EDUCAUSE Board of Directors
Meeting Minutes
July 22, 2010
Boulder, Colorado

Board members attending: Joel Cooper, Ted Dodds (Chair), James Hilton, Joanne Kossuth, David Lassner, Thomas Maier (Secretary), Diana Oblinger (President and Chief Executive Officer), Pattie Orr (by teleconference from 11:00 a.m.–12:00 noon, MDT), Kathleen Santora, Linda Thor, Brad Wheeler (Treasurer)

Staff attending: Jarret Cummings, Greg Jackson, Garth Jordan, Julie Little; Michelle McIrvin (8:00–9:00 a.m.)

Call to Order
• Dodds called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m., Mountain Daylight Time (MDT), and welcomed the board members and staff to the meeting.
• He noted that Carrie Regenstein was called away just prior to the meeting and thus could not participate; Pattie Orr would join the meeting by telephone from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon; and Tracy Mitrano would not be able to participate due to the EDUCAUSE/Cornell University Institute for Computer Policy and Law seminar she oversees.
• Dodds welcomed Julie Little to the meeting and congratulated her on behalf of the board for her recent appointment as EDUCAUSE Vice President for Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development (TLPD).

Consent Agenda/Reports

Consent Agenda
• Dodds requested a motion to approve the consent agenda.
• Maier so moved, Cooper seconded, and the board approved the consent agenda unanimously.

President’s Report
• Oblinger began her report by noting the eight awards for excellence recently received by EDUCAUSE Review and its editor and publisher, Teddy Diggs. The board expressed its great appreciation for the continuing achievements of Diggs and the magazine overall.
• Oblinger asked Little to discuss the highlights of regional conference attendance in 2010, noting that actual revenue from those events only modestly trailed budgeted revenue while overall attendance increased 4% over that of the 2009 regional conferences.
• Little reviewed the satisfaction rates for the 2010 regional conferences, highlighting that four of the five events had combined “satisfied/extremely satisfied” rates of 90% or greater. Rates ranged from a high of 96% for NERCOMP to a low of 86% for the Southeast Regional Conference.
• Little also discussed the challenges of getting conference participants across EDUCAUSE events to respond to postconference evaluations, noting that on average 31% of event participants completed such evaluations. She reported that TLPD staff were working on ideas to improve response rates.
• Little reminded the board of the various issues that led EDUCAUSE not to hold the Western Regional Conference (WRC) in 2010, such as the comparatively high costs relative to registration rates and the particularly acute economic challenges in the region, but instead to conduct a “Best for the West” local/regional hosting pilot led by member institutions.
• She highlighted TLPD plans to merge the western and southwestern regional events into a single regional conference in 2011—the West/Southwest Regional Conference (WSWRC)—which will operate as a hybrid, face-to-face/online event to help extend access across the broad geographical area it is intended to serve.
• Little reported that EDUCAUSE will conduct its first online preconference workshop as part of the first WSWRC; the event will also utilize virtual discussion sessions to make the interaction of the face-to-face event available to remote participants.
• In 2012, WSWRC will be located in a more central location from a geographic perspective (the 2011 event will be held in Austin, Texas), with the goal of enabling most participants to reach the conference in one flight.
Oblinger then reviewed new features and innovations for the EDUCAUSE 2010 Annual Conference (EDUCAUSE 2010).

- She noted the introduction of the “CIO and Senior IT Leader Experience,” which will include a chief information officer (CIO) lounge as well as designated conference sessions and an exclusive exhibit hall hour for CIOs and senior information technology (IT) leaders.
- In response to a question, Oblinger stated that CIO/senior IT leader status would be determined by participants on a self-identified basis when they register for the conference.
- Oblinger indicated that the Hawkins Leadership Roundtable would be fully integrated into the conference this year, with related events and discussion sessions throughout EDUCAUSE 2010.
- She identified “In the Hot Seat” sessions as new for EDUCAUSE 2010; these sessions will entail more interaction and dialogue between the presenter and the audience on hot topics. The audience will have the opportunity to present difficult questions to the presenter to simulate the experience of having to respond to difficult questions/meetings on campus.
- Oblinger reported that EDUCAUSE 2010 will provide a formal learning space simulation, as opposed to the informal learning spaces provided at the last few annual conferences. Ten sessions will be held in the space; they were selected based on the interactive formats they incorporate, which will allow them to demonstrate the flexibility of the space.
- She also noted plans for a “Learning MC” pilot, which will entail having members attend various teaching and learning and library-oriented sessions and develop a community synthesis of themes from them.
- Oblinger highlighted the expansion of the online companion conference for 2010, which will entail increasing the number of online sessions by 30% over the 2009 level; she noted that the integration between the online and face-to-face 2010 conference experiences has also received careful attention to ensure that the experiences are as comparable as possible.

- Oblinger reported that EDUCAUSE 2010 registrations were running 8% below the previous year’s level at that time, but that was consistent with the association’s planning/budgeting assumptions for the conference given economic conditions. She indicated that major marketing activities would launch the week following the board meeting, which could drive increased registrations over the then-current rate.
- She highlighted that the association’s 2010 revenue from corporate sources at the time of the meeting exceeded the financial goal for year-to-date; Oblinger also noted that EDUCAUSE 2010 was already at nearly 100% of its corporate revenue goal.
- Oblinger discussed the ongoing implementation of the association’s corporate strategy, which includes the following activities and initiatives:
  - She noted that the EDUCAUSE 2010 call-for-proposals (CFP) allowed for corporate participation, and that the program committee was pleasantly surprised to have received as many strong proposals from the corporate community as it did.
  - Oblinger indicated that each member of the executive team had been assigned to work with a specific set of major corporate partners to help with relationship development.
  - She highlighted association efforts to diversify its corporate sponsorship opportunities, such as recently offering the first sponsorship option for the EDUCAUSE Live! webinar series.
  - Oblinger reported that EDUCAUSE had created a “one-stop shop” online form to allow EDUCAUSE 2010 exhibitors easier access to sponsorship opportunities. She also mentioned that the market research night held at the annual conference would be expanded for the 2010 event.
- Oblinger noted that an EDUCAUSE staff working group has begun a project to redesign the association’s web presence, with the goal of increasing its value as a member resource as well as its overall ease of use.
- She discussed EDUCAUSE’s ongoing progress in providing federated identity management services to members on the EDUCAUSE site via InCommon; board members noted that the feedback they had received from the InCommon community about the association’s implementation and involvement with the community had been very positive.
- On the Core Data Service, Oblinger noted that the 2009 annual summary report would be released on schedule in October. She also discussed the ongoing work of the redesign project, which will lead to redevelopment of the survey and service in time for the January 2011 survey launch. Examples of potential redesign features included data access via spreadsheet downloads (as opposed to the current online interface), a modular structure
allowing for greater customization of survey response by institutional type, and enhanced metadata to facilitate better selection of peer comparison groups as well as subsequent data analysis.

- Oblinger reviewed the proposed key themes for EDUCAUSE in 2011, which the association would use to focus its event programming and publications—mobility, alternative sourcing, and the future of higher education. She noted that the future of higher education is a broad category, but that allows it to address financial and academic development issues in an integrated fashion.

- It was noted that “alternative sourcing” essentially covers the same space as the 2010 key issue of “cloud computing,” so the question was asked as to why EDUCAUSE planned to use “alternative sourcing” in 2011. Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE found “cloud computing” was not an accessible term for non-IT audiences; for example, feedback from the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) indicated that “cloud computing” did not resonate with its members. Thus, EDUCAUSE decided to shift to “alternative sourcing” to make the underlying issues more accessible to the broader higher education audience.

- Oblinger noted that the development of key themes allows for the creation of a consistent body of information and editorial focus across EDUCAUSE publications, which may be one reason why EDUCAUSE Review, for example, had achieved such significant recognition in recent years.

- Oblinger reviewed the association’s continuing work on the Gates Foundation grant opportunity, Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC).
  - When the board met in May, Oblinger reported, staff had assumed that the Gates-funded grant program would launch in June; however, in the interim, the program partners had decided it was best to delay the launch to the fall to allow for better program development in advance of the launch.
  - She noted that, at the time of the board meeting, the partners were discussing launching the program either the week before EDUCAUSE 2010 or at the annual conference itself.
  - Oblinger indicated that she saw the delay in the launch as constructive since it would allow EDUCAUSE and the other partner organizations to make much greater progress in refining the program and establishing the infrastructure needed to support it prior to launch.
  - It was noted that the number of partners had expanded from EDUCAUSE, the League for Innovation in the Community College, and the Gates Foundation to include two K–12 organizations—iNACOL and CCSSO.
    - Oblinger reported that the addition of the K–12 organizations reflected the incorporation of Gates college readiness program objectives into the program, which would allow NGLC to address the continuum of college readiness from secondary into postsecondary education.
    - Oblinger also indicated that the first wave of challenges would focus on postsecondary institutions and issues, the second wave would emphasize secondary institutions and issues, and the third wave would seek to identify and support integrative approaches across the two.
  - Oblinger noted that the Hewlett Foundation had also joined the program as a sponsor, with plans to contribute funding to the first-wave open courseware and deeper learning engagement challenges.
  - Oblinger reported that a major emphasis of the requests for proposals (RFPs) for the first-wave challenges would be to have respondents present evidence of effectiveness for their innovation or approach in order to potentially get a grant under the program, in keeping with the program’s focus on providing support for taking effective models and processes to scale.
  - Oblinger discussed the partners’ continuing efforts to establish effective working and decision-making processes for developing and sustaining the program from the planning phase through the launch and into ongoing operations.

- Board members expressed their appreciation for the progress EDUCAUSE had made in improving the annual conference experience each year for the past few years. It was noted that those improvements have made a significant difference in the quality of the conference experience for the membership.

- Board members also praised the association for its increased willingness to pursue innovations and take risks in the interest of improving EDUCAUSE events, programs, and resources; they stated that staff’s increased willingness to try something and learn from failure as well as success had had a significant positive impact on the value the association delivers for its members.
Financial Report

- Oblinger reviewed financial report highlights, noting that McIrvin was attending the meeting to answer any questions the board might have.
- Oblinger reported that the EDUCAUSE investment portfolio had increased 4% over the first five months of the year, with the overall portfolio maintained within the board-approved investment policy.
- She noted that EDUCAUSE’s current net loss was nearly 60% less than budgeted for the year, with most of the variance due to factors such as the timing of certain expenses (e.g., contract labor, travel) and full-time equivalent staff levels that were below budget in some program areas.
- Oblinger discussed the cost containment approaches the association has continued to pursue through the first five months of the year, such as eliminating or lowering some event costs, which have held expenses to approximately $153,000 less than for the same period in 2009.
- Oblinger reported that much of the events savings achieved has stemmed from careful review and control of conference expenses, noting the great work that Gretchen Bliss, Director of Conferences and Educational Activities, has performed in this area since joining the association last summer.
- Oblinger invited McIrvin to respond to any questions that the board had about the association’s IRS Form 990 submission. McIrvin reviewed questions about the submission sent to her by board members prior to the meeting, noting areas of improvement made in the association’s response based on the board’s insight and input.
- Santora discussed the value of the board’s review of the Form 990 as part of its fiduciary responsibility; she noted the availability of an Association of Governing Board’s article highlighting key points for board members to consider in conducting their review.

Business Meeting

Appointment of 2010–11 Director-at-Large

- Oblinger asked board members to consider possible nominees for the director-at-large position coming open later this year. She noted that the recently adopted revisions to the bylaws made consideration and appointment of nominees for the at-large director at this meeting necessary.
- Oblinger highlighted the value of the at-large directorship in allowing the board to add any specific knowledge and expertise it may think it needs to fulfill its strategic responsibilities.
- Oblinger discussed the backgrounds and potential benefits that different nominees could bring to the board if appointed, and then invited the board members to have an open discussion of the nominees’ attributes and potential fit with the needs of the board.
- In addition to discussing the appointment of an at-large director, the board discussed potential emphases to recommend to the Nominations Committee in terms of searching for candidates for the elected director positions in 2011.
- Board members considered different steps they might take to encourage a broad candidate pool for director elections each year, as well as to spur greater member participation in voting in the director elections.
- Kossuth highlighted different approaches to voting that NERCOMP has used in electing members of its board that might serve as options for EDUCAUSE to consider.
- The board agreed on a consensus approach to filling the at-large directorship that it believed would serve its needs and those of the EDUCAUSE community well and asked Oblinger to proceed with its implementation.

ECAR Organizational Alignment

- Dodds invited Jackson to begin the discussion of ECAR’s organizational alignment.
- Jackson indicated he would share some of his initial thinking about potential realignment of ECAR programs and services given the transfer of ECAR leadership to him following the departure of former vice president Richard Katz from the organization. He referred the board members to the background brief provided for this session in the board meeting materials.
- Jackson noted three areas in which realignment of ECAR might need to take place:
Lowering boundaries between ECAR research planning and development processes and those of other EDUCAUSE programs, such as the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative and Policy and Analysis: The assumption isn’t that boundaries should be removed completely, but that there should be greater dialogue and interaction between ECAR and other programs so ECAR can take advantage of their knowledge, resources, and communities.

Eliminating unnecessary duplication of resources between ECAR and EDUCAUSE operations generally: This wouldn’t necessarily generate significant direct savings, but it could yield significant returns in terms of more efficient operations and services.

Resolving confusing distinctions between ECAR and other EDUCAUSE resources and activities: For example, the ECAR Symposium is essentially a professional development event for high-level leaders/strategic thinkers, so it should probably be considered as such, but approached in a way that preserves the high-level focus and needs of senior leaders.

It was noted that ECAR’s current organizational alignment arose from needs at the time of its initial development which no longer apply, such that the current transition allows EDUCAUSE to consider new needs and approaches while maintaining what is valuable about the existing ECAR model.

In discussing how to proceed with ECAR’s organizational development, Jackson reported that discussions have led to the identification of four studies ECAR and EDUCAUSE should pursue:

- A value study, to allow EDUCAUSE and ECAR to better understand the value ECAR members derive from participating in ECAR and why they establish or renew their memberships.
- A methodology study, to identify ways in which ECAR’s research methodologies might be improved to generate better, more valid research, particularly in terms of ECAR’s survey-based research processes. Jackson indicated that he sees contracting with outside reviewers to pursue these evaluations, which would most likely start in the next six months.
- Jackson noted that the next two study areas EDUCAUSE needs to pursue for ECAR—staffing and finance, and content and dissemination—depend on the outcomes of the value and methodology studies, so they would trail those reviews.
- He clarified that the content and dissemination study would address the types of content ECAR should produce based on member feedback about their relative value, as well as how ECAR might best disseminate such content based on the same considerations.

Board members asked if EDUCAUSE has an aspirational example it can use as a general model for what ECAR might become; Jackson noted that the Technologizer blog (http://technologizer.com/), which focuses on taking a large body of material about technology developments and making it accessible for a broader audience, might present an example of principles ECAR could apply.

It was also suggested that ECAR might strive to become the primary source for information and thinking about higher education technology issues, not just from the perspective of the higher education IT community, but the higher education community at large.

Another option raised would be for ECAR to adopt a think-tank model, in which it would address a narrower set of issues but in high-quality, in-depth, authoritative ways.

Board members indicated that ECAR should definitely consider adopting a different philosophy in terms of research development, emphasizing clarity, brevity, and accessibility. Board members thought this might enable ECAR to better establish itself as the authoritative voice on higher education technology with other senior higher education leaders such as presidents and chief business officers.

Board members also discussed the existing separation between the Core Data Service and ECAR, focusing on the extent to which this division does or does not make sense from a member value perspective.

It was noted that trying to establish ECAR as the authoritative research organization on higher education IT might entail costs that EDUCAUSE would have to evaluate carefully in light of existing and projected resources.

Board members suggested that the best way to approach the potential evolution of ECAR might be to refocus on what EDUCAUSE wants to achieve in general, and then consider which research organization model best fits with EDUCAUSE’s overall strategic directions.

The board discussed whether resources and services associated with ECAR should be integrated with the general slate of EDUCAUSE offerings. It was mentioned that this might be a consideration for EDUCAUSE
Board members stressed the potential value of ECAR in becoming an authoritative applied research body on behalf of the EDUCAUSE membership, especially in helping members to more effectively frame and pursue strategic discussions about technology on campus and across higher education generally.

It was suggested that the more EDUCAUSE can establish itself as a source of data-driven research on issues of importance, the more effective it will be in establishing itself as a leader in the higher education community on behalf of its members.

Dodds noted that the main question from the discussion was the underlying motivation for EDUCAUSE to support ECAR and/or a data-driven research operation more generally—answering that question would frame the underlying evolutionary issues EDUCAUSE and ECAR need to address. He also raised the point that such an approach might help EDUCAUSE better identify potential partnership options in this space, which might mitigate the resource requirements of pursuing the relevant efforts.

Jackson indicated his agreement with this perspective, noting potential major areas of focus for the association around the health of the profession, teaching and learning, IT strategy and management, and policy. Within this framework, he thought that ECAR would ideally emphasize research support for policy and IT strategy and management.

Board members generally agreed that EDUCAUSE should consider opportunities for partnership and collaboration in pursuing the evolution of ECAR and/or a general research function. It was also reiterated that mainstreaming the research function ECAR represents into the general EDUCAUSE services portfolio should be evaluated, along with the staffing and expertise considerations such a transition might involve.

It was suggested that EDUCAUSE could evaluate MIT’s Center for Information Systems Research as an effective model for the shape a reconceptualized EDUCAUSE research function might take.

Jackson invited board members to send him brief written descriptions of their vision for a broader EDUCAUSE research function.

**Demand Aggregator/ACTI Reviews**

- Jackson discussed the development of the Demand Aggregator Task Force, which generated the report on demand aggregation options presented to the board in the meeting materials. He noted the task force involved representatives from EDUCAUSE, NACUBO, and Internet2, and that it was tasked with identifying opportunities for pursuing demand aggregation across higher education, beginning with cloud computing services.

- Jackson indicated that the task force worked to cut through jargon and relevant institutional service structures to delineate very concrete areas in which demand aggregation might be possible.

- He identified four ways in which institutions have traditionally pursued demand aggregation in the IT space:
  - Proceeding similarly by *sharing wisdom*
  - Standardizing contract terms and conditions through *umbrella agreements*
  - Combining purchases through *brokered procurement*
  - Joint provision through collectively owned entities

- Discussion of those approaches and institutional needs led to recommendations for potential demand aggregation initiatives such as:
  - Developing a set of shared data center and infrastructure facilities, consolidated on a broad regional basis and focused on addressing emerging as opposed to existing demand.
  - Establishing brokered or shared contracts for services and software used widely across higher education.
  - Creating a joint development, aggregation, and support entity to procure and/or supply applications and services especially important or unique to higher education.

The task force suggested that EDUCAUSE might be able to undertake the brokering function around shared contracts; it was thought that Internet2 might be well positioned to pursue the shared data center/infrastructure option. However, the task force wasn’t sure how best to pursue the joint development, aggregation, and support entity. A clear organizational option to take the lead was not readily identifiable.
It was suggested that EDUCAUSE continue to lead discussions about how best to bring together relevant organizations to potentially address the development of an aggregation entity.

Santora noted the value of the task force’s report in clearly explaining the emergence of cloud computing and the potential benefits of demand aggregation for higher education generally. She suggested that it might serve as the basis of a brief for other senior leadership audiences to generate support for the demand aggregator concept. It was noted, though, that clearly establishing the interconnections between possible initiative areas in such a brief would be important, since they might not be immediately apparent to non-IT leadership audiences.

Board members seconded the view that the task force report was well done and very valuable in framing the issues and opportunities around demand aggregation.

Board members discussed the interconnections between various recommendations and what that might entail in terms of their priority ranking. Directors generally agreed that a shared data center/infrastructure initiative would provide an effective foundation from which to pursue other potential opportunities.

It was suggested that a possible brokered or shared contracts initiative might focus on identifying or aggregating the demand for common services and software and then brokering or developing shared contracts on that basis. Jackson discussed the extent to which the aggregation concept was implicit in the concept for such an initiative, as well as the challenges institutions have historically encountered in pursuing such efforts (e.g., delivering a shared value proposition to vendors from among the participating institutions).

Thor noted that the recommendations presented in the task force support would probably be well received at the presidential level within higher education.

Wheeler noted that successfully pursuing the range of possible activities might depend on establishing an effective convening function to help institutions come together regionally or nationally to develop relevant consortia or other arrangements.

Thor indicated that having a blueprint for how institutions might pursue consortial arrangements on a regional basis in the areas for potential collaboration addressed in the report would be very helpful.

In response to a question, Oblinger discussed what taking the lead or convening relevant discussions related to the various possible activities might mean for EDUCAUSE operations, including the staff expertise EDUCAUSE may have or need to acquire.

Oblinger asked the board to consider whether to request that the task force reconvene to further develop the demand aggregator concept, so that EDUCAUSE and the other relevant parties could get a clearer understanding of the shape such an entity might take. Board members discussed the pros and cons of asking the current task force or a new one to undertake more detailed development of the concept.

It was suggested that having a group continue to work through the details and implications of a demand aggregator concept made sense; however, the view was expressed that further research might not be as effective as initiating pilot activities and learning from them in an iterative way.

Maier noted that cross-jurisdictional issues potentially loom large in considering the viability of a demand aggregation entity, which might place greater emphasis on points Dodds raised about pursuing loosely coupled but closely coordinated efforts across institutions and regions in which shared activity might be viable.

Oblinger presented some ideas about the form a demand aggregation entity might take and asked for board members’ views on how those thoughts fit with their perspective on such an entity and how it might work.

It was noted that higher education has a deep and abiding interest in shared models and approaches, but it currently lacks an entity to sustain exploration and development of such models and processes over time. It was suggested that the best way to establish such an entity might be to engage a group of like-minded institutions in piloting such an organization and evolving, improving, and growing it over time. The next question would be what role EDUCAUSE might take in convening and sustaining such an effort. The potential need for EDUCAUSE to incorporate mechanisms to identify and incubate member-generated innovations was also discussed.

It was noted that pursuing efforts such as those involved in this discussion might entail taking better advantage of the knowledge, expertise, and volunteer spirit of the membership. The point was made that, to be scalable, such activities cannot depend on simply adding EDUCAUSE staff; likewise, it was argued that other EDUCAUSE community activities have demonstrated the value of members’ enlightened self-interest and desire to support the common good in driving significant volunteer-based initiatives.
Oblinger asked Jackson to present a brief overview of the status of the Advanced Core Technologies Initiative (ACTI):

- Jackson indicated that the board would see a formal prospectus for ACTI in the next few weeks.
- He highlighted the set of questions that were driving the development of the prospectus, which included:
  - What constitutes “core technologies?”
  - What does “advanced” mean in this context?
  - Why is an entity such as ACTI needed? How will it work?
  - Why is EDUCAUSE the best organization to undertake ACTI?
  - What topics might the ACTI steering and working groups undertake (e.g., high-performance computing and networking; evolving communications models)?

- It was noted that this type of organization might benefit from having a focused membership, given the nature of the technical issues involved and the relevant expertise members will need to have to address them effectively.
- It was also suggested that the breakdown of the resource requirements for ACTI might serve as an effective model for developing and sustaining a function for brokering common or shared contracts for services and software.

**Evolution of the EDUCAUSE Awards Program**

- Oblinger noted that the awards program has evolved over time without the organization necessarily evaluating the underlying strategy and philosophy behind the program.
- Oblinger invited Little to provide the board with an overview of the program’s current status and possible changes proposed by the Recognition Committee.
- Little discussed the historical context for the awards program, noting how the number and type of awards changed over time, beginning with the EDUCAUSE precursor organizations through the current portfolio of awards.
- She noted that many changes were made without consideration for the underlying purposes the awards were intended to serve; for example, for a number of years, the association awarded a broad range of leadership awards without necessarily reflecting on the leadership principles EDUCAUSE intended to promote.
- Little indicated that the Recognition Committee undertook an overall review of the existing awards portfolio to address the lack of clarity on why the awards are offered and the basis on which the awards should be made. The committee found that the criteria for the two major awards—Leadership and Catalyst—were not well defined. The committee also determined that the underlying premise for the Catalyst Award was not sufficiently established to warrant continuing to offer it.
- Little then asked the board to consider a set of questions, noting that board input based on the questions would help inform the work of staff and the Recognition Committee to refine the EDUCAUSE awards program.
- It was noted that EDUCAUSE would extend only the Leadership Award in 2010.
- It was suggested that the Catalyst Award may need sharper criteria, but could still have value as part of the awards program as an honor that is only extended when a technology development or innovation rises to the appropriate level of significance.
- In response to a question, Little noted that the EDUCAUSE awards program may not be fully developed when compared with programs of other associations of similar size and importance in their fields.
- The importance of awards to association members in general was discussed; board members discussed their experience with awards and honors in different venues, and how award recipients view the honors as significant validation of their participation in and contribution to the profession.
- It was suggested that relying on members to nominate potential award recipients may not be sufficient—that staff may need to be empowered to take a greater role in helping stimulate award nominations.
- Board members discussed the potential value to the community of establishing an award to recognize emerging leaders in the field, especially given the community’s interest in stimulating the development of the next generation of higher education IT leaders.
• It was noted that the original purpose of the Catalyst Award was to recognize major developments in higher education IT that have fundamentally advanced higher education. Thus, the shift in the award criteria this year to focus on an IT leader or professional who was a principle catalyst of change at an institution came as a surprise to some members. It was argued that these new criteria address issues that are better achieved via the Leadership Award, which would allow the Catalyst Award to return to emphasizing industry-changing developments in higher education IT.

• The point was made that in addition to establishing an award for emerging leaders, it might make sense to establish an award to recognize community volunteers who have made significant contributions to the community.

• Board members discussed the need to reestablish the Catalyst Award as a celebration of an achievement of the higher education IT community, which would mean not having someone accept the award; instead, the recognition of the achievement by the community for the community at the annual conference would be sufficient.

• It was suggested that EDUCAUSE should have more awards to better serve the public recognition and professional development purposes of the association, such that individual members could better envision how they might achieve recognition within the community.

• Oblinger noted that the Catalyst Award might be better served if the board and staff were engaged in working with the Recognition Committee to identify achievements for consideration.

• It was noted that EDUCAUSE might return to offering more than one Leadership Award a year, with the nature of the leadership being recognized in any individual case stated in the making of the award.

• Oblinger summarized the board’s feedback as:
  o The awards program should maintain the Leadership and Catalyst Awards, but modify the Leadership Award to allow for multiple awards in a year.
  o The Catalyst Award should be maintained as part of the association’s awards portfolio, but only awarded when a community achievement warranted it.
  o EDUCAUSE should add emerging leader and volunteer honors to its awards portfolio.

• Santora suggested that EDUCAUSE might consider adding a scholarship award to recognize members who generate significant intellectual contributions on behalf of the profession, similar to the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA) Fellow award her association extends when warranted.

The board went into executive session at approximately 1:43 p.m., MDT. The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 p.m., MDT.