EDUCAUSE Board Meeting
October 11, 2010, Anaheim, California

Board members attending: Debra Allison (incoming director), Joel Cooper, Ted Dodds (Chair), James Hilton, Joanne Kossuth (outgoing director), David Lassner, Tom Maier (Secretary), Tracy Mitrano (outgoing director), Richard Northam (incoming director), Diana Oblinger (President and Chief Executive Officer), Pattie Orr, Carrie Regenstein (Vice Chair), Kathleen Santora (outgoing director), Randy Stiles (incoming director), Linda Thor, Brad Wheeler (Treasurer)

Staff attending: Jarret Cummings, Greg Jackson, Garth Jordan, Julie Little, Michelle McIrvin (9:00 to 11:15 a.m.)

Call to Order

• Dodds called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and welcomed Allison, Northam, and Stiles to the board as recently elected (Allison, Stiles) or appointed (Northam) directors.

• Dodds also recognized the board members whose terms were set to expire—Kossuth, Mitrano, and Santora—and thanked them for their service on behalf of the board as a whole.

Approval of Consent Agenda

• Dodds requested a motion to approve the consent agenda.

• Regenstein made a motion for board approval of the consent agenda. Maier seconded the motion and the board passed it by unanimous consent.

President’s Report

• Oblinger began the president’s report with an overview of EDUCAUSE 2010 highlights.

  o Oblinger recognized Jordan and the operations team for their great work in planning and implementing new conference features and improvements while effectively managing costs.

  o She noted that full conference registrations were 3.6% higher than the previous year, with registration revenue exceeding the budgeted amount by 15%.

  o Oblinger highlighted the fact that, based on the numbers available at the time, representatives of 41 countries would be in attendance.

  o She reported that registration for the online conference had increased significantly over the previous year, reaching 302 registrations representing approximately 2,400 participants engaging in the event individually or as part of campus teams.

  o The strength of corporate participation in the conference was highlighted—100% of sponsorships were sold, with 269 companies represented in the exhibit hall and 25 more wait-listed. Overall, corporate revenue from the event was 10% higher than in 2009.

  o Oblinger discussed the successful launch of the CIO and Senior IT Leader Experience as part of the annual conference, noting that of the 757 CIOs and senior IT leaders who registered for EDUCAUSE 2010, 164 had not attended the annual conference in the previous three years. She also reviewed the key elements of the program, such as a CIO lounge and a CIO-only exhibit hall hour.
• Board members noted the community’s positive reaction to the CIO and Senior IT Leader Experience, with senior leaders expressing appreciation for how it addresses their unique conference attendance and professional networking needs.

• Oblinger reviewed various elements of the program intended to make the conference experience more interactive and engaging, such as “In the Hot Seat” sessions and the Hawkins Leadership Roundtable.

• She reported that poster sessions would be presented twice to give attendees more opportunity to see them, and that the number of featured sessions had been increased by 30%.

• Discussing the online conference, Oblinger noted a 30% increase in the number of sessions offered, including online-only sessions; she also reported increased use of the association’s on-campus event planning kit to facilitate greater engagement with EDUCAUSE online conference programming among campus teams.

• The new features of the conference website, which allowed for easier searching and sorting of session information as well as mobile access, were reviewed, as was the interactive map of the conference space.

• Wheeler noted how effectively the conference had evolved under the leadership of Oblinger and her executive team. He expressed strong appreciation for the hard work of the EDUCAUSE staff in planning and implementing the changes, as well. He indicated that the membership clearly sees how hard EDUCAUSE is working to advance the quality and value of the conference experience.

• Oblinger noted the continued growth in the EDUCAUSE membership as well as in the membership of its core programs.

• She highlighted the success of EDUCAUSE Review in terms of the awards it received in 2010, reminding the board that such recognition has become an annual occurrence.

• She discussed the key outcomes expected from the Core Data Service (CDS) redesign process, including the move to a modular structure and survey question revisions intended to increase the relevance and value of the survey results. Oblinger highlighted improvements in the annual summary report as well, which included more and more informative graphics as well as five-year trend information.

• The redesign of the CDS appropriate use policy was also noted; it involved simplifying the text to make it clearer and easier to understand while introducing provisions that allow EDUCAUSE to develop aggregate analyses for the benefit of the membership.

• Stiles expressed appreciation for how well the CDS redesign consultant, Dan Updegrove, performed in leading the redesign process to a positive outcome.

• Oblinger reported on the resolution of the trademark infringement problem EDUCAUSE encountered with Pro Media Group’s (PMG’s) use of “EduComm” in violation of the “EDUCOM” mark owned by EDUCAUSE; she stated that EDUCAUSE had reached a settlement with PMG that will allow PMG to transition to a new mark over the next two years, after which it will cease all use of the infringing mark.

• Oblinger reviewed the steps taken to support the public announcement of the Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC) grant program that day, highlighting the messaging to EDUCAUSE members and the conference sessions about the program.
She noted that the first round of NGLC funding EDUCAUSE would receive from the Gates Foundation would be approximately $20 million, with the second round to be settled by January to allow for a public launch of the next wave of grants then.

Oblinger discussed the three major components of the program—establishing the evidence base for the value of IT in addressing college readiness and completion challenges, developing a community of individuals and institutions committed to addressing those issues, and providing investment capital for relevant projects.

She highlighted key messages board members might convey if asked about NGLC:

- A postsecondary credential or degree is now essential to individual economic success, as well as to that of society as a whole.
- NGLC focuses on possible IT solutions to persistent educational attainment barriers.
- Overcoming such barriers is mission-critical for higher education, and thus NGLC aligns well with the mission of EDUCAUSE.
- Finding and scaling effective solutions involves all of higher education IT, not just academic technology.
- The program targets postsecondary institutions serving U.S. students, particularly low-income young adults, as well as high-enrollment, low-completion courses in developmental education, general education, and high-demand fields (e.g., nursing).
- NGLC involves and encourages team approaches to overcoming tough college readiness and completion challenges.

Thor asked about what steps EDUCAUSE will take to ensure diversity of views and perspectives, both institutionally as well as in terms of developmental and general education, among those involved in reviewing NGLC grant proposals. Oblinger noted that the program had implemented an extensive volunteer reviewer application process for Wave 1 in an effort to recruit a diverse array of potential reviewers; she also referenced the role of the League for Innovation in the Community College and other NGLC participating organizations in facilitating outreach to their communities.

Maier asked about the diversity of other grant programs in the education space and how NGLC fits into that context; Oblinger discussed the array of relevant programs and noted NGLC’s focus on IT approaches, which is distinct from the others’ areas of emphasis.

Wheeler expressed support for the outcomes-based focus of the NGLC grant competitions, but expressed concern about the size of some of the grants—he noted that $250,000 as the maximum grant in some areas may not be sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes.

Oblinger indicated that the size of the grants in various areas is a matter of ongoing discussion between EDUCAUSE and the other NGLC participating organizations; she reported that the program is focusing on initial adoption to match expectations to funding while striving to encourage scalability over time. She also noted that the program will serve to uncover projects and ideas worthy of additional funding that the foundations involved may decide to provide directly.

Mitrano expressed appreciation for the high rate of speed with which EDUCAUSE had worked to plan and implement the program, as well as NGLC’s potential to greatly advance higher education IT. Orr noted the value of the program’s emphasis on trying to bring institutions together in partnership.
• In response to a question, Oblinger noted that some of the potential for follow-on funding is publicly known, particularly in relation to the open core courseware challenge, but that additional funding in other areas will be determined based on the progress achieved.

• Oblinger also highlighted the interest the program had generated among other higher education associations, particularly in relation to their online learning and developmental/general education efforts.

• Regenstein applauded the effort to focus initial NGLC funding on adoption given the realistic perception it reflects of the state of the field and what is doable in the one-year timeframe for most of the grant areas.

• Santora noted the importance of NGLC in highlighting EDUCAUSE outreach and collaboration with other higher education associations, as well as its standing in the higher education community.

• Oblinger remarked on the possibility that the Hewlett Foundation might provide additional funding for NGLC as well as plans for continued outreach to other potential sponsors.

• Orr noted the value of NGLC in allowing IT leaders to drive a major higher education initiative, and thus establish their capacity for providing strategic insight and leadership for higher education in general.

• Oblinger reviewed the timeline and process steps for implementing the first wave of grant competitions, as well as for planning and launching the second.

• Dodds echoed Mitrano’s earlier comments about the speed with which the program had been developed; he recognized the staff team that contributed to successfully completing the initial proposal and budget leading to the program’s launch.

• **Dodds made a motion that the board recognize Cummings for special effort and dedication in supporting the initial development of the NGLC program; Mitrano seconded the motion and the board approved it by unanimous consent.**

• Cummings expressed appreciation for the board’s recognition and asked that it be extended to the other core members of the association’s NGLC planning team—Diana Oblinger, Carie Page, Marge Gammon, and Garth Jordan—as well as to Michelle McIrvin for her work on the project as the association’s finance director.

### Financial Report

• Oblinger began the financial report by noting the association’s strong financial position.
  - The value of the investment portfolio had increased by approximately 13% as of the end of August while maintaining alignment with the association’s investment policy.
  - The association’s net loss through the end of August was $1 million less than budgeted, consistent with total expenses for the first eight months of the year being held $1 million under budget. (Note that it is customary for EDUCAUSE to post a net loss over the course of the year until revenue from the annual conference is recorded.)
  - The net loss through August was $155,000 higher than in 2009, though, due to additional expenses for the EDUCAUSE Cloud Computing Summit, adjustments in staffing, and lower unrealized gains in the market value of EDUCAUSE investments.
• On behalf of the board, Dodds expressed appreciation for the association’s effective financial management during a challenging economic period.

2011 Budget Proposal

• Prior to reviewing the proposed 2011 budget, Oblinger reported up-to-the-minute information that EDUCAUSE had achieved an estimated $6 million in revenue from the annual conference for the first time.

• In opening the 2011 budget proposal discussion, Oblinger noted the following provisions:
  o On the income side, the proposal included a modest membership dues increase and registration fee changes.
  o On the expense side, the proposal included an increase in health insurance costs, a 2.5% salary pool for merit increases, and other costs such as additional staffing to support the strategic directions approved by the board.

• In response to a question, Jackson noted that the Advanced Core Technologies Initiative (ACTI) was budgeted for an additional position as participant dues increase, but that position was included in the existing budget proposal. McIrvin also mentioned that funding for consulting services was built into the proposal.

• Oblinger noted that a position had not been added for implementing a demand aggregation program or function, but that EDUCAUSE had engaged a consultant to help define the shape such a program or function might take, which will help inform how it should be staffed.

• Board members encouraged the executive team to request board approval of additional funding as necessary to ensure that a demand aggregation effort could be launched in a timely fashion once a plan had been finalized. They indicated that it was important for EDUCAUSE to be prepared to invest quickly if necessary to ensure it does not miss strategic opportunities emerging in the demand aggregation space.

• Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE is working to define a possible data and analysis function so it can determine what investments will be required to initiate it; she indicated that this would be the subject of further discussion later in the meeting.

• Allison asked if EDUCAUSE develops a multi-year budget; Oblinger responded that it does not at this time. Board members suggested that EDUCAUSE consider such an approach to facilitate strategic and fiscal planning.

• Dodds reminded the board that Oblinger could convene it between meetings as necessary to request approval of reserve expenditures. Oblinger noted that the association’s financial reserves policy requires board approval of reserve expenditure proposals.

• Dodds noted that the board could also use online mechanisms to quickly address issues requiring board approval between its scheduled meetings.

• Dodds asked if there were any additional questions or issues regarding the 2011 budget. Maier asked how the budgeted revenue for next year’s conference was calculated; McIrvin responded that the figure was based on the previous year’s revenue estimate.
• Dodds requested a motion to approve the 2011 budget. Maier moved that the board accept the 2011 budget as presented. Regenstein seconded the motion and the board approved it by unanimous consent.

Next Generation Learning Challenges Executive Committee

• Oblinger informed the board that the association had been advised by legal counsel that its bylaws and District of Columbia non-profit statutes required the board to pass a formal resolution establishing a proposed NGLC Executive Committee to guide the program’s development and activities. A draft resolution and draft committee charter were submitted to the board for its consideration and revision if necessary.

• The board discussed the details of the proposed resolution and the Executive Committee charter that it would implement. Oblinger also discussed the conflict of interest policy developed for the program to ensure compliance with all legal requirements.

• In response to a question, Oblinger noted that no changes were currently anticipated in the proposed committee membership or structure; the charter, though, would allow her to make modest changes if needed, such as substituting a new NGLC participating organization representative for one who retired, changed jobs, or for some other reason could no longer represent the organization.

• Dodds asked for a motion to approve the resolution. Richard Northam moved that the board approve the draft resolution and committee charter as presented. Cooper seconded the motion and the board approved it by unanimous consent.

2010–11 Board Officer Elections

• Dodds reminded the board of the nominees for the 2010–11 board officer positions and opened the floor for discussion, noting that each position had a single nominee—David Lassner, chair; Pattie Orr, vice chair; Joel Cooper, secretary; and Brad Wheeler, treasurer.

• Hearing no request for discussion, Dodds moved that the board elect the proposed slate of officers for 2010–11. Regenstein seconded the motion and the board approved it by unanimous consent.

• Regenstein asked the board to acknowledge Dodds for his exemplary service as 2010 board chair. Lassner further requested that the board express its appreciation to Regenstein, Maier, and Wheeler for their exemplary service as 2010 board officers.

EDUCAUSE Directions

• Dodds asked Oblinger to initiate a discussion of the association’s strategic directions.

• Oblinger indicated that the discussion was not intended to produce a specific plan or set of plans at the meeting, but rather to provide parameters for the executive team in planning and developing EDUCAUSE functions, projects, and activities.

• To provide context for the conversation, Oblinger reviewed the content and outcomes of previous board discussions about strategic threats, issues, and opportunities.

• She highlighted the aspirations the board had previously approved for the association, which included embedding a thought leadership emphasis throughout the organization; developing a systematic sense-and-respond mechanism for emerging issues and trends; learning to operate and adapt in an
• Oblinger also discussed board feedback on key concerns and opportunities for organizational development, such as being more definitive in its positions, pursuing a more active agenda of engagement and advocacy, fulfilling the role of convener of strategic dialogue and collective action, and so forth. She noted specific examples of activities the association has pursued to address the concerns and opportunities raised.

• She reviewed the association’s major goals, which include enhancing EDUCAUSE leadership, developing outstanding member experiences, and increasing organizational capacity. She then highlighted major 2010 activities consistent with those goals, such as implementing a comprehensive operations plan and corporate strategy, transitioning from Net@EDU to ACTI, updating EDUCAUSE Institute programs, growing online and hybrid professional development and event models, developing focused programming for CIOs and senior IT leaders, implementing NGLC, and pursuing collaboration around cloud computing and demand aggregation.

• Allison noted that EDUCAUSE has addressed the types of issues and concerns that EDUCAUSE members similarly confront on their campuses; she suggested that EDUCAUSE consider developing a case study on its approach to pursuing change as something that might benefit members in trying to drive change at their institutions.

• Dodds noted the total change in the association’s receptivity to open source and community source efforts as a major positive shift in its culture.

• Oblinger asked the board to consider suggested 2011 directions for the association, which included exploring alternative financial models for higher education, demand aggregation in higher education, and the potential development of an EDUCAUSE data and analysis function. Oblinger noted relevant activities already completed or under way, such as the joint report on demand aggregation with NACUBO and Internet2 and the CDS redesign project.

• Oblinger then asked the board to consider emerging trends that might impact EDUCAUSE strategic directions. She mentioned, for example, that social media developments have significant implications for the future of EDUCAUSE publications and content efforts.

• She noted how trends in digital information access and social media-driven shifts in the acquisition and management of an audience’s attention and trust create a content environment where a publisher/producer has limited control at best over its market position.

• Wheeler referenced earlier research that established how limited and therefore valuable an audience’s attention is, and thus how carefully EDUCAUSE might need to think about approaching and seeking to engage community members’ attention on critical issues.

• Mitran suggested that the key may be in trying to better understand the critical analysis needs of its community—rather than trying to refine distribution, EDUCAUSE might seek to refine its ongoing analysis of user needs and strive to meet them more effectively. Stiles seconded that view and discussed the critical needs of institutions for analysis leading to meaning and understanding in a context of information overload.

• Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE faces the core question of how best to plan for and structure itself to operate in this very dynamic information/social media environment.
• Oblinger discussed the executive team’s work in analyzing existing EDUCAUSE programs, content development functions, and so forth, which identified a clustering of programs and functions around thought leadership, putting IT into practice, and career pathing for higher education IT leaders and professionals.

• She then took one area, putting IT into practice, and provided examples of all the various ways in which EDUCAUSE tries to provide content, programming, and services in relation to it. She noted that the range of offerings may lead to information overload for members and overburden staff, while a more targeted portfolio of knowledge and information resources might better meet member needs.

• Oblinger asked the board to consider a number of related questions:
  ○ How should EDUCAUSE change the member experience (to continue moving from confusion to coherence)?
  ○ Is it better to organize by product type rather than sub-brand (i.e., specific programs)?
  ○ What causes members to remain with specialty programs?
  ○ How much change should EDUCAUSE make entering another down economic period?
  ○ Bottom line: Where should EDUCAUSE and its executive team focus given the environment and issues raised?

• Mitrano asked how EDUCAUSE has been gathering information on member use of the information and resources it provides. Oblinger and Jordan noted that a survey on the use/value of EDUCAUSE Review was planned for the fall, but that the association lacks broad resource usage data.

• Dodds indicated that the EDUCAUSE program and content structure mirrors issues that institutions face in assuming students know and understand the institutional structure sufficiently well to navigate it effectively. He suggested that EDUCAUSE focus how it organizes and structures its offerings not in terms of program or product type, but rather member needs; this would encourage EDUCAUSE to take a more proactive approach to anticipating and understanding members and their needs.

• Northam seconded Dodds’ comments, noting that his experience indicates that EDUCAUSE may provide too much information in too “siloded” of a way; he suggested that EDUCAUSE consider organizing products and services by member interests, which would allow EDUCAUSE to engage members in defining and maintaining an interest-based structure (ontology of terms). He also suggested that this type of approach would allow for better tracking and promotion of thought leader interests, which would help the community understand and follow emerging issues and trends.

• Orr noted that the EDUCAUSE profile is a valuable service available to members that may be underutilized; she raised the question of whether it might better serve as a locus for members and the association to interact around member interests; for example, she suggested it would be great if member specification of interests led to targeted distribution of resources in terms of those interests.

• Regenstein advocated for regular communications that would provide members with a quick scan of recently released information and resources, which might serve as a way to navigate and further explore the issues or opportunities those products address.

• Stiles noted that the market for EDUCAUSE information and resources on campus may be much broader than just the IT community; he noted that products such as the 7 Things You Should Know About series highlight this and extend the association’s reach beyond the IT community, but they also raise the issue of how EDUCAUSE might do so more effectively.
• Maier indicated that the issues under discussion were not unique to EDUCAUSE or higher education; he suggested that the expertise of the community in understanding where IT can make a difference is a potential resource EDUCAUSE might tap to address such concerns.

• Thor raised the CEO perspective on managing information flow; she reinforced the need for trend and summary analyses by people serving as senior institutional leaders.

• Kossuth noted that students, faculty, and staff often seem to want to find their own path to information—to develop their own “neural map” that connects their needs and interests with the information sources available. She also highlighted their emerging interests in “concierge services” to help them find and use the specific information, as well as their increasingly heavy reliance on and preference for video resources. She thought EDUCAUSE might consider these trends in refining its content structure and approach.

• Allison mentioned other organizations that use portals to provide information based on institutional or professional role, which she thought EDUCAUSE might consider emulating.

• Lassner recommended that EDUCAUSE pursue a revamping of its content structure and access regardless of the difficult economic environment. He also suggested that EDUCAUSE base its approach more on topic or area as opposed to institutional role.

• Lassner also encouraged EDUCAUSE to evaluate its information dissemination efforts in light of the distinction between news and content. He suggested that search-based knowledge and information access might be more effective than role-based access.

• Orr noted that the EDUCAUSE resource library is excellent in terms of how it categorizes EDUCAUSE resources and information, but that it lacks a clear way for members to establish easy, direct paths to specific topics and issues of interest.

• Hilton suggested that aggressive experiments with small member groups (e.g., ELI) on new approaches to information/resource generation and dissemination might be worthwhile, even as EDUCAUSE pursues more modest innovations in knowledge and information access for the broader membership.

• Stiles and Orr noted the need to help members better understand and access what is available to them, even as EDUCAUSE strives to use web analytics and other approaches to better understand what members are currently using.

• Wheeler suggested that EDUCAUSE continue to offer a range of information and resources across a broad array of topics and issues given the size and scope of the EDUCAUSE membership. However, he stressed the importance of expanding options for members to organize their own access to information through tagging, social networking, and so forth.

• Northam seconded this view, noting that “bottom-up” approaches to organizing community and information would enable EDUCAUSE to provide more of a platform for community collaboration and self-organizing than a top-down structure for information dissemination.

• Santora noted the value of having association staff to answer inquiries about resources and information—of not resting member access solely on the staff, but maintaining an effective staff capacity as a supplement to other member paths to accessing information and resources. She also noted the development of applications for associations that provide Facebook-like capabilities for members to self-organize community and knowledge/information access.
• Cooper noted how this discussion highlights the shift from authority-based information/resource dissemination to a “discoverability” model in which the individual user searches for information/resources that meet his or her needs, with authority of source being an important but next-level consideration.

• Oblinger asked the board to consider what the top 2011 priorities for the association should be based on the current discussion, with the set including both new ideas and 2010 issues/activities that might carry over to 2011:
  ○ EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR) redesign
  ○ EDUCAUSE web presence redesign
  ○ Redesign and expansion of “career pathing” activities
  ○ Publishing redesign
  ○ Demand aggregation (2010)
  ○ Cost structure of higher education (2010)
  ○ Transition of Net@EDU to ACTI (2010)

• Board members asked for a reminder about the full scope of the “cost structure of higher education” topic. Oblinger indicated that it referred to the existing cost structure of institutions in general, with high labor and benefits costs, and the costs for, for example, which are becoming increasingly unsustainable. Wheeler added further perspective, noting that administrative cost savings are well-explored, but that the larger cost issues associated with teaching, learning, and research remain to be addressed and ultimately will have to be.

• In response to a question, Oblinger noted that the concept of an EDUCAUSE data and analysis function was introduced with the “ECAR redesign” issue.

• In relation to the ECAR redesign issue, it was proposed that EDUCAUSE strive to become the authoritative voice on technology in higher education from a research and analysis standpoint to further advance its standing in terms of thought leadership.

• It was noted that EDUCAUSE is at the higher education “leadership table” in many ways, and that NGLC will help expand that role. However, it was suggested that the cost structure of higher education issue was not something the higher education IT community could drive, but rather a topic it must pursue in collaboration with other leadership groups.

• The point was made that EDUCAUSE could most effectively help senior IT leaders participate effectively in cost structure discussions by highlighting where technology can truly have an impact on major cost issues, such as scholarly publishing.

• It was noted that the identified priority areas are different in terms of demand, impact, and resource requirements, and that parameters might be key factors to consider in determining what EDUCAUSE can and should emphasize in 2011.

• It was proposed that, given the different levels at which the identified priorities operate, as well as the ongoing activities and demands in each area, it may be important to pursue all of the priorities, but in appropriately scoped and resourced ways.
• The point was made that the college completion agenda is top of mind for presidents and chancellors, so showing how IT can make a difference in impacting college completion issues will gain EDUCAUSE entry into high-level strategic discussions.

• It was suggested that, given the board’s interest in pursuing the full set of proposed priorities, EDUCAUSE might seek to engage members in actively working on some of them to appropriately augment staff capacity.

• In response to a question, Jackson noted that a potential data and analysis function and the CDS redesign effort would naturally have converged with a potential ECAR redesign, but that staffing changes have increased the urgency of an ECAR redesign project.

• Jackson also noted that the transition of Net@EDU into something along the lines of ACTI was overdue, but that emerging trends in cloud computing drove the need to initiate it.

• It was argued that, rather than trying to determine three priorities from among the set, EDUCAUSE should be prepared to expend reserve funding to address the full list of priorities to the extent appropriate, given their scope and impact.

• Oblinger noted that the executive team would take the input from the board’s discussion and define the proposed scope and staging for the identified priorities, recognizing the board’s view that all of the priorities require action and progress at some level.

**Vision for Higher Education IT**

• Oblinger reported that discussions between EDUCAUSE, ACE, and Internet2 had led the organizations to begin collaborating on the development of a shared vision for the role of technology in advancing the mission and progress of higher education.

• She noted that the organizations believe there are a number of areas in which this may prove helpful. For example, it might help put the transformative power of IT in higher education on the Obama administration agenda. It might also catalyze dialogue and engagement among higher education leaders and groups on the use of technology to address mission-critical challenges.

• Oblinger indicated that, in discussing the context for a shared vision, the working group had identified an emerging confluence of forces, both domestically and internationally, that is driving demand for change in higher education access and cost, areas in which IT may have unique potential to make a difference.

• She reported that the working group had also identified broad strategic areas in which higher education, enabled by the effective use of technology, could have significant impact, such as workforce development, economic vitality and innovation, and civic and community engagement.

• Oblinger indicated that, as a starting point, a shared vision might include:
  o Realizing the transformative impact of IT
  o Creating an “infrastructure” for economic progress and innovation
  o Establishing the essential connection between education, technology, and collaboration as major drivers of innovation

• She also noted that formulating a shared vision would entail design challenges in terms of establishing and maintaining a common and appropriately balanced focus, set of principles, and body of intended
outcomes. In turn, she suggested that addressing these design challenges might require referencing real-world examples that illustrate how technology has sparked dramatic changes in society, the economy, and industry, and what such technology-influenced change might mean for higher education.

- She highlighted that the communication approach for the vision might entail using student scenarios to frame what IT-enabled changes in higher education would mean in the lives of different types of students.
- Wheeler suggested that, as part of its process, the working group carefully evaluate the extent to which the organizations involved have the capacity to implement and sustain whatever vision and associated agenda they ultimately develop.
- It was further noted that the primary issue may not be what the vision should entail, but what the participating associations should do once the vision has been developed.
- EDUCAUSE should consider how best to engage a variety of higher education associations and gain their active commitment to driving adoption of the vision in practical terms.
- Stiles suggested that all higher education institutions understand learning and research as a continuum from data to knowledge and ultimately wisdom. He noted that, in this context, IT has often been most closely associated in the minds of many with data development and management, and thus the key to an appropriate vision may be clarifying how technology contributes to the processes of developing knowledge and wisdom.
- Regenstein noted the importance of providing a vision for IT in the context of what institutional progress across a variety of areas essential to advancing higher education would look like.
- Hilton indicated that the opportunity may reside in establishing IT’s relevance to helping institutions solve the major challenges facing higher education, and by extension, the country. He suggested that the vision needs to be based on the view of IT as a valuable partner in addressing those issues, recognizing that there probably are not any major challenges in which technology would not be at least part of the solution.
- Mitrano suggested that revitalizing the concept of higher education as a social good is essential to the potential vision. She proposed basing the vision on the concept of the student as a participatory citizen. Adopting that concept would drive a view of technology as enabling students to effectively develop and function in a global community.
- Orr indicated that the 7 Things You Should Know About model might serve as an effective framework for developing and driving the vision (e.g., 7 Things a President Needs to Know About the IT-Enabled Future of Higher Education).
- Santora encouraged EDUCAUSE to try to get issues related to the vision on the conference and programming agendas of the major higher education leadership organizations, including but not limited to the presidential associations.
- Dodds indicated that there will likely be varying degrees of understanding and engagement among presidents and chancellors on the role of IT in higher education’s future regardless of outreach efforts; he suggested a way to penetrate their thinking might be to highlight how for-profit institutions have utilized high-quality online learning and a student-focused approach to achieve success, and thus may provide models for traditional institutions.
• Dodds also noted the degree to which higher education has outsourced the review and dissemination of scholarly research and publication, and how that impacts the cost structure of higher education. By pursuing a fundamentally different and technologically enabled model, Dodds suggested, higher education could change the cost structure of scholarly research and thus that of the institution overall.

• Kossuth suggested that focusing the vision on the pressing issues facing presidents will be more effective than beginning with how technology can and will drive change.

• Cooper also raised the issue of how the next cohort of senior institutional leaders and faculty may change what is achievable in terms of using technology to address the major challenges facing higher education.

• Northam noted the importance of engaging presidents and chancellors on how technology can impact the core business of the institution—teaching, learning, and research—in substantive ways, and of empowering EDUCAUSE members to initiate such conversations.

• Maier stressed the need to emphasize the transformative impact of technology and what it could mean for higher education, as opposed to talking in terms of enablement.

• Allison advocated for the use of scenarios in framing potential change and impact, but with specific outcomes highlighted, given institutional leaders’ results orientation.

• Lassner noted that the vision should not emphasize just efficiency and cost savings, but also the increases in quality and capability that technology makes possible.

• Oblinger summarized key points from the discussion in terms of clarifying and highlighting the relevance of IT to the issues senior institutional leaders face, as well as the need to get all major leadership sectors engaged, not just presidents and chancellors. She also noted the emphasis on a student focus in framing the vision.

• She suggested that the vision development effort may have to address both positive and negative considerations; for example, IT offers significant potential benefits, but failure to take advantage of them may have serious negative consequences for institutions.

• Wheeler pointed to the advent of mobility as a major platform for higher education computing as an example of the continuing problems higher education faces with incremental, fragmented approaches to major technological advances, and as an indicator of the role EDUCAUSE and other associations might play in trying to convene collaborative action to achieve systemic, strategic change.

• It was noted that the locus of control of technology in higher education has shifted from the institution to the individual; colleges and universities no longer set the course of IT development due to the consumerization of IT. It was suggested that recognition of this shift forces the question of how to leverage consumer-space technologies to advance the higher education mission while minimizing potential negatives.

• Oblinger thanked the board for its insights on the potential content and strategy for a shared vision; she indicated that she would ask for further input as the project develops.

In closing the regular session of the board meeting, Dodds again thanked the board members concluding their terms (Kossuth, Mitran, and Santora) for their significant contributions to the work and direction of the association. The board in general extended its thanks and best wishes to them for their service.

The board went into executive session at 3:30 p.m. PDT and adjourned at 4:30 p.m. PDT.