EDUCAUSE Board of Directors
Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2010
Washington, D.C.

Board members attending: Joel Cooper, Ted Dodds (Chair), James Hilton, Joanne Kossuth, David Lassner, Thomas Maier (Secretary), Tracy Mitrano, Diana Oblinger (President and Chief Executive Officer), Pattie Orr, Carrie Regenstein (Vice Chair), Kathleen Santora, Linda Thor (by teleconference starting at 10:05 a.m., EDT), Brad Wheeler (Treasurer)

Invited participants: Ellen Waite-Franzen, Chair of the EDUCAUSE Nominations Committee (by teleconference, 11:00–11:15 a.m., EDT); Dan Updegrove, Consultant, Core Data Service (CDS) Redesign Project (joined the meeting in person 1:45–2:45 p.m., EDT)

Staff attending: Jarret Cummings, Greg Jackson, Garth Jordan, Michelle McIrvin (by teleconference, 8:00–8:45 a.m., EDT)

Call to Order/Consent Agenda
• Dodds called the meeting to order at 8:07 a.m., EDT. He noted that Thor would join the meeting via teleconference later in the day and that McIrvin would join the meeting to provide the financial report and participate in the reserves strategy discussion.
• Dodds requested a motion to approve the consent agenda; Maier proposed such a motion, Mitrano seconded it, and the board approved the consent agenda unanimously.

Reports
President’s Report
• Noting that registration for the EDUCAUSE 2010 Annual Conference had just opened, Oblinger reported on changes in format that staff had initiated for this year’s annual conference; examples included the following:
  o To simplify the conference experience, the schedule has been adjusted to have sessions start on the hour and half-hour, and to organize sessions physically to minimize the travel time between session locations.
  o Exhibit hall hours have also been consolidated in the schedule to facilitate attendee access to the exhibit hall and participation in sessions scheduled around the exhibit hall hours. The redesigned exhibit hall hours would also give attendees more time for informal networking and lunch.
  o The visual design of the online program and on-site signage has been improved to make it easier for attendees to navigate the physical conference space.
• On a question about the self-selected use of informational ribbons on name tags by attendees at the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative (ELI) 2010 Annual Meeting and whether that model could be used at EDUCAUSE 2010, Oblinger indicated that staff would look into how to do that since it facilitates informal networking among participants.
• On a question about whether the schedule redesign would impact the number of conference sessions, Oblinger indicated that the effect was neutral. Jordan noted that a key element in achieving a neutral effect had been the elimination of odd blocks of time that had previously appeared on the conference schedule.
• In response to a question, Jordan indicated that the schedule redesign process had not impacted the timeline for notifying those who submitted session proposals for EDUCAUSE 2010 about proposal acceptance and that such notifications would be made within a couple of weeks.
• Oblinger reported that webinars are being held with Frye Institute alumni on the redesign of the program, which will start again in 2011.
• In terms of the association’s international engagement efforts, Oblinger reported that:
  o The next issue of EDUCAUSE Review would include a cloud computing article produced collaboratively by representatives from the United Kingdom (U.K.), Canada, the Netherlands, Australia, and New Zealand.
EDUCAUSE is conducting regular briefings with representatives from the Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology (CAUDIT) and the Canadian University Council of CIOs (CUCCIO), with both groups having representation on the Core Data Service (CDS) redesign working group.

EDUCAUSE representatives had recently held discussions with representatives from Universia, an Ibero-American/Latin American consortium of approximately 1,200 universities, about the potential for Universia members to participate in the CDS.

Santora noted the broad interest in international engagement among higher education associations and institutions generally. She stated that her organization, the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA), is talking with the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) how best to enable such engagement. She suggested that EDUCAUSE consider joining those discussions, and Oblinger indicated that she would discuss this with Santora after the meeting.

Mitrano asked about whether any disciplinary associations are working on the issue of how best to facilitate international collaboration among faculty. Oblinger answered that she was not aware of such efforts, but she and Santora identified various groups that support international education programs.

Oblinger indicated that former board member Marilyn McMillan of New York University planned to present at EDUCAUSE 2010 on the issues surrounding the establishment of international campuses.

Oblinger and Jordan reported that EDUCAUSE would sign the lease for its new office space in the District of Columbia within a few days.

Oblinger indicated that the agenda for the July board meeting might include issues such as the following:

- Changes might be proposed to rectify ongoing challenges in identifying appropriate candidates for the Catalyst Award; it was noted that such challenges had led to the award not being given in 2010.
- The board might be asked to consider a proposal to address the lack of recognition opportunities for young achievers in the community. Santora identified NACUA’s First Decade Award as a potential model EDUCAUSE might consider.
- Oblinger noted that the issue of possibly renaming a major association award in honor of a past community figure had been raised. It was noted that the board had previously discussed such a proposal and decided that existing honors, such as naming programs or scholarships for prominent figures, was sufficient. The board generally reaffirmed its prior decision on not naming association awards after community figures.
- As board chair, Dodds volunteered to serve as the contact person for requests by association members made to individual board members. He asked board members to direct such requests to him for coordination.
- Oblinger noted that the executive team is working to reallocate responsibilities following the resignation of EDUCAUSE Vice President Richard Katz. She indicated that the team is approaching the process in a systematic fashion, given that there were no issues of immediate concern. Oblinger reported that:
  - EDUCAUSE will operate with two vice presidents for the time being, with operations reporting to Jordan and programs to Jackson; this distribution of responsibilities will be revisited over time to affirm or change the initial response as necessary.
  - The assessment of related organizational structure issues will entail:
    - Considering the core value proposition of the EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR).
    - Exploring opportunities for better managing overlapping memberships in various EDUCAUSE programs.
    - Addressing functions that EDUCAUSE may need to add (e.g., business development).
    - Resolving possible structural/functional disconnects among association programs and services.
  - It was noted that a public announcement about Katz’s resignation had been made the previous day.
- Jackson reviewed the layout of the association’s new D.C. office space, including how EDUCAUSE will share the space and associated costs with National LambdaRail (NLR) and Internet2. He noted that a contractor for preparing the space will be selected soon to try to meet a time frame for occupying it later this summer.
- Jordan indicated that EDUCAUSE will be the lease owner; NLR and Internet2 will share the space under license from EDUCAUSE, which gives EDUCAUSE greater flexibility in managing those relationships.
- Jackson also mentioned that EDUCAUSE has the opportunity to expand into adjacent space if needed.
- The board commended Jackson and Jordan on acquiring the new D.C. office space at a highly competitive rate.
**Reserves Strategy Revisions**
- Oblinger invited McIrvin to review the proposed adjustments in the association’s financial reserves strategy based on board feedback. McIrvin noted that the proposed adjustments addressed:
  - Gradually increasing the Operational Reserves to the nine-month maximum ceiling rather than doing so as quickly as possible.
  - Revising the description of the Leadership Reserve to eliminate the possible conceptual overlap between that fund and the Strategic Initiative Reserve.
  - Adopting a life-cycle approach for funding the Capital Equipment Reserve.
- Wheeler proposed that the board adopt the proposed strategy revisions on the handling of the Operational and Leadership/Strategic Initiatives Reserves, but that it delay action on the third issue, pending further analysis.
- Dodds asked for a motion to approve the first two provisions now and defer action on the third, pending further analysis; Regenstein made such a motion, and Maier seconded it.
- In discussing the motion, it was noted that the proposed strategy revision on the Leadership and Strategic Initiatives Reserves still may not draw the distinction between the two as clearly as needed. Board members thus asked whether it made sense to keep them separate.
- McIrvin clarified the distinction between the two funds, noting that the Strategic Initiatives Reserve is intended to support program development, while the Leadership Reserve is intended to finance new business opportunities. Dodds indicated that another distinction concerned the order in which funding was to be allocated to the different reserves, with the Strategic Initiatives Reserve taking priority over the Leadership Reserve.
- The point was made that the board might still consider combining the Strategic Initiatives and Leadership Reserves for the sake of simplicity in financial reserves management.
- Dodds reiterated the motion on the table to accept the first two provisions and defer the third; Wheeler raised a point of order that, upon further review, the third provision could be adopted now while appropriate work on implementation moves forward.
- Maier moved to amend the motion to include approval of all three revisions; Regenstein seconded and the board adopted the motion unanimously. McIrvin was charged with finalizing the reserves strategy document to reflect the approved provisions.

**Financial Report**
- At Oblinger’s request, McIrvin presented the financial report to the board, focusing on major points for consideration while directing the board’s attention to the meeting materials for further reference.
- McIrvin noted that the statements of financial position showed an overall gain in investments of 5.9% in the first quarter of 2010. She also confirmed that the association’s investment portfolio remains consistent with the investment policy approved by the board.
- On the statement of activities, McIrvin reported that the association achieved $190,000 in net income by the end of the first quarter. She attributed this to timing issues in the incurrence of expenses and event-related cost savings that held total expenses below budgeted levels, as well as to unrealized gains in the market value of the association’s investments.
- On the two-year comparison of the statements of activities, McIrvin highlighted that the positive net income in the first quarter of 2010 compared favorably to the negative net income registered in the first quarter of 2009, noting that the association normally anticipates negative net income in the first quarter of the year.
- The board commended McIrvin and the association for the positive financial results.
- Dodds requested a motion that the board acknowledge receipt of the 2009 audited financial statements; Regenstein made such a motion, Maier seconded it, and the board adopted the motion unanimously.
- As treasurer and an audit committee member, Wheeler delivered the audit committee’s report on the 2009 audited financial statements, noting that the auditors were pleased with the status of the financial reporting of the association and identified no significant concerns.
- Dodds requested a motion that the board accept the audited financial statements as presented; Cooper made such a motion, Hilton seconded it, and the board adopted the motion unanimously.
- Dodds also asked for a motion affirming that its review of the current reserves status and targets conducted in conjunction with the meeting constituted its annual review of the reserves status as required by board policy.
(see the minutes of the October 25, 1999, board meeting for reference). Regenstein made such a motion, Maier seconded it, and the board adopted the motion unanimously.

Business Meeting

Cloud Services Developments

- Oblinger noted that the board had begun discussing cloud services issues last year, and that work since then has led to collaboration with NACUBO on a number of specific initiatives currently in planning or development.
- Oblinger also reviewed the range of activities arising from the cloud services workshop in February, including the chartering of a task group on demand aggregation for IT services in higher education involving NACUBO, Internet2, and EDUCAUSE, which Jackson will now chair, given Katz’s resignation.
- Oblinger indicated that the demand aggregation task group is developing a plan for collaboration among the participating organizations to fill the identified demand aggregation function, with the group’s recommendations due July 15.
- Jackson reviewed the underlying principles the task group has adopted to guide the development of demand aggregation models, noting that the task group’s first area of focus will be cloud services demand aggregation.
- He noted that as work in this area unfolds, some activities will focus first on identifying issues/opportunities and raising awareness. Others will entail the development of approaches to assist members and their institutions in framing and contracting for cloud services.
- Jackson indicated that some opportunities may lead to EDUCAUSE’s serving as a broker for the community in working to establish common frameworks and access to cloud services. He mentioned that EDUCAUSE’s sourcing and reselling of cloud services in some areas was also a possibility, but probably unlikely given the operational complexities that would entail.
- It was noted that EDUCAUSE should discuss these concepts with university systems and other organizations that have initiated various demand aggregation efforts to collect and apply lessons learned.
- The board indicated interest in adapting some key slides from the presentation for talking points board members could use in discussing EDUCAUSE cloud services/demand aggregation efforts. Oblinger indicated she would distribute the relevant slides to the board.
- Wheeler noted that a key emphasis from the cloud services workshop was for EDUCAUSE and the community to “learn by doing” in this space—not to wait for the perfectly defined plan, but to identify and pilot opportunities to develop the expertise for pursuing demand aggregation efforts over time.
- Dodds noted that the approach EDUCAUSE is adopting in terms of demand aggregation fits with the emphasis the board has placed on EDUCAUSE’s serving as a convener of collective action.
- Jackson indicated that hosting and brokering are likely roles for EDUCAUSE, Internet2, and other relevant organizations, but that the large higher education associations probably should look to their members to initiate collaborative activities that they can then support and advance.
- Hilton noted that the approach of developing pilot activities as opposed to starting by launching broadscale initiatives from scratch makes the most sense, given the current environment and EDUCAUSE staffing and resource limitations.
- Mitrano asked about how EDUCAUSE will communicate with its membership about the demand aggregation project and task group. Jackson noted that the task group needs to meet a few times over the course of the summer to develop a fairly clear statement of the opportunities and agenda the partner organizations might pursue.
- Regenstein highlighted this area of work as an example of EDUCAUSE pursuing innovative activities on behalf of the community, and that the board and association need to convey that message in any subsequent communications on the topic.
- Oblinger asked the board to consider whether the model by which EDUCAUSE has pursued development of the demand aggregation project is the right model to follow in the future—convening likely parties, exploring issues and opportunities, and establishing working groups and other mechanisms to initiate development of relevant projects and activities.
• Maier indicated that he saw the approach as consistent with the board’s directions to the executive team and staff about serving as a convener of collective action and helping the membership to identify, develop, and pursue common interests.

• Mitrano seconded Maier’s view, but noted that the next stage of development in EDUCAUSE’s approach to such efforts probably entails more clearly defining the planning framework and time frame in which results from a given activity are expected, which will enable more effective communication to the membership on anticipated deliverables.

• Hilton supported Mitrano’s view, but also stressed that EDUCAUSE is uniquely positioned to convene and organize member representatives interested in pursuing joint initiatives. He suggested that EDUCAUSE might identify and implement mechanisms by which members interested in collaboratively pursuing joint initiatives could find each other at conferences and events, as well as through other channels.

• Wheeler suggested that the open-source/community-source model for applications development might provide an appropriate framework for facilitating collaborative initiatives among EDUCAUSE members.

• Dodds noted that EDUCAUSE is meeting board expectations on the development of its convener function as represented by the demand aggregation effort, but that the association should continue pursuing and expanding its work as a convener of collective action. Lassner indicated that EDUCAUSE should also consider that it might be the prime actor in implementing proposals or projects arising from its convening efforts in some cases.

• In response to a question, Oblinger indicated that NACUBO continues to have interest in demand aggregation and other shared-services/cost-mitigation activities, and that EDUCAUSE would work with NACUBO to explore potential opportunities.

• Oblinger also noted the importance of having NACUA engaged in these discussions and activities from the start to inform the development of various projects from a legal perspective. Santora expressed NACUA’s appreciation for being engaged in this fashion and its desire to continue participating in such collaborations.

• It was suggested that the model EDUCAUSE is following with the cloud services/demand aggregation effort may still overly assume that institutions will pursue independent approaches to cloud services. The view was expressed that the migration of core functionality from the device to the network may accelerate further, requiring more proactive, integrated community responses.

• Dodds noted that the anticipated delivery of the demand aggregation task group’s recommendations by July 15 should allow for the board to review and consider the group’s proposals at its July 22 meeting.

New Opportunity

• Oblinger asked for the board’s input on the development of a new grant opportunity with which EDUCAUSE has been presented. She also highlighted the draft key messages provided to the board for talking about the opportunity, since it will be announced before the board meets again in July.

• Oblinger reported that the planning grant for preparing for the full grant is in the process of being awarded to EDUCAUSE, and that the full grant program will be publicly announced by mid-June.

• She informed the board that the name of the grant program was still under development and that its ultimate size in financial terms was still under consideration. However, EDUCAUSE understood that the individual grants it would make to other institutions and organizations under the program would range from the tens of thousands of dollars to over a million dollars.

• She also indicated that the initial public launch will most likely focus on conveying the program concept and outlines, but not the specifics of the grant competitions; those would be released at some point a few weeks after the public announcement, with the competitions beginning most likely in August.

• Oblinger reviewed some of the potential benefits of the program for EDUCAUSE members, such as the generation of new knowledge and collaboration in a core area for higher education IT and the degree to which it would enhance the community’s position of leadership in higher education.

• She noted that the program’s major goal is to improve the postsecondary learning success of low-income young adults in terms of course completion, achievement of learning outcomes, and degree completion. The program would accomplish this by scaling the development and adoption of promising technology-enabled solutions; this will entail providing investment capital, building the evidence base, and developing communities of practice to continue advancing the grant-funded solutions over time.
Oblinger reviewed the proposed areas the program would address:

- Deploying open courseware for developmental and general education (addressing the challenge of improving online course quality and modularity).
- Encouraging deeper forms of learning engagement through emerging technologies (addressing the challenge of increasing learner engagement).
- Scaling blended learning programs (addressing the challenge of providing flexible yet effective learning options).
- Mobilizing learning analytics for use by students, instructors, and advisors (addressing the challenge of providing learners with performance information to improve course and program retention/completion).

In response to a question, Oblinger noted that the first area on open courseware would address issues of accessibility for disabled populations.

Oblinger reviewed the outlines of the program implementation process, including issues such as the formation of grant application review panels, the potential application steps, and so forth.

Oblinger noted that the program partners are the Gates Foundation, EDUCAUSE, and the League for Innovation in the Community College, with EDUCAUSE as the lead organization for administering the grant and the League serving in an advisory capacity and as a channel for outreach to the community college sector.

Oblinger reviewed the current timeline for the program, beginning with the June public announcement through the proposed announcement of grant awards in early January 2011. She also discussed current operational planning efforts, which Jordan has been working with EDUCAUSE operations staff to address.

Oblinger asked for the board’s input on the draft key messages for communicating about the program.

- Board members discussed the need to frame the program in a positive, proactive light in terms of addressing the key issue of increasing student success. In particular, it was suggested that the messages highlight the program’s potential impact on advancing higher education as a public good.
- It was noted that both for-profit and nonprofit entities might be eligible for grants in some challenge areas, but not necessarily in all, and that some open information requirements will be associated with the knowledge and resources produced as a result of grant funding.
- Board members emphasized the importance of communicating that the program will not distract EDUCAUSE from its existing mission and focus on broader higher education technology issues; Oblinger concurred, stressing the need to convey that the program would rely fully on grant funding and not divert resources from existing programs and services.
- The point was made that the program will strive to focus technology in all of its facets on overcoming barriers to low-income student achievement, which includes the broader technological framework of the institution, not just specific learning technologies. For example, it was noted that networking is a vital component in providing and supporting the necessary learning access and engagement. Likewise, advancing learning analytics requires developing the appropriate administrative systems linkages and capacities. In that context, board members discussed how scaling any particular technology-enabled solution requires a comprehensive approach to technology.
- Regenstein noted that many EDUCAUSE members will want to be involved in the program in some way, such that program messaging will have to address how individual members can participate. Oblinger noted that the program staff will include a position focused on community engagement and development.
- Mitrano noted that the Obama administration has recently announced a national educational technology plan, so EDUCAUSE might consider addressing how the program might relate to that effort.
- In response to a question, Oblinger noted that communications and outreach planning for the program will address the need to inform presidential and other higher education associations on the nature of the program and the opportunities it will provide.

Dodds made a motion that the board expresses its full, enthusiastic support for EDUCAUSE to undertake this grant program given its alignment with the association’s mission and commitment to advancing uncommon thinking for the common good. Regenstein seconded the motion.

In discussing the motion, the board noted that the program represents the type of high-profile, high-impact initiative it envisioned EDUCAUSE would pursue when it set the association’s strategic directions in 2008.
Following the board’s discussion, Dodds called a vote on the motion, which the board approved unanimously.

**Potential Candidates for the 2010–11 EDUCAUSE Board Election**

- Ellen Waite-Franzen, chair of the Nominations Committee, joined the meeting by teleconference to provide the committee’s report on the selection of nominees for the 2010–11 board election slate.
- Waite-Franzen noted that the committee started with a set of 32 proposed nominees, which the committee ultimately narrowed to the eight it submitted to the board for consideration for the four candidate slots.
- She mentioned that all of the proposed nominees received very positive references; however, she indicated that the committee was able to use the other nomination information provided to identify those proposed nominees with sufficient professional experience and engagement with EDUCAUSE to serve on the board.
- As the board’s liaison to the committee, Regenstein commended the quality of the committee’s work, especially its emphasis on trying to provide the board with a range of knowledge and expertise from which to choose to meet the association’s needs.
- Waite-Franzen noted that the full set of proposed nominees included some members who would be good candidates for the board in the future, but who do not yet have the range of experience or community engagement to stand for election to the board at this time.
- Jackson, as the staff liaison to the committee, noted that Waite-Franzen had introduced an innovation in the committee process this year, in which the committee agreed to meet again following delivery of the board report to assess the process and recommend additional improvements.
- Jackson also discussed how the committee pursued a new work group approach to reviewing the proposed nominees that allowed for a better balance of review and workload among the committee members.
- Dodds thanked Waite-Franzen for the committee’s work and her report, and then initiated board discussion of the nominees for the four candidate slots on the 2010–11 election slate.
- In considering nominees, it was suggested that the board members whose terms conclude this year be noted so the board could consider the nominees in light of the knowledge and expertise of those rotating off the board. Oblinger noted that Mitrano, Kossuth, and Santora will conclude their board service this year. It was also noted that Maier, Regenstein, and Hilton will conclude their board service next year.
- The importance of the board in terms of providing strategic thinking and guidance for the association was noted as a primary consideration for the selection of nominees.
- Oblinger reminded the board that board members represent the overall needs and interests of the EDUCAUSE membership, not their institutions or specific types or categories of institutions.
- The board then reviewed all of the proposed nominees and discussed their relative strengths and weaknesses in terms of the association’s needs for strategic leadership and guidance.
- The board voted, with Debra Allison (Miami University), Steve Corbato (University of Utah), David Dodd (Xavier University), and Randy Stiles (Colorado College) selected as the candidates for the 2010–11 board slate.
- Oblinger noted that she would ask the board at its July meeting to consider candidates for the at-large director position Santora will vacate later this year, and that the board can appoint more than one at-large director.
- The board discussed how it might further encourage the development of an expansive, diverse pool of potential nominees for the board election in the future. The possibility of further simplifying the nominations process was considered, as were suggestions for better capitalizing on the proposed nominees generated from year to year.
- It was also noted that better outreach to the community college sector to generate nominees for the board election process may be warranted. Oblinger indicated that the association’s work with the League for Innovation around the potential grant program mentioned earlier might open avenues for greater engagement with the community college sector in general.

**Advanced Core Technologies Initiative (ACTI) and EDUCAUSE Data and Analytics Center (EDAC) Proposals**

- Dodds invited Jackson to introduce the ACTI and EDAC concepts.
• Jackson indicated that the Net@EDU program has diverged from its original roots in addressing emerging developments in core technologies.

• The ACTI proposal is intended to reestablish an EDUCAUSE focus on emerging developments in core technologies, which encompasses the networking interests of Net@EDU, but also the broader array of core technologies (e.g., processing, storage, middleware).

• The goals of the program would be to:
  o Convene those working at the evolving edge of core technologies and those approaching it.
  o Pursue a broader membership than Internet2, the Common Solutions Group, and other similar entities.
  o Have a broader focus than Net@EDU, emphasizing rapidly evolving core technologies central to campus infrastructure (e.g., processing, storage, networking, middleware).

• The structure of the program would be based on:
  o Two kinds of working groups—ad hoc and ongoing.
  o A steering committee to provide oversight and integration of the activities of the various working groups; EDUCAUSE would select the committee membership, but on a representative basis.
  o Funding by a subset of EDUCAUSE members.
  o An ideal membership of about 150.

• Jackson noted that the transition from Net@EDU to ACTI was motivated in part by the decision of the Net@EDU StateNets Working Group to exit the Net@EDU program, with its members remaining EDUCAUSE members.

• In response to a question about the breadth of the ACTI’s potential scope, Jackson noted that the steering committee would help determine the issues within the core technologies space that the program’s working groups would address, which would change over time as issues increased or declined in community priority. The availability of both ad hoc and ongoing working groups would allow for a rational process for distributing and pursuing issues based on their nature and priority.

• Jackson reported that Net@EDU dues notices were set to be issued a couple of weeks after the board meeting, and that a brief explaining the proposed transition to ACTI and inviting Net@EDU members to become founding ACTI members would accompany the invoices.

• Jackson indicated that other next steps would include:
  o Establishing a planning group, most likely including one or two EDUCAUSE board members, to delineate the ACTI structure and initial agenda.
  o Soliciting additional membership in ACTI from the broader EDUCAUSE membership, based on the framework the planning group produces.
  o Holding an organizational meeting at the EDUCAUSE 2010 Annual Conference.
  o Forming initial working groups and the steering committee.

• The board endorsed the ACTI concept and commended Jackson for the vision and initial plan behind it.

• Jackson noted that his conversations with many long-time Net@EDU members indicated support for transitioning to ACTI as a way of revitalizing community engagement in core technology areas.

• Board members noted that care must be taken to maintain the program’s focus on advanced core technologies, as opposed to the operational core.

• Jackson noted that documenting community standards as they emerge in core technology areas might be something ACTI would address, which would encourage a focus on the overall architecture and integration of core technologies.

• It was suggested that the program might utilize Gartner’s “hype cycle” to identify when it should start and stop addressing given issues (e.g., when a core technology no longer falls into the emerging, advanced field).

• The point was raised that corporate participation in the communities on a fair and constructive basis should be considered and encouraged to the extent possible.
Jackson thanked the board for its support of the ACTI concept and noted that he would work with the EDUCAUSE marketing staff to communicate the opportunity to the broader membership. He invited board members to participate in raising awareness of the program’s launch.

Jackson then turned to discuss the EDUCAUSE Data and Analysis Center (EDAC) concept, which reflects the data and analysis needs a board working group identified at the February board meeting; those included:

- Helping EDUCAUSE members to better access and use comparative data for institutional planning and budgeting purposes.
- Providing EDUCAUSE and related organizations with better data for identifying opportunities and challenges related to higher education IT, as well as for supporting collective advocacy efforts.

He noted that proposed EDAC activities would include:

- Collecting and linking to survey data and other relevant data collections.
- Providing guidance, access, and analytic tools to users of the data.
- Assisting with or producing reports based on such data to support practice, planning, and advocacy.

Jackson indicated that much of the expense potentially associated with EDAC would come in developing and maintaining the staff necessary to provide the guidance and analysis capabilities the program envisions.

He suggested that the resource requirements would most likely include:

- A sufficient level of staff.
- Ongoing relationships with key data-collection, data-linking, and dashboard-tool partners.
- Survey expenses.
- Formal collaborations with key entities within and external to EDUCAUSE.

Jackson indicated that starting the center would require a substantial financial investment, which requires EDUCAUSE to assess the affordability of the proposal in relation to its overall financial priorities. He noted that possible revenue-generating opportunities from the data and analysis functions of the center might mitigate, but would not eliminate, the cost of starting and operating it.

Jackson suggested that the possible sequence for initiating EDAC would be:

- Completing the Core Data Service redesign and restructuring.
- Augmenting CDS by including new features, such as geocoded links.
- Building a “dashboard” of key measures.
- Beginning to provide consulting services (perhaps for a fee).
- Designing and implementing panel surveys.
- Beginning to provide ad hoc analyses to EDUCAUSE corporate members (perhaps for a fee).

It was suggested that partnerships with other associations might allow for access to expertise and staff resources to support EDAC. The point was also made that the association might distinguish between general membership services and resources and premium, fee-based offerings.

In response to a question, Jackson indicated that, given the need to further consider the potential return on investment from an EDAC program, it might be reasonable to complete the CDS redesign and restructuring (discussed below in the next section of the minutes), learn from that process and members’ use of the revised service, and then revisit the possibility of pursuing the overall EDAC project.

Board members also discussed whether a broad, data-driven decision-making initiative like EDAC might have particular strategic value to EDUCAUSE since it might make the association “the place to go” for actionable intelligence on higher education technology environments, practices, trends, and so forth.

The community’s increasing concern about the degree to which higher education institutions have to buy back their own data and analysis on trends, operations, and so forth was raised, with EDAC identified as a project that might help address this issue.

It was noted that there remains a strong commitment to completing CDS within the community, such that updating it would likely meet a pressing community need while ensuring continued progress in the development of the association’s data and analysis capabilities.
• The board discussed the concept of taking a staged approach to developing the association’s data and analysis capabilities, in which revitalizing CDS would set the stage for answering some of the revenue stream and program/service portfolio issues associated with EDAC.

• The point was made that expanding the concept of EDAC beyond a focus on higher education IT to addressing the greater business intelligence needs of higher education, in collaboration with NACUBO, the Association for Institutional Research (AIR), and other relevant organizations, might be an important long-term objective. In this context, pursuing the CDS redesign as a foundational element from which to launch a broader initiative would make sense because it would enhance EDUCAUSE’s credibility with potential partners.

• Orr suggested that EDUCAUSE establish a series of professional development activities to accompany the redesign and restructuring of CDS, which would facilitate the development of greater data analysis capabilities within the community as well as broader, more effective use of CDS.

• A question was raised about how EDUCAUSE might engage its membership in the development of something like EDAC, given its other strategic initiatives already in process. Dodds suggested that EDUCAUSE develop some roadmaps for its current strategic initiatives, both to promote member awareness of what is in play and to highlight what the goals of those activities are; a roadmap for EDAC could be included that would show the redesign of CDS as the starting point for making progress toward EDAC’s ultimate development.

• The board discussion returned to revitalizing CDS as a path to establishing EDUCAUSE’s credibility for a broader data and analysis initiative, with the presentation of the CDS redesign and restructuring plan helping to promote the association’s credibility for advancing into a broader initiative.

Core Data Service Redesign Project

• Dan Updegrove joined the meeting to provide an overview of the CDS redesign process. It was noted that Updegrove is serving as the managing consultant for the project.

• Updegrove noted that he had been engaging with EDUCAUSE members at regional conferences through individual interviews and similar activities to develop an initial concept for the shape a redesigned CDS might take.

• He reviewed the rationale for redesigning CDS, which includes improving the quality and relevance of the survey and service to encourage greater survey participation and use of the data, as well as member feedback on the current shortcomings they see it having, which included the following issues.
  
  o Updegrove indicated that initial member input highlights the problems associated with having one basic survey for use by all types of institutions, such as the limits it places on making relevant data comparisons.
  
  o He reported that university system office representatives had raised concerns about their inability to contribute to the survey and thus establish the range of services and resources those offices provide to their institutions.
  
  o Updegrove noted that a number of international institutions participate in CDS, but neither the survey nor service makes any allowances for their participation.
  
  o He also suggested that the survey and service seem to exhibit a CIO-centric focus in terms of issues and data input/access, which makes capturing the full array of institutional IT data difficult to accomplish.
  
  o The lack of institutional and IT metadata in CDS to support effective analysis of institutional responses was also discussed.
  
  o Updegrove noted that the online data service currently can only present two years of data at a time.
  
  o Finally, Updegrove reported that initial findings suggest members and users don’t have a clear understanding of how the CDS survey process and service work. He also mentioned that general awareness of CDS among the broader EDUCAUSE community may not be strong, such that the membership may not be fully capitalizing on the value of CDS.

• Updegrove reviewed the project plan for redesigning CDS to address these issues and constraints, which include:
  
  o Establishing a working group to inform the redesign process with representatives from the business officer, librarian, and institutional research communities in addition to senior IT leaders and professionals.
  
  o Surveying members on their use/nonuse of CDS and needs to which it might be relevant.
  
  o Developing a mock-up and conducting a beta test of a redesigned survey and service.
Reviewing and potentially revising the appropriate use policy (AUP), which currently places significant restrictions on the use of data from the service.

Engaging with the 2009 summary report authors about improving the annual summary report and applying lessons learned from the development of last year’s summary report to inform the redesign process.

Introducing “Core Data Service, Version 2” at the EDUCAUSE 2010 Annual Conference.

Launching the redesigned survey in January 2011 and the redesigned data service in May 2011.

- Updegrove reviewed preliminary design concepts for the survey, service, and AUP with the board members, who then provided input and suggestions for further work or exploration.

- Updegrove suggested that the CDS redesign might include more and better promotion of the service and its capabilities, user training, and models/exemplars for data use. He also suggested that EDUCAUSE might consider outreach to other higher education audiences during the redesign process as well.

- It was noted that some CIO groups have discussed CDS in its current iteration and expressed disappointment with the quality and capabilities of the service, which reinforces the need to conduct the redesign process.

- The point was raised that more guidance on the parameters for appropriate use and analysis of CDS data needs to be provided before greater access to CDS is extended to non-IT audiences, given that accurately interpreting CDS data today may require specific knowledge of the institutions and IT operations in question.

- Oblinger invited the board members to send input on the redesign process or related issues directly to Updegrove.

- Oblinger asked the board members to consider how the discussion of the CDS redesign process might impact the previous conversation on EDAC; the board indicated that the process fits well with the proposed roadmap for potentially developing EDAC.

- The question was raised about whether all of the redesign tasks could be completed in time for the launch of a new survey in January and a new service in May. Updegrove indicated that EDUCAUSE might not be able to launch the complete “Core Data Service, Version 2.0” in January, but it might be able to implement a “Core Data Service, Version 1.5” that would represent a major improvement, with progress on Version 2.0 continuing thereafter.

- Oblinger thanked Updegrove for reviewing the project and plan with the board.

The board went into executive session at approximately 3:00 p.m., EDT. The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m., EDT.