ourselves” and also as a powerful brand, and cautioned that in pursuing new lines of service we must continue the activities that have made the brand so effective. Voss added that we have to keep in mind the balance of “go” versus “stop and listen.”

• Stiles suggested that in three to five years, all higher education institutions should understand that technology is a major piece of the puzzle for addressing the major challenges of higher education. He suggested that EDUCAUSE should be the place that leads that conversation, and the leaders of EDUCAUSE be recognized as the thought leaders in this space. He reported that in a recent Association of Governing Boards report on higher education trends, seven of the top-ten issues related to technology, and he encouraged EDUCAUSE not to shy away from the major issues of concern to presidents and boards. In response to Stiles, Oblinger noted that AGB has come a long way in five years in their interest in technology issues, which previously they did not address.
• Northam reported that in his current role working with researchers, he hears skepticism about campus IT services and often encounters the belief that IT people do not know how to support researchers. He recommended investigating and modeling on the approaches of other successful associations and suggested as an example the Professional Associations Research Network (PARN). Oblinger agreed, noting that we consult and learn from the ASAE (American Society of Association Executives).
• Allison observed that the discussion is exactly parallel to the pressures on CIOs, who are being asked to be more than about IT.
• Metros offered three suggestions for further exploration: (1) that perhaps authors could play a role as consultants, having already been vetted through their contribution; (2) that EDUCAUSE might look at Sloan-C, which has a certification for instructional technologists; and (3) that EDUCAUSE could investigate potential partnerships with institutions on certifications, for example, a “leadership and IT” program aligned with an MBA program.
• Lassner suggested that another value in developing and offering consulting by EDUCAUSE experts or members is that the institutional investment in a consulting engagement becomes an investment in the EDUCAUSE community. Peer reviewers will learn things that help them, and they will share those back with the community through writing, speaking, and service. Voss and Stiles agreed, and Stiles mentioned the parallel to accreditation.

Oblinger summarized key points of the discussion:

• That the future is about the needs of the profession as well as the needs of members.
• EDUCAUSE does need to go beyond content and conferences as a fundamental model.
• The process is about understanding and anticipating where higher education is going and how IT is changing.

• Schroeder suggested that members and other potential customers may not know what they don’t know, so the research process may be more oriented toward focus groups than surveys. She also observed that IT leaders often do not realize that peer review is an option.
• Hogue suggested including people from other functional areas in any assessments for building new EDUCAUSE programs. Metros agreed, citing students and faculty.
• Smith suggested that high-quality consulting at somewhat lower cost will be attractive.
• Metros and Schroeder observed that commercial consulting firms bring frameworks. Patterson concurred, adding that commercial consulting firms have another important advantage, that they have credibility among campus senior leaders as being impartial. She cited one challenge to be overcome is skepticism from deans and others toward members of the IT community providing strategic recommendations related to IT. Smith suggested that a diversity of perspectives on the team could mitigate this.
• Maas observed that accreditation teams often both require and lack a team member with solid IT experience and credentials, and that another opportunity for EDUCAUSE may be to help place members on accreditation teams.

Oblinger described the path for the next meeting as a further exploration about what is happening in higher education and the role of IT and identifying partners with an eye toward trust, credibility, and context. She requested final comments.

• Schroeder mentioned that ECAR provides a foundation for all the work discussed.
• Sipher mentioned the importance of maintaining quality. For example, if we are brokering consultants, evaluators, or other expertise, a bad customer experience could negatively impact the EDUCAUSE reputation.
• Oblinger observed that the original mission of the association, *advancing higher education through the use of information technology*, provides positioning that we can use to take us into this new arena. She noted that a prior EDUCAUSE initiative, Making the Case, may have new relevance.

• In response to a comment from Sipher, Oblinger explained that EDUCAUSE monitors possible activities related to research computing as an area of focus, but has not so far had the capacity for expanding it.

• Schroeder suggested that there may be a revenue opportunity in a tool that helps IT leaders and staff browse and find vendors in particular service areas.

  ▪ Oblinger responded that prior EDUCAUSE exploration in this area reveals that it is complicated to balance quality of information, openness, etc.
  ▪ Northam commented that CAUDIT implemented a similar “online marketplace” service based on charging vendors to participate.
  ▪ Metros added that a buyers’ consortium model can be extremely beneficial, citing the Apollo Group “balloon.com,” which analyzes a LinkedIn profile for gaps and suggests remediation.
  ▪ Grajek commented that CDS is building its data set on vendors.
  ▪ Schroeder suggested that a crowdsourcing approach may be possible.

Oblinger concluded the discussion with the commitment to summarize and synthesize potential directions for the February board meeting.

The business meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. (PT).

The executive session began at 2:45 and adjourned at 3:41 p.m. (PT).