

EDUCAUSE Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

May 12, 2009
Washington, D.C.

Board members attending: Jerry Campbell, Joel Cooper, Ted Dodds, James Hilton, Lucinda Lea (chair), Thomas Maier (secretary; participated via telephone), Marilyn McMillan, Tracy Mitrano (vice chair), Diana Oblinger (ex officio), Carrie Regenstein (treasurer), Kathleen Santora (participated starting at 12:30 p.m., EDT), Scott Siddall, Brad Wheeler

Staff members attending: Jarret Cummings, Cynthia Golden, Richard Katz, Michelle McIrvin (participated in the financial report via telephone), Rodney Petersen (participated in the policy program discussion)

Guests attending: Mary Beth Baker, strategic consultant (facilitated the corporate strategy discussion), Bill Hogue, chair of the EDUCAUSE Nominations Committee (participated in the 2010 board slate discussion via telephone)

Call to Order

Lea called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m., EDT.

Approval of Minutes

Lea asked for any edits to the minutes from the previous meeting. Hearing none, she requested a motion for approval. The following motion was made by McMillan, seconded by Mitrano, and passed by acclamation:

Motion—*That the minutes from the January 22, 2009, board meeting be approved.*

President's Report

- Oblinger opened the president's report by emphasizing that the strategic directions process deliberately set EDUCAUSE on an evolutionary path, with continuous improvement in meeting member needs as the goal. She reviewed a number of recent examples of that evolution, including:
 - Improvements to the EDUCAUSE web presence, both in style and navigation.
 - The initiation of online advertisements in *EDUCAUSE Review*, which has maintained the magazine's advertising revenue in the midst of the economic downturn.
 - The successful transition of *EDUCAUSE Quarterly (EQ)* to an online-only publication, which has allowed it to provide a rich array of multimedia resources and increased opportunities for member participation.
 - The ongoing content alignment process, with the association's broad coverage of sustainability/green IT issues across its events and publications highlighting the success of that effort.
 - The continued progress of the EDUCAUSE rebranding project, which currently entails extending the new logo to EDUCAUSE programs in a consistent fashion.
 - The use of Twitter to share information and facilitate member interaction at EDUCAUSE events.
- In discussing *EQ*'s transition to an online-only publication, it was noted that open-source journal publishing applications are now available that EDUCAUSE might explore for its future online publishing needs.
- Oblinger noted that EDUCAUSE memberships continue to run ahead of last year, but that the association is just beginning its renewal season. Staff will monitor renewals. Responding to a question, Oblinger indicated that EDUCAUSE isn't anticipating significant declines in membership due to the economic situation, but it is closely tracking event registrations for potential revenue impacts.
- Oblinger reviewed plans for EDUCAUSE 2009, noting that the program committee will meet at the end of the month to continue shaping the conference tracks. In addition to continuing innovative features introduced at last year's conference (e.g., point/counterpoint sessions), this year's event will include:
 - Tours of local advanced technology sites, such as the National Center for Atmospheric Research and Sun Microsystems facilities, as preconference workshops.
 - An "EDUCAUSE Central" space outside the exhibit hall in the main public area that will offer members greater access to EDUCAUSE staff, leadership, and information.

- An online component for those who can't attend in person, including online-only events; the goal is to offer an online experience that will allow members to participate without feeling that web-based participation is a less valuable option.
 - In response to a question, Oblinger stated that a registration fee will be charged for the online component, but that the level has yet to be determined.
 - Drawing on institutional experiences, board members suggested factors for EDUCAUSE to consider in setting online event fees, such as the relative value of the face-to-face versus online activities.
 - It was noted that a few associations have offered online activities with their events, but nothing as comprehensive as what EDUCAUSE is planning. Besides online-only activities, it will include an online EDUCAUSE Central plus streaming of general and featured sessions, special sessions, etc.
- An “unparty” on Thursday evening that will provide networking and relaxation options without reprising the large-scale social event of the past; activities will include:
 - A networking and socializing area.
 - Colorado-themed sports activities.
 - Space for member-initiated small group meetings.
 - A black box theater performance addressing a contemporary issue of interest to the community.
- An international study tour to begin after the conference; this initial tour will serve as a pilot project to assess whether and how EDUCAUSE should conduct similar tours in the future.
 - The annual conference attracts many international participants, and the study tour is one way in which EDUCAUSE might help them maximize the value of their investment in attending the conference.
 - Tour locations include the University of California, San Diego; Stanford University; Silicon Valley; the University of Washington; and Microsoft Corporation.
 - EDUCAUSE is primarily promoting the tour to organizations that have traditionally been represented at the conference (e.g., JISC, SURF, CAUDIT).
 - Oblinger stated that the current plan is to have roughly 5 slots for EDUCAUSE participants, including board members and staff, and 35–40 slots for international participants.
 - The tour cost is \$2,400–2,500 per person for travel, lodging, and so forth.
- Staff will present an update on EDUCAUSE 2009 plans and activities at the board's July 28 meeting.
- Oblinger cited EDUCAUSE Director of Financial and Administrative Services Michelle McIrvin for her great work in negotiating a new staff health care plan that lowered association costs while offering staff more options.
- Oblinger noted that the vice president for operations search is nearing a close and that interviews for the ELI associate director position will be held at the end of the month.

Financial Report

Audit Committee Report

- As audit committee chair, Regenstein reported to the board on the results of the 2008 financial audit. She noted that the auditors indicated the process went smoothly and they had no findings to report.
- On behalf of the committee, Regenstein congratulated McIrvin for the excellent work leading to a clean audit report. Maier mentioned the auditors' appreciation for her proactive approach to engaging them on issues.
- On behalf of the board, Lea commended Regenstein, the committee, and McIrvin for their efforts.

Reserves

- McIrvin reminded the board members that EDUCAUSE policy calls for the board to annually review and approve both the target level for financial reserves and the actual level of reserves.
- She stated that EDUCAUSE has set its target for financial reserves at six months of annual operating expenses for the coming year, which is equal to \$8,000,000 for 2009.
- Actual reserves as of December 31, 2008, were \$9,245,000, or \$1,245,000 in excess of the target.

- McIrvin noted that the original 2009 budget approved at the October 2008 board meeting included an 8.5% draw on reserves. This amount remains in the reforecast budget, but the result in dollars is lower due to lowered operating expenses.
- As of the board meeting, EDUCAUSE had not drawn on its reserves.
- Lea moved the motion provided in the board meeting materials:
Motion—That the board affirms the current target of \$8,000,000 for the EDUCAUSE reserves and that this motion reflects the annual review of this reserve level called for in a motion made at the October 25, 1999, board meeting.
- Mitrano seconded the motion, and the board approved it by acclamation.
- In response to a question, McIrvin noted that EDUCAUSE purchases conference insurance to cover unforeseen occurrences, such as a flu pandemic, that might force the cancellation of an event like the annual conference.
- It was noted that the association’s reserves and conference insurance are intended to allow EDUCAUSE to weather a major negative event such as the forced cancellation of the annual conference.

Budget Reforecast

- McIrvin reported that EDUCAUSE cut \$1,300,000 in revenues and expenses from the original 2009 budget estimate—thus, the budget is still about breakeven on the bottom line.
- She noted that the revised budget assumes a 15% reduction in registration income and a 20% reduction in sales and sponsorship income, which together represent the largest portion of the forecasted decline in income. The income revisions also include a 5% reduction in budgeted dues and subscription income as well as the elimination of the previously approved dues increase for 2009–10.
- McIrvin reiterated that the budgeted draw on reserves remains at 8.5% of operating expenses, but the reforecast amount is \$91,000 less than originally budgeted due to the reduction in total operating expenses.
- The largest expense reduction was in salary and benefits. EDUCAUSE eliminated some new positions (e.g., planning and analysis, campus cyberinfrastructure), and postponed hiring dates for some new hires.
- Additional significant reductions in budgeted expenses were taken in event and committee meeting costs, which included elimination of the Seminars and cancellation of a summit. EDUCAUSE did not reduce budgeted expenses for most conferences under the assumption that it should be aggressive on the expense side and conservative in its revenue estimates for these line items.
- McIrvin noted that on an actual basis some seminars and conferences saw a greater than 15% reduction in registrations. However, those declines were offset by increased sales and/or sponsorship income and decreased expenses, especially lower variable expenses (e.g., fewer attendees mean lower food and beverage costs).
- After the budgeted reductions in event and committee expenses, the next largest reduction was in contract labor followed by savings from not renewing the branding initiative contract.
- Lea highlighted the association’s approach to the budget reforecast as indicative of its overall philosophy for addressing the impacts of the economic downturn—to manage the budget prudently by scaling back plans in the near term while avoiding significant budget cuts unless and until major revenue or expense imbalances emerge.
- Staff has begun to review potential adjustments in event locations and budgets for 2010 as part of this process, Oblinger reported. She also highlighted staff efforts that have allowed EDUCAUSE to avoid paying attrition on 2009 events with lower-than-expected attendance.
- In response to a question, Oblinger indicated that the association’s long-range planning will take into account the potential need to discontinue support for some activities to free resources for higher priorities; this process may entail working with other organizations for whom the discontinued activities might be a better strategic fit.
- Lea requested the following motion, which was offered by McMillan, seconded by Regenstein, and approved by acclamation:

Motion—That the board approve the 2009 reforecast budget as submitted.

Financial Update

- McIrvin reported no major changes on the statements of financial position as compared to last year, with the exception of previously reported investment declines.
 - She noted that the association is not currently anticipating any significant variance in terms of income from membership dues, either for EDUCAUSE overall or programs such as ELI and Net@EDU.

- As an indication of this, McIrvin reported that ECAR subscription renewals for the year have already met expectations.
- She directed the board’s attention to the First Internet Securities Network (FISN) background information, which demonstrates FISN is acting in accordance with the investment policy established by the board.
- McIrvin noted the \$600,000 variance on the statement of activities (income statement) is comprised of (a) an unrealized loss in investments of \$475,000 and (b) the lack of a draw on reserves. She reminded the board that avoiding a draw on reserves is a positive, but it appears on the income statement as an unfavorable variance since it constitutes budgeted but unrealized income.
- The unrealized loss on investments was at 3.8% at the end of February, but it had improved to approximately 1% by the end of April.
- The audit committee had discussed these issues, Maier reported, and found that the association’s auditors were impressed with the modest investment declines EDUCAUSE has experienced in comparison to other nonprofit organizations with which they have worked since the start of the economic downturn.
- In response to a question, McIrvin agreed to discuss the association’s investment strategy with FISN to determine if changes might be needed to hedge against potential inflation increases over the next year or two. [Note: McIrvin received feedback from the association’s financial advisor after the board meeting that the staggered maturity dates of fixed-income instruments in the EDUCAUSE investment portfolio will allow for adjusting the portfolio to address an inflationary environment should that occur.]

Business Meeting

Corporate Strategy (Action: Review corporate strategy progress and provide input on key elements)

- Consultant Mary Beth Baker joined the board meeting to discuss the corporate strategy project.
- Baker noted that the process has highlighted the need to rethink who the strategy should address—corporations or noninstitutional members (NIMs) in general (including, for example, groups such as Sakai and Quali)—as well as the value such organizations can and would like to contribute to the community beyond sponsorship.
- Baker clarified the relationship between this project and the prior strategic directions effort and illustrated the history and growth of corporate participation and sponsorship in the association.
- She also stressed the importance of thinking about NIMs not as separate organizations but as part of a larger EDUCAUSE ecosystem in which actions, needs, and interests of all parties are interrelated.
- Baker indicated that the process will identify short- and long-term steps EDUCAUSE can take to better engage NIMs and maximize the value of their participation in EDUCAUSE for the community as a whole.
- Board members discussed the possibility of using a values-alignment approach to describing and managing the relationships different types of organizations and organizational representatives have with EDUCAUSE.
 - It was argued that EDUCAUSE might consider structuring its relationships with NIMs based on the degree to which their values align with those of the EDUCAUSE and higher education communities.
 - The degree of alignment would be determined by the organization’s actions as opposed to its public statements.
 - Those organizations with which EDUCAUSE sees a close alignment of values might be good candidates for a variety of collaborations, regardless of organizational type, while the association might engage an interested organization lacking values alignment in different ways when both view that interaction as useful.
- Baker reported that internal and external interviews conducted for the process showed that the EDUCAUSE Annual Conference is viewed as “the” higher education IT conference.
- The interviews also uncovered concerns about a perceived lack of internal coordination on corporate engagement and distrust of corporate member/participant motives, leading to suboptimal engagement with corporations both in the range of available opportunities and tone.
- Some corporate representatives indicated they and their companies strongly desire to see EDUCAUSE evolve the focus of NIM engagement from conference sponsorship to collaboration and thought-leadership activities.

- They also referenced the economic downturn as altering the dynamics of their engagement with EDUCAUSE; with budgets tight, they are increasingly focused on the value proposition for engaging with EDUCAUSE.
- Board members discussed the need to more clearly define the roles/“rules of engagement” for NIMs in the EDUCAUSE ecosystem beyond sponsorship, including the benefits and responsibilities different roles carry.
- Board members also exchanged ideas about prioritizing renewed engagement with different NIMs based on shared values, which would require greater clarity by EDUCAUSE about its values and the principles through which it applies them.
- The “commercial affiliate” model used by some community-source projects and foundations was cited as one approach to restructuring corporate engagement with the association.
- Baker led the board in brainstorming the major types of organizations comprising the EDUCAUSE ecosystem as a way of mapping and discussing their relationships to EDUCAUSE and each other.
- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE consider developing a NIM council to provide a framework for more constructive engagement with the association.
- Baker also noted the need to take a fresh look at the association’s existing principles for corporate engagement to ensure they align with EDUCAUSE values as demonstrated by an entity’s behavior.
- Oblinger emphasized EDUCAUSE’s role in terms of providing leadership for bringing different members of its ecosystem together to pursue shared goals and objectives-based on common needs and interests.
- Board members also highlighted the association’s role in creating a climate of innovation within its community.
- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE use its strategic focus areas (teaching and learning, managing the enterprise, e-research and e-scholarship, and the evolving role of IT and leadership) as guides for targeting engagement opportunities.
- To pursue such opportunities effectively, board members agreed EDUCAUSE would need to structure another level of involvement with the association in addition to the sponsorship mechanisms currently available. This other channel would offer NIMs a way to bring value to the table in collaborating on joint projects.
- Baker led the board in brainstorming possible principles and selection criteria to guide NIM engagement in collaborative projects on behalf of the EDUCAUSE and higher education communities.
- Board members generally agreed that principles should be framed in terms of community values to provide broad outlines for the pool of organizations with which EDUCAUSE might work, with engagement criteria set from a problem-based/initiative-based perspective.
- In discussing possible goals for inclusion in the corporate/NIM strategy, board members advised Baker to frame the goal statements in concrete, action-oriented terms.
- It was also suggested that the strategy process adopt an alternate term such as “affiliate organizations” instead of “NIMs” as a more accurate way of describing the nature of the relationships under consideration.
- Board members recommended that, as a result of the process, EDUCAUSE consider pursuing its first related activity as a practical, outcomes-oriented pilot project. This would allow for developing appropriate conceptual and organizational frameworks for future collaborations based on actual experience and member input.
- In closing the discussion, Lea stressed the need to address the perceived lack of collegiality on the part of EDUCAUSE in relation to corporations uncovered through this process. She requested that the board members join her in informally visiting corporate representatives during the annual conference to express the association’s appreciation for their participation in the conference and EDUCAUSE.
- Baker identified the next steps in the “corporate” strategy process as surveying such organizations on options for improved engagement, reviewing the engagement approaches of other associations, and finalizing recommendations for the strategy on that basis.
- Siddall announced his resignation from the board following the meeting to pursue new professional opportunities incompatible with continued board service. He thanked the board for the opportunity to serve, and the board members expressed their appreciation for his years of service to the EDUCAUSE community.

Selection of Board Slate (Action: Select four candidates for the board slate)

- Lea welcomed EDUCAUSE Nominations Committee Chair Bill Hogue to the meeting via teleconference to discuss the committee’s candidate review process and recommendations for the 2010 board slate.

- Hogue stated that the committee reviewed over 60 nominations to identify the nominees for the four board candidate slots. The committee felt the pool of potential nominees was very strong, allowing it to put forward an excellent group of nominees for the board’s consideration.
- Mitrano, an ex officio member of the committee, reported that the committee pursued a very thoughtful, respectful process; both she and Hogue thanked Cynthia Golden for the effective support she provided for the process as staff liaison.
- Hogue reviewed the six nominees for the four candidate positions with the board, noting that all nominees understand they are under consideration for the 2010 board ballot and have agreed to serve if ultimately elected.
- Before leaving, Hogue indicated that the committee had recommendations for streamlining the nominating process. Lea asked Hogue to provide Oblinger with the list of committee recommendations for further consideration.
- Lea asked Oblinger to speak about the expectations for board members.
 - Oblinger noted that the board agreed it should focus on the background, experience, and capabilities of potential board members as opposed to selecting candidates to represent specific constituencies.
 - She also mentioned the extent of a nominee’s participation in EDUCAUSE as something to consider.
 - Board members asked about staff feedback; Oblinger reported no negative feedback on any nominee.
- Oblinger reminded the board that usually two members are elected and one at-large member is appointed each year; the board can appoint more than one at-large member, though, if it feels that is necessary to address its needs for different backgrounds, knowledge bases, and skill sets.
- Lea noted that there is great value in having a diverse board that effectively reflects community needs and interests.
- Board members discussed the importance of having the relationship between the library and IT communities reflected on the board.
- The board chose the following candidates for the 2010 board slate:
 - Robert “Chip” German, Vice President for Information Technology, Millersville University of Pennsylvania
 - David Lassner, Vice President for Information Technology and CIO, University of Hawaii
 - Patty Orr, Vice President for Information Technology and Dean of University Libraries, Baylor University
 - Molly Tamarkin, Chief Technology Officer, University of Puget Sound

Key Issues for 2010 (Action: Discuss potential key issues to emphasize in 2010 content and conference activities)

- Oblinger reminded the board about the efforts started last year to identify key issues to emphasize in EDUCAUSE content channels and events each year.
- EDUCAUSE has conducted staff brainstorming activities, regional conference interviews, and a member survey to initiate the key issue selection process.
- Oblinger requested the board’s input on possible key issues.
 - It was noted that one approach would be to select issues members might find most compelling while another would be to choose issues where EDUCAUSE attention might raise a subject to prominence.
 - A third would be to choose based on both considerations—e.g., EDUCAUSE could select a couple of current topics as well as one where EDUCAUSE attention would change the trajectory of the issue.
 - Board members noted that staff may also need to consider issues in relation to the strategic directions, since those define the long-term focus of the association.
 - Consumerization of technology services/“below-campus services” was proposed as an issue likely to have the greatest impact on higher education IT in the near future.
 - General interest also emerged around cloud computing, efficiency and effectiveness, and a framework for general community collaboration in areas of common need and/or interest.
 - The nexus of “the future of higher education” and “preparing for the economic recovery” was raised as a potential topic, since current responses and emerging plans have long-term implications for the future.

- A continued focus on the value of openness was also identified as a possibility since it ties back to the core of higher education teaching, learning, and research and continues to generate an active dialogue.
- Board members mentioned the intersection of the consumerization of technology services and cloud computing as an option, citing online data storage as a specific example where cloud computing may enable solutions that students and faculty find more cost-effective than what institutions can provide.
- Oblinger thanked the board for its input and indicated it would be valuable in helping shape the final set of key issues for 2010.
- Oblinger also asked board members to review a draft value statement on innovation and share their feedback with her via e-mail.

Potential EDUCAUSE Services (Action: Explore potential directions for EDUCAUSE services)

- Oblinger asked Richard Katz to open the conversation about cloud computing/“above-campus services” based on the briefs provided to the board.
- Katz noted that cloud computing is currently the subject of a great deal of hype, but its rise indicates technology’s increasing potential to offer macroeconomic solutions to broad-scale problems or needs. In this case, he indicated that cloud computing may offer the opportunity to truly exploit economies of scale and other advantages to significantly impact the growth curve of IT and higher education costs.
- Katz identified two emerging forces:
 - The maturing of technologies, standards, and the marketplace: Technologies and standards are emerging to allow for the commoditization of significant aspects of technology-based services, and major corporate players have sufficiently developed to drive that commoditization, leading to...
 - The consumerization of IT services.
- Katz argued that institutions will either develop an above-campus/below-campus strategy to address this trend, or they will adopt one in an unplanned, incremental fashion and have to cope with the resulting outcomes.
- Board members discussed the concern that institutions may become early adopters of cloud services such as e-mail not on a strategic basis but rather out of expediency, leading to the question of how EDUCAUSE might frame these issues so institutions can approach them in a strategic, informed, and sustainable fashion.
- It was suggested the EDUCAUSE community may need to approach “the cloud” in terms of layers—institutional clouds to aggregate school and college needs, the consumer cloud to address individual student and faculty needs, etc., with the key point being that institutions aren’t outside the cloud—they’re part of it.
- Board members also recommended that EDUCAUSE consider the importance of InCommon/federated identity to potential higher education cloud services, and thus possibly take a more active role in supporting it.
- Oblinger asked the board for input on what EDUCAUSE might do in terms of cloud services. Should EDUCAUSE do something different from what it would normally do? If so, what form should it take?
- It was suggested that the association might frame the issue in terms of what EDUCAUSE can do to “make the market” for higher education cloud services—what can EDUCAUSE do to help members evaluate the range of options and issues and make good decisions about cloud services?
- Board members highlighted the community’s need for a clear delineation of the legal obligations institutions should consider for the security and management of their data in the cloud.
- Direct involvement by EDUCAUSE in a cloud service initiative was identified as potentially important to its understanding of such initiatives, and therefore its ability to educate and advocate on the topic. It was suggested that EDUCAUSE might participate in a project in terms of structuring the assessment process to determine its ultimate impact and value.
- Board members generally agreed that the window to influence the direction of higher education cloud services may be relatively brief, requiring EDUCAUSE to quickly make decisions about its potential involvement as well as members’ professional development needs on the topic.
- Board members agreed that EDUCAUSE must consider the education needs of general counsels, chief financial officers, et al., as it considers education and advocacy around cloud services. CIOs/CTOs won’t be able to make progress in advancing cloud services without the engagement and support of other institutional leaders.

- The point was raised that there may be a real opportunity for EDUCAUSE to serve as a convener of communication and collective action among relevant higher education leadership organizations, including NACUBO, NACUA, etc.
- Board members noted the challenges smaller institutions may face with comprehensively framing cloud services options, and thus the support needs their senior IT leaders may have in terms of developing and advancing a case for cloud services with other senior institutional leaders.
- Board members suggested that the higher education IT community might bring other institutional leaders along the path to cloud services by demonstrating how institutions might pursue them (e.g., outsourcing data storage) as opposed to talking about the possibilities of cloud services in the abstract.
- Board members indicated that InCommon is expanding beyond Internet2's membership, but it does not yet have a clear plan for its future. It was suggested that EDUCAUSE become more actively involved since InCommon could act as an important mediator between higher education and the cloud.
- The potential value of EDUCAUSE developing a brief to inform senior institutional leaders about what cloud services entail and how the institution might approach them was highlighted.
- Aggregating demand for higher education cloud services was identified as another important role EDUCAUSE might play in relation to such services.
 - Since many or most institutions are going to confront the same or similar issues, EDUCAUSE could work with members to develop a shared definition and collaborative sourcing of the identified needs.
 - EDUCAUSE could also evaluate the possibility of providing an organizational framework and a set of minimal applications and support services to structure and advance collaborative efforts.
 - The point was raised that, in this context, EDUCAUSE might not be the aggregator of demand itself but rather the convener of the discussion—the catalyst—to produce a higher education aggregator.
- Oblinger noted that staff will report back in July with recommendations to the board about what EDUCAUSE might do on cloud services.

Policy Program (Action: Continue deliberations on the future shape of the EDUCAUSE Policy Program)

- Oblinger welcomed Rodney Petersen to the meeting to assist with the discussion.
- Oblinger highlighted three points on which the board agreed at its last meeting.
 - When EDUCAUSE thinks about its policy efforts, it should expand its focus beyond networking and telecommunications.
 - EDUCAUSE's policy efforts need to reflect a balance between traditional government relations and institutional policy needs.
 - EDUCAUSE policy efforts should emphasize issue analysis, education, and communication, as opposed to focusing solely on government relations.
- The board reaffirmed these points, noting again that the emphasis of EDUCAUSE's policy efforts should be on higher education IT policy issues writ large, not just networking and telecommunications.
- The board discussed what the vision for the EDUCAUSE Policy Program might be given this broader scope, particularly how it might reflect technology's role in addressing major higher education and social challenges.
- The board then discussed the shape the policy program's activities might take given a greater emphasis on analysis, education, and communication.
- It was noted that "policy advocacy" can be defined in different ways, and that thinking of it in terms of policy analysis might spur better alignment with other EDUCAUSE activities and content development efforts (e.g., better understanding the policy implications of cloud computing would foster institutional policy development and decisions in that area as well as clarify where the community might promote different approaches to those issues in public forums).
- The board discussed how potentially adopting an analysis, education, and communication focus in the EDUCAUSE Policy Program would require addressing certain process challenges:
 - Input (how to get member input, define the association's issue agenda, and determine what the appropriate member advisory structure for policy should be).

- Alignment with the board (establishing clear linkages between the EDUCAUSE governance process and its policy program and member advisory structure).
- Communication (how to make EDUCAUSE policy efforts more transparent and ensure that all relevant constituencies are effectively involved and aware of policy decisions).
- It was suggested that EDUCAUSE conduct an analysis of the higher education/IT policy environment to clarify the major issues and their impact on higher education IT, which in turn would lay the groundwork for considering the association's overall policy agenda.
- The discussion turned to the capabilities the EDUCAUSE Policy Program might need moving forward, focusing on the concepts of anticipation and activity—the program needs the capacity to anticipate issues and influence the environment in which they develop (through activities such as analysis, education, and communication), as well as to initiate rapid response when issues arise or suddenly break.
- In returning to the governance issue, the question arose whether board representation on a policy advisory council might be necessary to ensure a clear reporting relationship.
- Board members also discussed how the existing Network Policy Council might relate to a policy advisory structure with a broader scope.
- The need to address the role and relationship of the Institute for Computer Policy and Law (ICPL) in the future shape of the overall policy program was raised.

Other Business

Future Directions for Net@EDU

- Oblinger noted that the Net@EDU program constitutes another major area of activity for the EDUCAUSE staff in Washington, D.C., and therefore it would be useful to get the board's perspective on its future development in conjunction with discussing the potential shape of the EDUCAUSE Policy Program.
- Oblinger reviewed the history and development of Net@EDU, including its alignment and interaction with Internet2, the incorporation of the StateNets group, and the program's relationship with the Network Policy Council.
- Oblinger also discussed the program's structure as a fee-based activity within the overall association, including its four working groups and their relative interest in and engagement with the program as a whole:
 - Campus Cyberinfrastructure
 - Converged Communications
 - Identity Management
 - State Education Networks (StateNets)
- Oblinger noted that some working group representatives view the Security Task Force as a model for how they might better work with and relate to the overall association.
- Petersen indicated that the best way to capture the value of the program for the overall EDUCAUSE membership remains an open question, as does effectively balancing D.C. staff resources among the staff's various responsibilities.
- The board discussed the relative alignment of the program with the association's strategic directions and indicated that more effective integration of the two should be considered.
- It was noted that EDUCAUSE may need a better process for helping members interested in particular topics and issues self-organize and work collaboratively to address shared needs and issues.
- Oblinger thanked the board for its input and indicated that staff would process the ideas raised into options for the board's consideration.

Miscellaneous Items

- Oblinger stated she would send a reminder to the board about confirming February 11, 2010, as the date for the first 2010 board meeting.
- The board agreed to the following motion, which was made by McMillan, seconded by Maier, and approved by acclamation:

Motion—That EDUCAUSE award an honorarium of \$5,000 to University of Chicago CIO Greg Jackson to recognize his exemplary work on behalf of the EDUCAUSE and higher education communities during the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) negotiated rulemaking process.

- In reviewing the background for this motion, Jackson’s willingness to accept the association’s nomination to serve as the lead higher education negotiator on regulations to implement the HEOA’s unauthorized file-sharing/peer-to-peer networking provisions was highlighted.
- Board members noted Jackson’s significant efforts over the course of the process (spanning February–May 2009) to engage other CIOs and relevant community members in assessing issues, developing positions, and crafting responses to recommendations posed by entertainment industry representatives.
- The board members determined that an honorarium was appropriate to recognize Jackson’s hard work and dedication in leading the community and the negotiators from other industries to a consensus position on the HEOA unauthorized file-sharing/peer-to-peer networking regulations.
- The amount of the honorarium was set at \$5,000 to ensure relative consistency with honoraria awarded for other association activities, as well as to address personal sacrifices in terms of time and expense Jackson may have incurred as part of his service to the EDUCAUSE community.

The board adjourned to executive session at 4:00 p.m., EDT.