EDUCAUSE Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
July 28, 2009
Boulder, Colorado

Board members attending: Jerry Campbell, Joel Cooper, Ted Dodds, James Hilton, Lucinda Lea (chair), Thomas Maier (secretary), Marilyn McMillan, Tracy Mitrano (vice chair), Diana Oblinger (ex officio), Carrie Regenstein (treasurer), Kathleen Santora, Brad Wheeler

Staff members attending: Jarret Cummings, Garth Jordan, Richard Katz, Michelle McIrvin (participated in the financial report) (Note: Staff members participating in the project overview session are identified in that section.)

Guests attending: Mary Beth Baker, strategic consultant (participated in the corporate strategy session via teleconference)

Call to Order
Lea called the meeting to order at 7:37 a.m., MDT.

Approval of the Minutes
Lea asked for edits to the minutes of the prior meeting. Hearing none, she made the following motion, which was seconded by Campbell and approved by acclamation:

Motion—That the minutes from the May 12, 2009, EDUCAUSE board meeting be approved.

President’s Report
• Oblinger noted that the recognition committee has developed a series of recommendations for improving the awards process.
  ○ The recommendations include a suggestion about possibly adding an award to recognize the accomplishments of newer members.
  ○ Oblinger mentioned that the executive team will consider the suggestion and share its thinking with the board.
  ○ Santora noted that the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA) offers a “First Decade Award” to recognize newer members; she proposed that EDUCAUSE consider establishing a similar honor to highlight the accomplishments of up-and-coming leaders in the profession.
• Oblinger also reported that EDUCAUSE will not have a clear picture of membership figures until the fall, but membership renewals are slightly ahead of the pace for 2008; as of the meeting, EDUCAUSE had 85 more organizations as members than at the same time the previous year.
• On the proposed 2010 value statement about innovation, Oblinger noted that edits had been made based on board feedback; she requested any final suggestions by September 1.

Financial Report
• McIrvin requested board action on the following motion, which Lea moved, McMillan seconded, and the board approved by acclamation:

  Motion: Resolved that Garth Jordan, vice president, operations, of EDUCAUSE, is authorized to sell, assign, and transfer EDUCAUSE investments held and managed by FISN and to execute any and all instruments necessary, proper, or desirable for this purpose. All transactions must be executed in accordance with EDUCAUSE investment policies and procedures.

• McIrvin asked for review and discussion of the association’s proposed IRS Form 990 policy. Santora proposed and the board agreed to a revision to the draft based on language NACUA has incorporated in its Form 990 policy on the review process for the policy.
• McIrvin noted that she would revise the policy as recommended, after confirming the change with the association’s auditors.
McIrvin requested board action on the following motions, which Maier moved, Santora seconded, and the board approved by acclamation:

*Motion: That an annual review and approval of the most current Form 990 is required by the board prior to filing with the IRS.*

*Motion: That the 2008 Form 990 has been reviewed and is approved for filing with the IRS.*

Also on the Form 990 discussion, Santora advised the board that the executive committee of the board should keep minutes of its meetings and post them publicly, particularly when the committee takes action on behalf of the board, so that EDUCAUSE can formulate a more complete response to the Form 990 in future years.

It was noted that, as with a meeting of the board as a whole, it is appropriate for the executive committee to move into executive session when addressing personnel actions.

McIrvin informed the board of the August 15 deadline for the 2008 Form 990 submission.

**Statements of Financial Position**

McIrvin noted the following variances:

- The market value of EDUCAUSE’s short- and long-term investments is $257,000 (2.08%) lower through May 2009 as compared to May 2008. McIrvin highlighted the First Internet Securities Network (FISN) charts in the meeting materials, which illustrate that FISN is following the investment parameters set by the association.
- Accounts payable were $330,000 lower at the five-month mark for the year due to a timing difference in the receipt of hotel invoices.
- Deferred revenue increased by $350,000 due in large part to annual conference registration starting in April this year as opposed to June last year.

**Statement of Activities: Budget versus Reforecast**

The net loss for the first five months of this year is $600,000 less than the reforecast budget amount of $1.1 million—several smaller amounts comprise this difference:

- Timing variances in the incurrence of various expenses
- Lower-than-budgeted food and beverage costs for regional and specialty conferences
- Lower than estimated printing costs due to changes in the economy
- No draw on budgeted reserves
- A 1.5% unrealized gain in the market value of investments
- Increased dues income due to 85 new members

**Statement of Activities: Two-Year Comparative**

- The net loss through the first five months of 2009 is $460,000 lower than that through the first five months of 2008; this is attributable to a few items:
  - Timing variances in the incurrence of various expenses
  - No expenses for the Grand Challenges program, which was discontinued after 2007
  - Reduced travel, food and beverage, and miscellaneous expenses
  - A 1.5% unrealized gain in investment market valuation at this point in 2009, as compared to a 2.5% unrealized loss at this point in 2008
- Operational losses for the first five months of both years are roughly the same at $720,000—while operational revenues are down by about $448,000 in 2009, operational expenses have declined about the same amount without impacting overall organizational productivity.
- In response to a question, McIrvin noted that annual conference expenses are recorded as the association incurs them throughout the year, but registration revenue is deferred until the conference takes place, leading to the disparity between annual conference revenue and expenses shown in the statement of activities for the first five months of the year.
- The board once again thanked McIrvin for her excellent work.
Staff Overviews of Major Projects

- Oblinger welcomed the following staff to the meeting to present project overviews on behalf of their departments:
  - Victoria Fanning, Director, Conference and Educational Activities Services (CEAS)
  - Catherine Yang, Senior Director, EDUCAUSE, and Teddy Diggs, Publisher/Editor, EDUCAUSE Review
  - Rodney Petersen, Interim Head, EDUCAUSE Washington Office
  - Ron Yanosky, Deputy Director and Senior Fellow, EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR)
  - Carie Page, Program Administrator, and Holly Fowler, Research Assistant, EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative (ELI)
  - Lisa Gesner, Director, Marketing Communications, and Marge Gammon, Marketing Consultant
- Fanning began by highlighting the mechanisms for communication and collaboration EDUCAUSE provides to its program committees, including a new ProjectSpaces collaboration site.
- Fanning also noted the new ways in which CEAS is supporting communication and engagement among and for conference attendees, including the use of Twitter and other microblogging applications for communications backchannels.
- Fanning pointed to the significant increase in conference satisfaction reported by 2009 event participants as evidence of the positive impact these new methods are having on members’ conference experiences.
- Yang and Diggs presented for the EDUCAUSE “content team.”
  - Yang reported that the team has been working to increase the focus and coordination on EDUCAUSE 2009 key themes (openness, sustainability, and the economic downturn) across all content channels.
  - Yang discussed the wide range of content EDUCAUSE has produced across all channels in relation to the themes, as well as the over 100,000 page views the content has generated so far this year.
  - Diggs noted the expansion of the 7 Things You Should Know About… series from teaching and learning with technology issues to higher education technology issues in general.
  - Diggs also discussed the coordination between EDUCAUSE Review and EDUCAUSE Quarterly (EQ) on how the publications address the association’s key themes at different levels, with the Review emphasizing strategic perspectives and EQ focusing on practitioner issues.
  - Diggs reported on the 2009 awards received by the Review and plans to promote those honors in highlighting the value of the magazine as an information source for the community.
  - In response to a question, Diggs noted that advertising revenue for the Review has declined only 5–7% this year, which is much better than for many similar publications. The decline has been offset by online advertising revenue.
  - Yang discussed the EDUCAUSE key themes for 2010—the future of higher education, student engagement, and cloud computing. She also reported that the content team will move to systematize the key themes development process in 2010 so that it is a regular part of the team’s operations.
  - Oblinger emphasized that the content team’s work responds to member feedback about EDUCAUSE focusing, truly delving into meaningful issues, and not trying to be all things to all people.
  - In response to a question, Oblinger noted that the strategic/tactical split between EDUCAUSE Review and EQ has always been a part of the association’s publications strategy, but the distinction might not have been sufficiently established in the past.
  - The board recommended that further efforts be made to communicate the different emphases of the association’s magazines moving forward.
- Petersen reviewed policy and legal issues related to cloud computing as well as current and proposed EDUCAUSE initiatives in the field.
  - He suggested that it might be best to think about cloud computing in terms of IT sourcing, focusing on the different levels at which functions and needs could be met within the institution as well as through institutional collaborations or outsourcing to third parties.
  - Petersen also noted that considering cloud computing policy and legal issues helps with illustrating some of the activities the EDUCAUSE Washington Office is pursuing, because the issues cut across a variety of governmental levels and policy areas.
○ Petersen highlighted Washington Office efforts in relevant areas:
  ▪ Awareness and outreach
    • A Policy@EDU column in EDUCAUSE Review, “Cloud Computing: ‘Be Prepared’”
    • A NACUBO Annual Conference session, “Partly Cloudy: What a CBO Should Know About Cloud Computing”
    • EDUCAUSE/Cornell Institute for Computer Policy and Law sessions
      o “The Tower and the Cloud: Higher Education in the Age of Cloud Computing”
      o “Policies for Computing in the Cloud”
      o “Outsourcing E-Mail: Technology and Policy Issues”
  ▪ Working group deliberations
    • The EDUCAUSE/Internet2 Security Task Force’s work on policy and legal issues to inform and support potential institutional cloud computing initiatives
    • The Net@EDU Identity Management Working Group’s efforts to address identity and access management issues essential to enabling cloud services in higher education
  ▪ Development of a cloud computing policy project plan with the following structure:
    • Phase One: Information collection (e.g., the Cloud Computing Policy Resource Page http://www.educause.edu/Resources/Browse/CloudComputingPolicy/35559)
    • Phase Two: Identification of issues (e.g., creation of a key issues checklist for institutions considering cloud computing initiatives)
    • Phase Three: Identification and development of solutions
  ▪ Yanosky presented a sample of 2009 ECAR studies for which data is available.
    ○ He began with data on social networking from the 2009 student study; he noted that social networking had mostly been a youth activity until recently, with use by older audiences now increasing significantly.
    ○ Yanosky also discussed data on student handheld devices—51% of respondents have Internet-capable handheld devices, but most aren’t using that capability due to the expense of data plans. However, 74% expect their use of the Internet on handheld devices to increase.
    ○ Yanosky reviewed data from the ECAR study on sourcing alternatives, which show that major changes in sourcing haven’t emerged since ECAR’s study a few years ago. However, 25% of responding institutions are now outsourcing student e-mail to Gmail and other cloud providers.
    ○ In response to a question, Yanosky noted that student use of computers to access library information is very high, but that activity hasn’t migrated to handhelds to this point, perhaps because libraries may not have adjusted their content for mobile devices yet.
    ○ Yanosky indicated that results from ECAR’s data management study show a general concern among respondents about a “data deluge” driven more by the variety of data than data volume.
    ○ He reported that institutions generally feel they are doing a good job with data security, but not with data quality or maximizing the value of analytical tools to generate management information.
    ○ Yanosky discussed ECAR’s “green IT” study, which showed:
      ▪ Most responding institutions are still struggling with the effects of the economic downturn.
      ▪ Most senior IT leaders responding have a significant role in campus sustainability efforts.
      ▪ IT units haven’t progressed as far with sustainability efforts as their institutions have with campus sustainability projects, most likely due to the difficulty of implementing IT sustainability efforts.
    ○ In response to a question, Katz noted that ECAR had been offering two symposia for the last few years, but a loss of corporate support plus lower participation rates for the second one led ECAR to discontinue it.
  ▪ Page and Fowler presented on the 2009 Top Teaching and Learning Challenges project.
    ○ Page discussed the project’s goals, which included having members set the agenda and drive content development efforts.
    ○ ELI and EDUCAUSE have viewed the project as an experiment in leveraging community expertise and piloting Web 2.0 tools to generate community collaboration and content.
• The project led to the creation of five wikis in which members have developed or posted content around the top-five teaching and learning challenges, mostly on campus solutions to related issues.
• Project participants also co-authored articles in EDUCAUSE Review about the challenges.
• The project has included “Solutions in Action” webcasts that are averaging approximately 100 participants per session, with some institutions having groups participate through a single login.
• Page reported the project’s next steps as:
  • Implementing a survey to assess the project’s impact and stakeholder satisfaction.
  • Conducting an internal assessment of project success in terms of content generated and used.
  • Identifying the best tools for community collaboration and engagement based on these assessments.
  • Working on a 2010 research agenda, leading to the start of research activities in 2010–11.
• Page noted that the project is maintaining the same set of top challenges for 2010 to sustain momentum.
• In response to a question, Page indicated that the project does not have information about participant demographics yet, but plans to collect it as part of the proposed survey.

• Gesner and Gammon reviewed the latest information on the EDUCAUSE rebranding project.
  • They presented storyboards illustrating how the colors and formats for the EDUCAUSE brand and sub-brands are developing across a variety of association materials (e.g., business cards, web pages).
  • They also reiterated the focus of the branding project, which is to clarify the organization’s mission, goals, and value proposition, and to reflect those through its brand image.
  • Gesner noted that most members interact with EDUCAUSE through its website, so a major focus of the project has been adding brand identities to the EDUCAUSE site and subsites (e.g., conference sites).
  • Gammon indicated that the “the best thinking in higher ed IT” has emerged as the proposed theme for the annual conference from year to year.
  • Gesner highlighted the launch of the EDUCAUSE logowear site through Lands’ End as part of the project; board members received information on how they can use the site to order EDUCAUSE logowear.
• The board congratulated the staff on their presentations and the progress achieved with the various efforts.

**Business Meeting**

**Corporate Strategy (Action: Review results of association interviews on external engagement and preliminary survey data; provide input on principles and next steps)**

• Oblinger welcomed strategic consultant Mary Beth Baker to the meeting via teleconference to discuss the latest on the corporate strategy project—the results of a corporate member survey as well as findings from discussions with other associations about their approach to corporate engagement.
• Baker noted the importance of corporate support to the association, as well as trends in event participation that may impact corporate interest in working with EDUCAUSE.
• She highlighted that corporate member feedback indicates a need for a new approach to corporate engagement:
  • Corporate members would like greater clarity on how to work with EDUCAUSE.
  • They are interested in new opportunities for corporate engagement beyond traditional sponsorships.
  • Survey results showed only 10% of corporate members are satisfied having a relationship with EDUCAUSE based solely on the annual conference.
  • One-third of survey respondents were neutral on whether the annual conference and exhibit hall were important to them.
  • A significant percentage also indicated uncertainty about the future of exhibit halls and the competitive advantage to be gained from being in the exhibit hall relative to the expense.
• A question was asked about how EDUCAUSE could engage corporations in cloud computing initiatives and other higher education IT innovations without stifling the potential for innovation. Oblinger responded that EDUCAUSE would have to work with relevant stakeholders to carefully structure a potential initiative to ensure all participants—corporate and institutional—would be well-served by the activity.
The point was raised that EDUCAUSE will have to determine whether it should take a more active role in advocating on behalf of its members, where such advocacy would in part take the form of identifying areas for collaborative action that best serve member interests and catalyzing community response on that basis.

It was further argued that whatever decision EDUCAUSE chooses to make about an advocacy role would need to be reflected in its guiding principles for corporate participation because that decision would affect the nature of the association’s possible corporate relationships and collaborations.

For the purposes of discussion, a possible segmenting of corporate relationships was suggested. “EDUCAUSE members” would encompass all organizations—institutional and corporate—interested in working together to advance the best interests of higher education. Companies primarily interested in marketing relationships with and through EDUCAUSE would participate in the community as part of a “marketplace” arrangement.

Board members indicated support for more clearly distinguishing between thought leadership and marketing approaches in the association’s framework for corporate engagement.

Board members also agreed that the concept of “advocacy” as identified earlier in the discussion made sense, but EDUCAUSE would need to carefully and clearly define its full meaning before seeking to pursue it.

In response to a question, staff noted that EDUCAUSE does not currently develop and maintain data on the return on investment corporations receive from their participation in various association activities; however, companies themselves track such information (e.g., leads generated from the annual conference exhibit hall).

Staff also noted in response to a question that institutional members often identify the exhibit hall as a valuable part of their annual conference experience, although that view is not universal.

Jordan noted that most associations attempt to quantify the institutional “buying power” event participants control to serve as a marker for companies in assessing the value of their participation in a given event.

The point was raised that EDUCAUSE needs to achieve greater clarity on where and how corporate engagement can truly support its mission. It was argued that continuing to develop the association’s thought leadership role would encourage sustained corporate participation in EDUCAUSE activities.

Cloud computing was identified as an area in which the knowledge and expertise of the EDUCAUSE community lends itself to establishing thought leadership in furthering higher education research and education.

The point was made that this might encourage EDUCAUSE to take a leading role in helping higher education pursue cloud computing quickly, effectively, and in a fashion that best serves the higher education mission.

It was noted that a number of companies have substantial intellectual capital to offer in support of advancing research and education, and that the community should not assume such companies cannot participate constructively in relevant efforts.

It was argued that the corporate principles as currently revised may not provide a clear path for companies to participate in EDUCAUSE thought-leadership activities. EDUCAUSE may need to further revise the principles to provide it with greater flexibility in working with corporations.

The board members agreed that taking a more flexible approach to corporate engagement includes establishing and following well-defined parameters for accepting corporate financial support, as opposed to a set cap on the amount of corporate funding the association would accept.

In a discussion about a possible advocacy role for EDUCAUSE, it was suggested the association could:

- Facilitate a dialogue between the institutional and corporate communities about what an appropriate framework for cloud computing services in higher education would look like.
- Work with stakeholders to establish an action plan for defining and pursuing the community’s strategic priorities for cloud computing.

Federated identity management was noted as another area where EDUCAUSE might catalyze collective action.

In either context, it was argued, “advocacy” would entail a proactive stance toward helping members define and pursue shared needs. That would then lead to basing the association’s corporate strategy on the primary goal of defining and advancing members’ shared needs and interests.

The point was made that EDUCAUSE needs to take care to include the smaller companies and organizations that often drive innovation in framing its corporate strategy, and not just focus on the largest companies.

Oblinger reflected back to the board three key takeaways from the group’s discussion:

- EDUCAUSE should pursue advocacy on behalf of its members as manifested through specific “campaigns” to highlight and address core issues.
• EDUCAUSE should work with the companies and organizations in its “ecosystem” in ways that fit their different roles and needs while best serving the interests of higher education.

• Principles are very important—EDUCAUSE needs to maintain its legitimacy as a trusted broker among the participants in its ecosystem without sacrificing its leadership role and responsibilities.

• Oblinger also noted the general consensus around pursuing pilot projects in cloud computing and federated identity management as the best way to learn how to balance these considerations.

**Review of Potential EDUCAUSE Vulnerabilities (Action: Discuss EDUCAUSE’s exposure to competitors and economic issues; brainstorm ways to address major vulnerabilities)**

• Oblinger walked through the possible competitors EDUCAUSE has identified. She also discussed the relative importance of changes in conference revenue to the association’s budget.

• She also reminded the board about the ongoing discussion with the Professional Media Group, publisher of University Business magazine, around its potential infringement of EDUCAUSE’s “EDUCOM” trademark.

• Jordan noted that declines in corporate participation in the annual conference have a larger impact on the event’s profitability, since the corporate participants cover most of their costs of attending and exhibiting.

• Jordan also suggested EDUCAUSE think about potential trends and impacts of corporate participation in the annual conference in terms of a three- to four-year horizon.

• Oblinger shared some general economic and higher education trend information as background for board discussion of EDUCAUSE planning assumptions.

• The point was made that now may be the time to experiment with new online delivery approaches for professional development as a way of expanding member access and generating potential new income streams.

• The board also discussed opportunities for partnering with other associations or collaborating with them on co-branded activities as a way of leveraging EDUCAUSE resources to better meet member needs. It was agreed that clearly defining the issues and areas in which EDUCAUSE should maintain a leadership position is a key factor in considering potential opportunities for partnership or collaboration.

  ○ Besides strategic issues, the economic value to EDUCAUSE of such opportunities has to be considered.

  ○ The point was made that EDUCAUSE historically has not clearly defined what it wants to achieve from a particular relationship in evaluating potential partnerships or opportunities to collaborate. More effectively assessing such options would require EDUCAUSE to more clearly identify its strategic foci and priorities.

  ○ Board members stressed the importance of carefully considering the number of partnerships and/or collaborative relationships EDUCAUSE can realistically support given finite resources and the time and attention such relationships require.

• It was suggested that emerging trends in federal funding for higher education might benefit community colleges, and thus lead EDUCAUSE to more actively engage that sector of higher education.

• Board members agreed that EDUCAUSE should develop a more effective way of segmenting its membership base to identify universal needs and issues as well as needs and interests specific to different constituencies.

• It was noted that an affiliate program might be an effective approach for managing relationships with other organizations. An affiliate relationship would grant an organization formal status within the EDUCAUSE community and provide a basis for coordination and mutual support.

• Oblinger noted the general consensus of the board that the higher education community is not going to be able to recapture its pre-economic downturn funding levels for some time.

• Oblinger also asked the board to consider whether EDUCAUSE should strive to be the umbrella group for higher education IT organizations, which may entail EDUCAUSE extending its brand to groups and activities with which it has a collaborative, not a controlling, relationship. It was suggested that:

  ○ Judiciously extending the EDUCAUSE brand to other higher education IT groups makes sense in that it would bring together areas and responsibilities that are increasingly falling under the CIO and spur growth and innovation through affiliation while providing appropriate space for member-generated initiatives.

  ○ Higher education leaders are recognizing the strategic nature of IT. On that basis, EDUCAUSE must maintain its stature as a strategically focused IT organization for the higher education community.
Helping higher education institutions navigate the balance of centralization and decentralization in IT assets and services is important work for EDUCAUSE. Central IT has to own enterprise-wide functions and to facilitate coordination and cooperation among institutional IT areas that do not rise to an enterprise level.

Thinking of EDUCAUSE in this context, what issues might define EDUCAUSE?
- Professional development for IT leadership and management
- Advocacy for the best interests of higher education
- Data-driven resources and guidance on higher education IT
- Facilitating community collaboration to address shared needs and interests

The board discussed how EDUCAUSE might advance this vision across its membership and higher education, especially with presidents and provosts. Members agreed that strong relationships with the presidential associations are the key—which might entail, for example, EDUCAUSE seeking greater representation in their programs and requesting more presidential association representation in EDUCAUSE programs.

It was noted that EDUCAUSE should frame its efforts as advocating for the best interests of higher education in the digital age, which sets IT issues at the strategic level within the institution and thus engages presidents and provosts.

Oblinger asked the board to validate its consensus on key issues from the discussion:
- EDUCAUSE should serve as the “big tent” for higher education IT.
- EDUCAUSE should emphasize catalyzing and facilitating member-led organizations or collaborations to address shared needs and interests, which is different from being content- and conference-focused.
- EDUCAUSE should establish clear leadership in professional development for IT leadership and management, advocate for the best interests of higher education, and develop data-driven resources and guidance about higher education IT.

The board agreed that EDUCAUSE has to capitalize on its existing core competencies to build relationships with potential affiliates, but insist in return on EDUCAUSE’s role in thought leadership.

It was suggested that EDUCAUSE explore new content models to further establish EDUCAUSE as the “go to” organization for higher education IT knowledge and information while continuing to engage with other relevant media outlets around shared interests.

The point was made that EDUCAUSE could conduct targeted activities at the annual conference or other events, such as a presidents forum or CIO forum, to conduct strategic outreach to major stakeholders.

To facilitate further consideration of the association’s strategic directions and options, each board member agreed to write a brief about the future of higher education as the nation emerges from the economic downturn.

Other Business

Filling the Vacant Board Seat
- Lea noted that the board had a nominee, Joanne Kossuth, to complete the board term vacated by Scott Siddall.
- She noted that roughly a year remains in Siddall’s term, and that after serving the rest of that term, his replacement could stand for election to a full term after a one-year hiatus from board service.
- The board discussed the nominee’s qualifications and record of service to the EDUCAUSE community.
- Regenstein moved and McMillan seconded that the nomination be accepted, which it was by acclamation.
- Lea asked Oblinger to notify Kossuth of her appointment to the board and to make whatever arrangements were necessary to facilitate her integration into the board’s activities.

Considering an Addition to the Association’s Policy Advisory Structure
- Oblinger distributed a draft description of a proposed Advisory Committee on Policy for feedback.
- In response to a question, Oblinger noted the proposed committee would not supplant any existing group, but rather establish a new body to provide comprehensive guidance to the association on policy issues.
- Oblinger indicated she would send an e-mail to board members after the meeting soliciting their thoughts about the draft committee description.

The board adjourned to executive session at 1:12 p.m., MDT, and ended its meeting at roughly 2:30 p.m., MDT.