**Call to Order**

- Lea called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m., MST; she welcomed Joanne Kossuth to the board and congratulated David Lassner and Pattie Orr on their election to the board for terms starting January 2010.
- Lea also welcomed Greg Jackson as the new EDUCAUSE vice president for policy and analysis.

**Approval of the Minutes**

- Lea asked for edits to the minutes of the board’s July 28 meeting. Hearing none, she asked for a motion to approve the minutes as written.
- Campbell moved that the board approve the July 28 minutes as written; Dodds seconded the motion, and the board approved it by acclamation.

**President’s Report**

- Oblinger reported that registration for the annual conference had significantly exceeded attendance estimates set earlier in the year, reaching over 6,500 from all registration categories. Lea congratulated Kossuth as the program chair as well as Oblinger and the EDUCAUSE staff for this success.
- Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE 2009 Online, the first online companion event for the conference, had generated over 270 registrations, with participation via those registrations estimated to be roughly 2,000.
- Oblinger highlighted the on-campus hosting kit for online events developed by the EDUCAUSE Professional Development Committee under the leadership of board-member elect Orr that was made available to EDUCAUSE 2009 Online participants.
- Oblinger also reported that the online event and the main conference drew representatives from 47 countries.
- Oblinger noted that the number of corporate exhibitors had reached over 250 by the time of the conference, with conference revenue from corporate sources exceeding last year’s level by over $240,000.
- It was reported that efforts by the operations staff under the leadership of Jordan and Gretchen Bliss, the new conference services director, yielded roughly $250,000 in savings from the conference budget.
- Oblinger highlighted innovations at the annual conference, including onsite preconference tours of local technology sites and the implementation of EDUCAUSE Central, a conference hub to help members and other participants connect with EDUCAUSE leaders, staff, and resources.
- In terms of membership, Oblinger reported that the current figures had increased slightly since the board received the meeting materials and were higher than at the same time the previous year; she noted that corporate membership numbers had increased over the previous year as well.
- Oblinger highlighted the changes in the Core Data Service annual summary report for this year, including the introduction of longitudinal data and new charts and graphs to make information more accessible.
- She noted that the board meeting materials contained an overview of the final version of the corporate strategy. Oblinger stated that the strategy entails a new approach to corporate engagement, which would be reflected in the partnership forum taking place at the conference the next day.
• Oblinger indicated that another key part of the strategy is the recognition that EDUCAUSE can engage with corporations based on shared needs and interests. Oblinger highlighted revisions to the guiding principles for corporate programs as well as new efforts to provide avenues for engagement with corporate members.
• Oblinger discussed the refinement of the EDUCAUSE graphic identity and its value in signaling change and a clearer brand identity for the association.
• Oblinger reported on the implementation of DNSSEC for the .edu domain, which EDUCAUSE administers; she noted that it would enhance security for all members of the domain.
• Oblinger announced that EDUCAUSE had joined InCommon, noting that a related press release would be sent shortly after the Catalyst Award for federated identity management was presented during Thursday’s general session.
• Dodds congratulated Oblinger and the EDUCAUSE staff for the association’s success in light of the year’s challenges. He asked how the board might compare EDUCAUSE’s experience with that of similar associations. Jordan indicated that the association’s event services vendors had reported that most of the events with which they work were down 20–40%, whereas the EDUCAUSE annual conference was down only 12% from last year’s record attendance. In terms of membership, Jordan noted that most associations in Colorado had seen membership declines of 10–20%, whereas EDUCAUSE had actually grown membership over the course of the year.
• Santora reported that her perspective as the head of another higher education association supports the view that EDUCAUSE had definitely avoided the negative trends many other associations had encountered. She also noted that many associations had moved their smaller events from face-to-face to online to facilitate greater participation in a cost-effective fashion.
• Wheeler and Katz reported that the Kuali Foundation and EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR), respectively, had also experienced generally good results, given the economic climate.

Financial Report
Resolution
• McIrvin requested board action on the following resolution to adjust the authorized signatories on the association’s checking and brokerage accounts to reflect staff changes:

RESOLVED, That Lucinda T. Lea, Chair; or Carrie E. Regenstein, Treasurer; or Diana G. Oblinger, President; or Richard N. Katz, Vice President; or Garth Jordan, Vice President; or Gregory Jackson, Vice President; or Catherine Yang, Senior Director; or Susan A. O’Rourke, Senior Office Manager; of this organization; be and are hereby authorized to withdraw funds of this organization from said Wells Fargo Bank of Boulder checking, money market, federal securities, repurchase agreements, and certificate accounts by transfer to other EDUCAUSE bank accounts and upon checks of this organization, signed as provided herein with signatures duly certified to said bank by the Director of Financial and Administrative Services of this organization, and said bank is hereby authorized to honor and pay any and all checks so signed, including those drawn to the individual order of any officer or any other person authorized to sign the same. Any check exceeding ten thousand dollars ($10,000) requires two authorized signatures.

• Regenstein moved that the board adopt the resolution as written; Maier seconded the motion, and the board approved it by acclamation.

Statements of Financial Position
• On the performance of the association’s investments, McIrvin reported a 1.2% increase in market value from August 2008 to August 2009.
• She also highlighted for the board the materials provided by the association’s investment advisor showing that the EDUCAUSE investment portfolio is in line with the investment policy approved by the board.
• McIrvin noted that the reported decrease in deferred revenue relates to the relatively late time frame in which the bulk of annual conference registrations were made this year—the financial statement figures in the board materials dated from the end of August, while updated numbers through the end of October showed a marked improvement that McIrvin expected to continue as the full annual conference results were registered.
Statement of Activities

- McIrvin noted that the net loss as of the end of August was $700,000, which is $1 million less than originally budgeted through that time frame. (She reminded the board that EDUCAUSE budgets to roughly break even by the end of the year, including a final accounting of annual conference revenues and expenses.)
- McIrvin noted that timing differences in the incurrence of expenses in areas such as travel, marketing, and professional fees comprise part of this variance, with most of the relevant expense items expected to fall in line with the budget as the year progresses.
- McIrvin also reported that food and beverage costs for regional and specialty conferences were less than budgeted.
- EDUCAUSE had over-budgeted for printing costs due to the rising costs for paper and shipping at the time the budget was made; since those costs declined significantly thanks to the drop in fuel costs, actual printing expenses were lower than budgeted.

Business Meeting

2010 Budget (Action: Approval of 2010 budget)

- Before the board reviewed the proposed 2010 budget, Oblinger noted that the EDUCAUSE budget process is being revised to include a regular review of the assumptions behind budgeted programs and services, as opposed to simply extending funding trends into the future.
- McIrvin answered a question by noting that the budget provides EDUCAUSE with flexibility to address strategic issues. Oblinger seconded that perspective, citing the relevant aspects of the budget.
- Board members recommended that the staff remind the board each year about the amounts and purposes of those strategic funds so the board has a clear understanding of the flexibility available to the organization.
- Oblinger noted that the 2010 budget does not include a planned draw on reserves, so such funds can be used to support the operational plan scheduled for discussion later in the meeting or other needed investments.
- In response to a question, McIrvin noted that the budget includes nonallocated funds to provide operational flexibility, with any other funds for unbudgeted purposes necessitating a draw on reserves requiring board approval. McIrvin indicated that the board would only need to approve an overall draw, not each item such a draw might fund.
- Oblinger stated that the current process for approving a draw on reserves provides the executive team with the flexibility to address strategic and operational issues as they arise. She did note, however, that some policies about expenditures requiring board approval (e.g., the amount above which board approval is required) may be outdated; the board will be asked to consider changes in those areas next year.
- McIrvin presented the proposed 2010 budget:
  - She reminded the board that the dues year for the association runs from July to June, while the budget year follows the calendar year. She noted that the budget recommends a 2% dues increase in 2010, following a year in which the association did not have a dues increase. Oblinger stated that the increases would range from $10 to $159, for an average increase of $34, with the increased revenue going to partially offset increased programming and services for members.
  - In response to a question, Jackson stated that Net@EDU is assessing how its expenses relate to its activities and where it may need to make adjustments; Oblinger also noted that Net@EDU has not actively recruited new members in the past, so it may have unexplored growth opportunities.
  - McIrvin stated that the budget calls for modest increases in registration fees for the annual and regional conferences, with the proposed levels based on an evaluation of registration fees for comparable events and, in the case of the regionals, projected break-even points. Jordan and Oblinger noted that the revenue and expense structures for the annual and regional conferences had not been reevaluated for an extended period, so the proposed 2010 fee changes would bring fees in line with expenses even as the staff explores ways to realign event cost structures with contemporary standards.
  - The board discussed potential member reactions to the budgeted increases in registration fees and member dues given the fiscal issues they may face. Board members were satisfied, though, that the increases were needed to sustain the association’s revenue model, which relies on modest annual increases in dues and fee
levels to avoid potentially large spikes at any given time, as well as to fund operational and technology improvements needed to maintain and enhance member services.

- Board members indicated that members may not be aware of the association’s historical approach to managing dues and fee levels, and therefore the 2010 changes should be communicated to them in the context of how EDUCAUSE manages such increases to keep them relatively modest over time.
- Board members requested that staff present an overview of the association’s policy on financial reserves at an upcoming meeting to clarify what constitutes the appropriate level and uses of reserve funds.
- It was further suggested that the statements of financial position indicate the level of operational reserves with a notation highlighting the appropriate level and uses of such funds under EDUCAUSE policy.
- The board discussed the proposed 2% merit salary pool increase for nonexecutive staff in light of the need for EDUCAUSE to stay competitive in the nonprofit market in which it operates. Lea referred the board members to the minutes of the board’s executive committee meetings for the year (please see appendix A to these minutes). As noted in the committee’s September 15 meeting minutes, a majority of the committee decided to recommend to the board that no salary increases be given in 2010 to EDUCAUSE personnel versus adopting the president’s recommendation for a merit salary pool increase, citing concerns about the economic downturn and its impact on member institutions. However, the committee agreed to recommend to the board that it approve one-time bonuses for staff based on merit.
- The board discussed the executive committee’s recommendation as well as Oblinger’s recommendation that the board approve a merit salary pool increase of 2% given the association’s financial health and the competitive pressures previously noted. After careful deliberation, the board agreed the proposed increase in the salary pool was appropriate given the identified needs and the association’s solid financial standing. The board considered the executive committee’s recommendation that the increase be allocated in the form of one-time bonuses versus merit increases in salary, but decided to leave the allocation approach as specified in the proposed budget (i.e., merit increases).
- The board stressed the importance of ensuring that however the increase was allocated, it went to recognize and maximize staff performance. It was also suggested that the executive team explore the potential efficacy of a bonus program to enhance organizational performance and competitiveness in the future.
- McIrvin reviewed the proposed capital expenditures for 2010, noting they would be financed by a 6% draw on reserves, which is in line with previously approved board policy.
- With the budget presentation concluded, Regenstein moved that the board approve the 2010 budget as submitted; Hilton seconded the motion, and the board approved it by acclamation.
- As chair, Lea thanked McIrvin for the quality and effectiveness of her financial management and reporting, with the board as a whole voicing similar appreciation.

**Operations Plan (Action: Review and validate key directions of the operations plan)**

- Lea invited Oblinger and Jordan to present an overview of the proposed operations plan.
- Oblinger noted that Jordan would cover the plan’s major elements with the goal of generating board input on the overall philosophy and approach it reflects.
- Jordan indicated that he had reviewed the organization’s operations, interviewed staff, and evaluated the branding work that had taken place over the last year as part of developing the operations plan. He noted that the driving concept behind the plan is developing the capacity to deliver member experiences that surpass expectations, and how achieving that is central to clarifying and sustaining the value of the association’s brand in the eyes of members. Jordan indicated, though, that EDUCAUSE could not enhance all member experiences at the same time—the resource requirements would be too great. That led to an emphasis in the plan on identifying those member experiences EDUCAUSE could address in the near term with available resources where such efforts would significantly advance the value of the EDUCAUSE brand from the member perspective. Given that context, Jordan reported that the operations plan calls for the following:
  - A redesign of the EDUCAUSE website: Jordan noted that the website requires serious updating and improvement, but staff are still sorting through the needed changes and associated costs.
  - Improvements to the annual conference: Jordan stated that he had “secret shoppers” attending the 2009 annual conference to provide objective feedback on where EDUCAUSE might improve the member experience. He also discussed plans for a process audit to improve the efficiency of conference operations. Noting the $250,000 in savings EDUCAUSE generated from the 2009 annual conference budget with
minimal review, he suggested that further process refinement might yield additional savings as well as a more effective allocation of staff resources.

○ A new position to manage the delivery of hybrid meetings: Jordan indicated that conducting EDUCAUSE 2009 Online had highlighted the need for a position focused on making the delivery of similar events as efficient and effective as possible.

○ A more clearly defined and integrated membership model:
  ▪ Member feedback demonstrates that EDUCAUSE has to consider whether a unified brand requires a unified member experience, Jordan stated.
  ▪ He suggested that part of this process entails assessing the existing memberships EDUCAUSE offers (e.g., ELI, ECAR, Net@EDU), their different benefits, the association’s primary representative model, and the types of volunteer experiences EDUCAUSE provides.
  ▪ As an example, he indicated that EDUCAUSE might address these issues through a tiered membership model for programs and services, which could also be structured to take into account different types of institutions and positions.
  ▪ Jordan noted that implementing something like the example presented would have major operational and programmatic implications, and thus the overall issue requires careful, thoughtful consideration.

○ Jordan asked for board input on membership models, benefits, the primary representative structure, and volunteer experiences:
  ▪ Board members agreed that having separate membership programs within the context of overall EDUCAUSE membership has been a source of confusion; the board indicated support for the more unified model Jordan discussed.
  ▪ In response to a question, Jordan noted that the approach reflected in the sample membership model could apply to the member interface for identifying and selecting volunteer opportunities.
  ▪ Jordan replied to a question about the primary representative model by stating that it wasn’t clear what changes EDUCAUSE might consider to it, but that ensuring EDUCAUSE communications do not depend so heavily on primary representatives to reach other member audiences is a concern.
  ▪ The board supported the view that EDUCAUSE should consider a hybrid representative model, in which some key communications are directed to the primary representative while more general information about content, programs, services, and so forth, is channeled to individual members.
  ▪ It was suggested that EDUCAUSE ask the primary representatives what decisions/information needs to flow through them, versus what information and communication could be directed to EDUCAUSE members in general; the possibility of member institutions having a designated marketing representative to facilitate general EDUCAUSE outreach was raised.
  ▪ Board members also encouraged EDUCAUSE to consider more actively marketing its services and member benefits to other relevant professional communities, such as librarians, while taking care to avoid overtaxing the association’s resources in the process.
  ▪ It was noted that empowering members to self-organize and conduct their own activities might create new volunteer opportunities, and thus increase the potential for member engagement.
  ▪ Board members discussed the potential implications of consolidated invoicing for EDUCAUSE programs and services, noting that how possible package discounts might be structured could play a significant role in whether such an approach produces overall increases in program participation.

○ Market segmentation: Jordan noted that segmenting EDUCAUSE’s markets will help clarify the value proposition EDUCAUSE presents to its constituencies. He suggested that an initial focus in 2010 on CIOs as a market segment seems both doable and appropriate from a strategic perspective:
  ▪ Jordan indicated that the executive team had had some initial discussions on CIO needs and interests, and thus the targeted programs and services EDUCAUSE might consider providing to that segment.
  ▪ Jordan noted that EDUCAUSE currently does not present a comprehensive picture of the benefits it offers to CIOs; thus, segmentation would allow EDUCAUSE to establish a clear value proposition for CIOs that would improve their experience and enhance the association’s brand in their eyes.
  ▪ Oblinger noted that segmentation entails making choices about what EDUCAUSE provides for different constituencies, which departs from an “all things to all people” approach.
She also indicated that segmentation has the potential to create friction in terms of how segments are defined and the degree to which those not in a particular segment react.

- The board briefly brainstormed other segments EDUCAUSE might target to inform staff planning.
- It was suggested that an alternative or augmentation to a segmentation approach might be focusing on the themes EDUCAUSE wants to advance and structuring programs, services, volunteer options, and so forth, along those lines.
- The board supported addressing CIOs as the association’s core constituency, but suggested the staff explore the merits of using a thematic approach for engaging other stakeholder groups.
- It was noted that helping members self-organize within the EDUCAUSE context into the groupings that make the most sense to them is an important consideration. Also raised was the key question of how EDUCAUSE might help potential segments relate to each other and the community as a whole.
- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE enhance its outreach to the more technically oriented campus IT staff members (e.g., system architects) to ensure the full spectrum of the community is appropriately engaged.
- Board members expressed interest in continuing the dialogue with staff on these issues as implementation of the operations plan takes shape.

**Policy and Analysis Program (Action: Review and validate new thinking on EDUCAUSE policy and analysis efforts)**

- Jackson presented an overview of the various policy and organizational options facing the policy and analysis program and how he was thinking about integrating them, getting board input on the choices.
- Jackson walked the board through his views on the nature of policy and its development, focusing on the levels and dimensions at which policy is made and applied. He noted that some policies are endogenous (from within the institution or organization) and some are exogenous (generated from external sources, such as the federal government); some are pragmatic (intended to solve a particular set of problems) and some are fundamental (essential to the functioning or handling of a given operation or process); some are motivational, intended to spur action, and some are regulatory, intended to inhibit action; and some are protectionist versus progressive.
- Jackson noted the need to think about EDUCAUSE policy operations in terms of partnerships and foci:
  - In terms of partnerships, Jackson suggested that primary audiences include the presidential associations, for example, where engagement entails achieving a balance between the general interests and needs of higher education and specific IT policy concerns.
  - He also noted that professional and disciplinary associations are key potential partnership groups, as are other higher education IT organizations (e.g., ACUTA, Internet2, NLR, regional and state networks).
  - Jackson indicated that EDUCAUSE might look to build policy-oriented partnerships with CIO organizations that are currently separate from EDUCAUSE.
  - In response to a question, Lea noted that it is common for CIOs to organize by state, region, university system, athletic conference, and so forth. Wheeler asked if we have the full inventory of such organizations; Jackson noted that we do not yet, but that he is developing one.
  - Federal relations officers, Jackson noted, are another potential higher education community with which EDUCAUSE might develop partnerships on policy issues.
  - He also indicated that EDUCAUSE has and will continue to work with legislative and agency staff.
  - Jackson noted that while EDUCAUSE cannot fully engage all of these constituencies at all times, it has to have points of contact throughout all of them.
- Key policy foci Jackson highlighted included:
  - Legislative mandates—e.g., CALEA, Higher Education Opportunity Act peer-to-peer networking provisions, emergency alerts, broadband stimulus funding; in response to a question, Jackson noted that EDUCAUSE has been actively engaged in trying to influence the debate around how anchor institutions might participate in the available broadband stimulus funding.
  - Security and privacy—once primarily concerned with networking, this dialogue has migrated to a mainly data security focus.
○ Intellectual property—balancing higher education’s needs for open access to informational resources with institutional interests in safeguarding existing or potential income streams from intellectual property generated on their campuses.

○ Investments and incentives—the impacts of funding guidelines from NSF and other sponsors on institutional decision-making and operations.

○ Corporate relations—engaging the corporate community serving higher education in establishing common templates and guidelines for contracts, for example.

○ Jackson noted that many of these issues would benefit from common policy approaches, with collaboration returning significant benefits while idiosyncratic approaches yield little competitive advantage.

• Jackson walked the board through a table comparing policy opportunities and players, structured in terms of networking and communication, identity and authentication, privacy and security, and intellectual property along one axis, and legislative and regulatory, interstitial and collaborative, and campus practice and compliance along the other. (Please see appendix B to these minutes.)

• It was noted that higher education institutions have to be careful that efforts to develop shared frameworks for IT policies and contracts do not cross over into potential “restraint of trade” violations. Jackson agreed, but indicated that there is adequate room for appropriate member collaboration on policy and contract issues.

• Jackson highlighted that EDUCAUSE has historically focused on the “networking and communication/legislative and regulatory” cell of his table. He asked for the board’s input on other policy areas into which the policy and analysis program might need to reach, guided by two key parameters:
  ○ Areas that are truly important.
  ○ Areas in which EDUCAUSE involvement can make a real difference.

• The board endorsed a programmatic focus on that convergence of important issues in areas where EDUCAUSE can have a genuine impact.

• Board members suggested that engaging with major research sponsors (e.g., the National Science Foundation) to develop research computing infrastructure guidelines that support shared infrastructure approaches, both within and between institutions, might fall into the “important issue EDUCAUSE can impact” arena.

• Working to advance higher education’s interests in a possible revision of the federal E-rate program was identified as another possibility, as was addressing intellectual property issues related to the development of open educational resources.

• The point was raised that EDUCAUSE should have a role with the presidential associations beyond shared policy concerns—EDUCAUSE should strive to educate presidents and provosts on why IT issues should matter to them by trying to secure presentation slots on presidential event programs, for example.

• It was noted that there are important issues in all of the areas Jackson identified, which raised the question of how EDUCAUSE should make choices. Jackson indicated that part of the process entails having discussions like the one taking place, and part of it comes down to the association’s leadership making judgment calls.

• He also stated that EDUCAUSE has good sensor networks in Washington, D.C., but he needs to build a broader set of relationships with member and other higher education constituencies around the country, which he is in the process of doing.

• Responding to a question, Jackson agreed that he needed to build an advisory mechanism to help inform the thinking of the policy and analysis staff on how to shape and pursue the EDUCAUSE policy agenda. It was suggested that establishing a committee or some more formal advisory mechanism might help with this.

• Board members indicated that EDUCAUSE should calibrate its views on where it might have an impact to account for the shift in the policy environment that took place with the change in administrations.

• In response to a question, Jackson indicated that EDUCAUSE is heavily engaged in network neutrality policy issues and that he would continue to evaluate the activity level the association needs to have in this area.

• Orr asked if EDUCAUSE has developed good relations with IT policy officers, to which Mitrano replied that the Institute for Computer Policy and Law (ICPL) could provide a list of the IT policy officers at many EDUCAUSE member institutions to facilitate staff contacts if necessary.

• It was suggested that as EDUCAUSE considers restructuring its representative structure it might add designated policy representatives to the framework.
Future Directions (Action: Discuss “Future of Higher Education and EDUCAUSE” thought pieces; provide background for EDUCAUSE future directions, including development of a long-term strategy for CIO support and engagement)

- Oblinger asked the board to consider whether EDUCAUSE has the right strategic directions, given its current context, and what has changed since they were established a year ago.
- Oblinger also indicated that she wanted the board’s input on how EDUCAUSE should engage with CIOs, taking into account the segmentation discussion held earlier in the meeting.
- Oblinger reviewed the common themes from the board members’ essays on the future of higher education and EDUCAUSE:
  - Finances will never return to “normal.”
  - New business models are emerging.
  - We face a more complex marketplace (including new players).
  - The cost of education and student debt will drive changes.
  - The marketplace will drive reform.
  - The operative metaphor for many activities is moving to “above campus”—the expansion of service delivery and service provisioning to sources outside the institution.
  - We need to educate senior institutional leaders on IT’s role given this context.
  - CIOs have an important role in framing the debate (regardless of how one defines “CIOs”).
- Oblinger asked Maier to highlight Georgia Tech’s strategic planning efforts targeting 2035; as part of the process, the institution brought in a futurist who highlighted “the top-10 trends for the extreme future.” The focus on these trends highlights their potential for disrupting existing social, economic, and cultural norms:
  - Maier noted that it’s useful to think about such trends not just in and of themselves, but also in terms of how their effects might combine and compound. For example, he noted the potential impact of dramatic growth in global population combined with ever-increasing longevity in the industrialized world.
- Oblinger indicated that the board essays also expressed some shared perspectives on what EDUCAUSE should do about the trends board members identified:
  - EDUCAUSE can’t be “Switzerland” anymore.
  - Move to more engagement and advocacy.
  - Convene discussions (e.g., with corporations).
  - Enhance professional development options.
  - Develop strategic partnerships with other organizations, including international ones.
  - Proactively surface trends.
- Oblinger stated that in thinking about potential actions, it is useful to think about EDUCAUSE’s primary functions: educate, analyze, advocate, and convene.
- Oblinger then asked the board if EDUCAUSE is on track with its existing strategic directions, given the current changes in the environment:
  - It was suggested that helping members work together to address major challenges (e.g., facilitating the formation and operation of consortia to address shared needs) might be a function unto itself. However, others indicated that it probably falls under the “convene” function or might be addressed by specific projects or activities under each function.
  - It was also suggested that international engagement might be an area for greater EDUCAUSE focus.
  - The point was raised that the four broad functions or directions are fine, but the board would be able to provide more effective input on whether EDUCAUSE is pursuing them effectively if it could see a breakdown of the actions EDUCAUSE is taking in each area, the actions it might take if it had the resources, and so forth.
  - Board members agreed that the top leadership of higher education IT sees technology’s potential to facilitate the unbundling of higher education, but it is unclear that presidents and provosts do.
• It was argued that EDUCAUSE has an essential role to play in educating presidents and provosts about this emerging trend, especially as IT’s place among the senior leadership roles within the institution may be less clear at some institutions than it was previously.

• Others expressed the view that presidents, provosts, and faculties may not be ready to accept the possibility that higher education services could become unbundled, with different organizations delivering different aspects of what are currently considered core higher education services, and thus EDUCAUSE might better spend its efforts on other issues. From this perspective, EDUCAUSE could still play a positive role in addressing the potential emergence of unbundling by providing professional development opportunities for higher education IT professionals on how to function in an environment of radical change.

○ The point was raised that EDUCAUSE may have a narrow time frame in which to take a leading role in convening collective action on shared models for a range of important issues (e.g., open educational resources, scholarly communications):
  • It was argued that applying an open educational resources model to textbooks, for example, might dramatically reduce student and institutional costs associated with them, and thus put IT on the presidential agenda in a positive way.
  • Collaborating with libraries to develop effective models for providing durable access to scholarly resources was also identified as an important potential focus for EDUCAUSE.

○ The board members generally agreed that EDUCAUSE should begin recruiting member and community support to pursue collaborative initiatives in key areas like those discussed.

• Noting the earlier point about IT possibly losing momentum in the context of higher education leadership, Oblinger opened a discussion about what EDUCAUSE might do to more effectively engage and support CIOs:
  ○ Oblinger indicated that the executive team had had initial discussions about how to distill an action agenda from the input gathered so far on CIO needs and interests. Oblinger noted a few key needs identified so far:
    • The ability to share information with other CIOs in a trusted, protected environment.
    • The ability to share information with other CIOs publicly.
    • Providing access to thought leadership (in and outside higher education).
    • Leveraging CIOs’ collective influence on specific issues (e.g., with a corporation, on a policy issue).
  ○ She discussed establishing a CIO-focused blog site as an example of a service EDUCAUSE could provide:
    • It could be a closed blog, with only CIOs able to contribute and respond to posts directly.
    • Well-respected CIOs would be invited to be guest bloggers and rotate as contributors.
    • CIOs could forward posts outside of the group under set terms; if non-CIOs wanted to contribute to the blog, their submissions would be shared through their CIO.
    • Periodically EDUCAUSE would synthesize blog comments and publish a summary, including selected statements from blog contributors (with their permission).
  ○ Oblinger also suggested EDUCAUSE might establish listening posts with organized groups in the CIO community as another way of enhancing CIO support and engagement:
    • Relevant groups might include the Common Solutions Group (CSG), Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) CIOs, Research University CIO Conclave (RUCC), and others.
    • EDUCAUSE would work with these groups to identify and integrate relevant perspectives into EDUCAUSE events, publications, and programming.
  ○ Oblinger discussed the concept of a CIO track at the annual conference as another example of a near-term option for better serving CIOs. A possible structure would be:
    • Sessions for CIOs:
      ○ Wednesday: four CIO sessions (not back-to-back)
      ○ Thursday: four CIO sessions (not back-to-back)
      ○ A specific CIO-only period to visit exhibit hall
      ○ A special CIO/corporate representative reception
      ○ Special discussions with keynote speakers
• Sessions by CIOs:
  ○ CIO-led panels and small group discussions
  ○ Volunteer mentors for aspiring CIOs or IT managers, with discussions individually or in small groups
  ○ The board expressed support for the options presented and provided input on implementation. For example, some suggested that EDUCAUSE utilize a relatively broad definition of “CIO” to facilitate effective dialogue among relevant constituencies, while others encouraged a narrower focus to ensure that CIOs feel their views are heard and their needs are met.
  ○ It was suggested that the mentoring sessions mentioned as a possible feature of a CIO conference track might serve as a starting point for a broader focus on CIO-to-CIO-aspirant mentoring. This point connected with prior board discussions about the importance of building affinity for EDUCAUSE among CIO aspirants, especially as the current generation of CIOs moves toward retirement.
  ○ Board members encouraged staff to consider how CIO engagement efforts might achieve a balance between general leadership considerations and the unique issues CIOs at different types of institutions may face. Also, in considering potential CIO blog contributors, it was suggested that EDUCAUSE would need to take care to include truly innovative thinkers regardless of institutional type.
  ○ It was suggested that having EDUCAUSE primary representatives identify who at their institutions could access CIO-specific content and opportunities might generate the balance a segmentation model requires.
  ○ Another idea concerned the possibility of EDUCAUSE adopting customer relationship management (CRM) approaches to frame what it should do for its major constituencies, including CIOs.
  ○ Board members noted that a way to move beyond possible concerns about segmentation might be to focus on personalization, i.e., allowing individuals to choose the communication channels in which they engage.
• The board agreed that the association should move forward on the major strategic issues it can and should address, either directly or by convening collective efforts among members.
• Board members then discussed various topics for that agenda, including open educational resources, scholarly communication, teaching and learning with technology, and cloud computing.
• Another suggested approach to framing an action agenda concerned identifying a major goal for higher education in which IT would play a pivotal role and initiating specific activities to help achieve it.

**Election of Officers/Selection of Appointed Board Member**
• The board discussed the need for greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities of board officers, the criteria for selecting them, and the information that should accompany officer nominations.
• Oblinger noted that the board may need to review its bylaws and governance processes in general to address possible inconsistencies and make adjustments, given the association’s evolution over the last several years.
• The board supported a proposal for staff to review the bylaws, identify potential issues, and propose a set of revisions for board approval, taking into account any relevant legal requirements. It was suggested that the review encompass the officer election process, the board committee structure, and any inherent inconsistencies in the bylaws. A recommendation was also made that the board institute a regular review of the bylaws; such a review might take place every five years or so. It was noted, for example, that the board had agreed that the vice-chair would serve as the liaison between the board and the Nominations Committee, but that this decision was not yet reflected in the association’s bylaws.
• The board then moved to the election of board officers for 2010 after a brief review of office roles and responsibilities as well as those nominated for election to the various posts.
• The following board members were elected to serve as board officers for 2010:
  ○ Chair: Ted Dodds, University of British Columbia
  ○ Vice Chair: Carrie Regenstein, Carnegie Mellon University
  ○ Secretary: Tom Maier, Georgia Institute of Technology
  ○ Treasurer: Brad Wheeler, Indiana University
• The board discussed the nomination of Linda Thor, president of Rio Salado College, to serve as an at-large member of the board for a four-year term starting January 2010. Regenstein moved that the board appoint Thor as an at-large member; Maier seconded the motion, and the board approved it by acclamation.
New Business

- Oblinger noted that the terms of three board members would expire at the end of 2009—Lucinda Lea, Marilyn McMillan, and Jerry Campbell.
- Oblinger expressed her thanks to each of the retiring board members and invited them to make a parting statement to their fellow board members.

The board moved into executive session at approximately 3:50 p.m., MST; the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 p.m., MST.
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EDUCAUSE Board of Directors Executive Committee
2009 Meeting Minutes

Members of the EDUCAUSE Board Executive Committee (2009): Lucinda Lea, Chair; Tracy Mitrano, Vice Chair; Tom Maier, Secretary; Carrie Regenstein, Treasurer; and Diana Oblinger, EDUCAUSE President and CEO.

July 6, 2009
On July 6, 2009, EDUCAUSE Board Executive Committee members Lea, Mitrano, Maier, and Regenstein met via teleconference to discuss an anonymous memo that had been sent to some committee members regarding EDUCAUSE leadership. The situation, as discussed, was then presented to the full EDUCAUSE board in executive session at the July 28, 2009, board meeting.

September 15, 2009
On September 15, 2009, EDUCAUSE Board Executive Committee members Lea, Mitrano, Maier, Regenstein, and Oblinger met via teleconference to discuss the presidential evaluation and compensation process and guidelines for 2009. Lea, Mitrano, Maier, and Regenstein felt that anonymous evaluations by all staff of the president should continue this year, as had been agreed on by the board at its July meeting. Oblinger requested the board consider merit increases for nonexecutive staff. Given the state of the economy and the experiences of EDUCAUSE general membership, Lea, Mitrano, Maier, and Regenstein decided to recommend to the board that no salary increases be given in 2010 to EDUCAUSE personnel. However, the committee decided to recommend to the board that one-time bonuses for exceptional work be given to the appropriate personnel. This was presented to the full EDUCAUSE board at the November 2, 2009, board meeting.

October 16, 2009
On October 16, 2009, EDUCAUSE Board Executive Committee members Lea, Mitrano, Maier, and Regenstein met via teleconference to discuss and formulate a draft version of the 2009 evaluation of EDUCAUSE President and CEO Diana Oblinger. The draft 2009 evaluation was presented to the full EDUCAUSE board for review and discussion, and the 2009 evaluation was finalized in executive session at the November 2, 2009, board meeting. Executive Committee members Maier, Mitrano, Regenstein, and Oblinger stated that they would like to acknowledge the overall effort and leadership provided by EDUCAUSE Board Chair Lucinda Lea this year, and in particular her work in bringing the annual presidential evaluation and compensation process to a successful conclusion.

Respectfully submitted by EDUCAUSE Board Secretary Tom Maier.
## Appendix B

### EDUCAUSE Policy Analysis and Advocacy—Policy Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Identity &amp; Authentication</th>
<th>Privacy &amp; Security</th>
<th>Intellectual Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>.edu</td>
<td>CALEA, &amp;c</td>
<td>P2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Neutrality .edu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cybersecurity Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative &amp; Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StateNets, &amp;c Tempe .edu</td>
<td>InCommon .edu</td>
<td>Cybersecurity Initiative</td>
<td>P2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstitial &amp; Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converged Communication Access</td>
<td>MACE, &amp;c .edu ICPL+</td>
<td>Cybersecurity Initiative ICPL+ Policy Repository, CDS, &amp;c</td>
<td>P2P ICPL+ Policy Repository, CDS, &amp;c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Few More Areas