

EDUCAUSE Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

October 27, 2008

Orlando, FL

Attending: Board Members Joel Cooper (member elect), Ted Dodds (member elect), James Hilton, Rebecca King, Lucinda Lea, Thomas Maier, Marilyn McMillan (via telephone starting at 1:00 p.m.), Tracy Mitrano, Diana Oblinger, Margaret Plympton, Carrie Regenstein, Kathleen Santora, Scott Siddall, and David Smallen

Unable to attend: Jerry Campbell

Also present: Staff members Jarret Cummings, Peter DeBlois, Cynthia Golden, Richard Katz, Mark Luker, and Michelle McIrvin

The meeting was called to order by Chair David Smallen at 10:04 a.m.

Motion: *That the minutes from the July 24, 2008, board meeting be approved.* Motion made by Lucinda Lea, seconded by Thomas Maier, and passed by unanimous vote.

President's Report

- Diana announced that Jarret Cummings would take over board support from Peter DeBlois.
- The current official enrollment count for the 2008 annual conference is 4,655 full-pay attendees, up more than 13 percent from the 2005 conference in Orlando, and up 10 percent from the 2007 conference in Seattle. Contract hotels are 96 percent full.
- New activities/features at this year's conference include point-counterpoint sessions, lightning rounds, innovation showcases, a redesigned booth, and new messaging emerging from our rebranding effort. In addition, efforts to "get greener" at the conference include recycled tote bags and self-stuffing of totes so staff can see what material attendees want in order to adjust print runs in the future. Diana requested board members participate and provide feedback, also noting the two member webcasts scheduled in November to get feedback on the new activities.
- Board meeting handouts included key messages for staff to communicate to members about the rebranding effort. Diana encouraged board members to review the key messages and use them if opportunities arise. The key message is that EDUCAUSE is the members' association, and we want to meet their needs.
- There were three follow-ups from the July meeting:
 - *The values statement on openness* (handout) – A question was asked at the July meeting about what EDUCAUSE is doing to implement the value. Board materials included list of the various activities staff are pursuing to advance the value statement.
 - *COBRA-style EDUCAUSE memberships* – Cynthia reviewed a plan to offer people retiring from or in-between jobs at member institutions, who would otherwise lose member benefits, to pay member rates for EDUCAUSE events. The plan has been implemented and information posted on the "Institutional Membership" web page (<http://www.educause.edu/AboutEDUCAUSE/Membership/InstitutionalMembership/581>).
 - *EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative (ELI)* – The question of whether to keep ELI as a membership-based program or to fold it into the larger association had been raised. It was decided to keep ELI as pay-to-play program in order to maintain its revenue stream.
- Tab 4 of the October board book provides information about how EDUCAUSE is implementing the strategic directions.
- The strategic directions call for EDUCAUSE to place a greater emphasis on experimentation. As an example, ELI Interim Director Julie Little presented the alternate reality game (ARG), *Saving Professor Bluth*, being developed for the ELI Annual Meeting as a way to expand interaction and engagement. ARGs are all about

learning by doing and encouraging community and collaboration. *Saving Professor Bluth* will provide an example of the use of gaming for teaching and learning. Teams from Middle Tennessee State University and the University of Central Florida are working with ELI to develop the game. Participants and student volunteers will use Twitter and EDUCAUSE Connect to make information about the game available. On the last day of the conference, there will be a "reveal" session where ELI discusses how the game came together, the learning objectives it was meant to serve, and lessons learned from the experience.

Diana noted that ELI has developed a reputation for experimentation, and that having people wonder what you're going to do next keeps people interested and engaged in your conferences and events. This strategy may be useful with other EDUCAUSE events

Tom noted that having the students involved is a major plus of the activity. Julie said that students are helping to validate the way in which the game is being developed.

- New information since the October board book was printed included the following:
 - EDUCAUSE is planning to apply ELI's *7 Things* format to other topics. *7 Things* has proven valuable for those who want to engage and discuss topics with which they have limited knowledge. The first example of the expanded *7 Things* series will be P2P. A draft document was shared.
 - It is important to frame the association's new and continuing activities in the broader context of mission, values, and technology policy priorities—that it's not about technology but what we do with it that matters. For example, EDUCAUSE must strive to help people see how its efforts in policy and government relations clearly relate to the mission and values of higher education.
- Tracy spoke about her note to Mark on HEOA rule-making, which noted how the Internet is evolving and how that changes what effective policy should look like. IT professionals and EDUCAUSE need to go back to a basic concept of the Internet—that it's not just a technology but rather an ecosystem of policies, practices, applications, markets, and culture. If we approach it from that perspective, we can drive the discussion to more useful approaches than the attempt of industry to focus on just technological solutions. Diana emphasized that this connects with our new message that it's not about IT, it's about what you do with it.
- The white paper from the summit, *The Role of IT in Campus Security and Emergency Management*, was shared as an example of how we can get more mileage out of summits for the broader community.
- Diana highlighted evidence of the rebranding project on the conference:
 - *Uncommon Thinking for the Common Good* banners
 - New brochures with the ESC key motif—trying for a more common look and feel that has more personality, and thus makes the messages and message vehicles more engaging
 - A booth format that encourages interaction
 - Bookmarks based on the *Uncommon Thinking* banners with quick messages to help drive the new brand approach, intended as easy takeaways for meeting/session participants and booth visitors
 - Plans to extend the messaging into the 2009 regional conferences to make people aware that we're going to establish a new brand identity next summer.

Questions for the VPs:

- *How many of the 600 volunteers mentioned in the professional development report will be engaged in new volunteer opportunities?* Cynthia explained that there are always more people who want to volunteer than the traditional advisory and program committee structure can accommodate. For the regional conferences this year, we took those in a particular region who expressed interest in volunteering and asked them to serve as alternate readers for their regional conference. We also asked new volunteers to help with session moderating, blogging, and contributing to wikis.

Financial Update (Tab 3)

All financial information contained in the board book is through August 31, 2008.

Balance Sheet or Statement of Financial Position (page 3.2):

- With the exception of investments, there are no variances/balances worthy of note.

- Given what has been happening in the financial markets, investments are a good place to start.
 - Details for the First Internet Securities Network (FISN) portfolio is on pages 3.9–3.17.
 - The pie chart on page 3.11 shows the percentages invested in the various instruments. These can be used to compare with our policy to verify that we are within the designated ranges.
 - Page 3.12 provides detail on the five mutual fund investments and the fixed income portfolio as a whole. The remaining charts show the performance of the mutual funds.
 - Unrealized investment losses were \$671K at the end of August. In September, we incurred additional unrealized losses in our investment portfolio, nearly doubling to slightly less than \$1.3M and representing 10.2 percent of the market value of the FISN investment portfolio, which was \$12.7M at the end of September.
 - Because of our investment strategy, we fared better than the broader market: As of October 17, 2008, the Standard & Poor's 500 Stock Index was down 32 percent. While only 28.6 percent of FISN investments are in mutual funds, 66.0 percent of the unrealized loss is coming from there. The remainder of the investments, 71.4 percent, are in fixed income instruments, and 34 percent of the unrealized losses occurred there. This attests to how conservative our portfolio is.
 - Our core holdings, 60-75 percent, are in fixed income instruments, e.g., CDs (FDIC insured), Government Security Agency Debt (guaranteed by the agency), and Corporate Bonds with A+ ratings.
 - A thoughtful and well-planned diversification strategy has served us well. We will continue to monitor and adjust as necessary.
 - We continue to earn and reinvest interest and dividend income on our investments. For the three quarters ended September 30, 2008, we earned \$422K, about \$18K above budget. Mutual funds are behind budget by \$22K; fixed income is up \$31K; and others are up \$9K.
 - In spite of the unrealized losses on investments, the balance sheet is still healthy with no significant changes in any of the other line items. This continues to be the case through September 30th.

Statements of Activities (the Income Statement) (pages 3.3 through 3.8)

Our net loss for the eight months ended August 31, 2008, is \$368K greater than budget. The most significant budget variances were as follows (explanations also listed in the far right-hand column of the statement):

- In the Federal Relations and Outreach cost center, the President's discretionary fund budget of \$367K has not been spent. However, as we move closer to year-end, Publications and Communications will begin to exceed their budget because of the branding project. These expenses could really be viewed as use of the discretionary budget.
- ECAR income is \$180K higher than budget, accounted for by \$80K in unbudgeted contract income and \$75K higher in subscriptions.
- By far, the most significant variance comes from the Financial and Administrative cost center. The net loss of \$1.2M is because of unrealized loss on investments of \$671K and reserves income of \$487K that was budgeted to be drawn, but no draw was necessary. While this is a good thing, it shows up on the income statement as unfavorable variance, i.e., income less than budget
- **UPDATE:** The major variances continue to be the same in September and for the same reasons.

Bottom Line, Budget to Actual

The bottom line net loss at the end of August was \$368K greater than budget (page 3.5). If we remove the unrealized investment losses from the equation, e.g., convert to an operational number, then we see a bottom line loss of \$1.6M actual compared to \$1.9M budget. In other words, operationally, we are ahead of budget by \$300K. This is without taking any of the budgeted draw on reserves of \$487K.

- **UPDATE:** The bottom line net loss at the end of September was \$755K greater than budget. Removing the unrealized investment losses yields a bottom line loss of \$1.7M compared to budget of \$2.2M. Operationally, we are \$500K ahead of budget at the end of September. Much relies on the Annual Conference; it is too early to predict where we may end up operationally at year-end.

- The same calculation is made on the two-year comparative statement (page 3.8) , i.e., convert each bottom line to operations-only, resulting in a \$270K greater loss operationally for the first eight months of 2008 compared to the first eight months of 2007.
- **UPDATE:** Through September, the operational loss is \$197K greater than 2007 on an operational basis (\$1.7M in 2008 versus \$1.5M in 2007).

Business Meeting

Investment strategy (Action: review and approve)

Two new investment procedure and policy items that were recommended at the July meeting were presented for review and action.

EDUCAUSE–FISN Redemptions and Purchases Procedure

NOTE: This policy applies to purchases and redemptions that fall outside of the EDUCAUSE FISN investment policy. This policy does not apply to reinvested dividends, interest, capital gains, or to the reinvestment of matured instruments. It applies to irregular infusions of cash to FISN or irregular requests for cash payouts upon the sale of investment(s).

NOTE: Only the President and one Vice President may authorize investment purchases or redemptions with FISN.

FISN Investment Purchases

- The Director of Financial and Administrative Services notifies FISN, in writing and/or via phone call, of the amount to be invested, the approximate date for the investment, and requests investment recommendations.
- FISN, in keeping with the EDUCAUSE FISN investment policy, supplies portfolios of recommended funds and provides in writing the rationale for their recommendations.
- The President and the Director of Financial and Administrative Services discuss FISN's recommendations and decide on which investment(s) to purchase.
- The President or Vice President notifies FISN via written, mailed correspondence or phone call of the investment to be purchased. (FISN is not allowed to trade on e-mail requests.)
- The President or Vice President authorizes a check request in the amount of the investment.
- The Accounts Payable Staff Accountant mails the check to FISN.

FISN Investment Redemptions

- The Director of Financial and Administrative Services notifies FISN in writing and/or via phone call of the amount to be redeemed and the approximate date of the redemption, and then requests redemption recommendations.
- FISN, in keeping with the EDUCAUSE investment policy, supplies recommended investments for redemption in writing along with the rationale for their recommendations.
- The President and the Director of Financial and Administrative Services discuss FISN's recommendations and decide on which investment(s) to redeem.
- The President or Vice President notifies FISN via written, mailed correspondence or phone call of the investment(s) to be redeemed and requests that funds from the sale be transferred to the EDUCAUSE Wells Fargo checking account.

Motion: That the proposed FISN Redemptions and Purchases Procedure be approved. Motion made by Carrie Regenstein, seconded by Peggy Plympton, and passed by unanimous vote.

EDUCAUSE–Wells Fargo and First Internet Securities Network (FISN) Investment Policy Statement

The EDUCAUSE Board of Directors has approved the following target ranges and guidelines for each of the investment categories. The investment policy provides for the allocation of funds by category or purpose. The investment objectives are defined for each of these categories, and specific guidelines are set for the types of investments used. In general, the operating and short-term funds carry almost no risk and have the lowest earnings

potential. As the term of investment increases, the investments carry slightly more risk, and the earnings potential increases.

The Director of Financial and Administrative Services, in conjunction with FISN staff, will provide quarterly FISN investment reports to the EDUCAUSE Board of Directors. These reports will show our initial investment cost, investment market value, and performance.

Operating—held exclusively by Wells Fargo

These funds are invested in highly liquid money market accounts. Investment purchases and redemptions are made between the Wells Fargo checking account and the money market funds according to daily cash requirements.

Target Range:	Up to \$3,000,000, depending on anticipated operational cash requirements for the upcoming three months—100 percent of Wells Fargo investment portfolio
Purpose:	Operational cash flow needs
Guidelines:	Low risk money market funds; timed instruments and certificates of deposit are prohibited by FISN because of potential insurance conflicts
Terms:	Less than one year

Short Term Funds – held exclusively by FISN

These funds are generated from maturities of medium- and long-term investments as well as dividend, interest, and capital gains income that are temporarily held in money market funds awaiting reinvestment.

Target Range:	0 percent to 5 percent of FISN investment portfolio
Purpose:	Holding place for matured instruments and earnings on instruments to be reinvested in either medium- or long-term funds
Guidelines:	Low risk money market accounts
Terms:	Less than one year

Medium-to-Long Term Fixed Income—held exclusively by FISN

These funds are invested in a combination of instruments that provide diversity across different markets. The inclusion of high quality corporate bonds with ratings of A+/A1 provides enhanced returns to the fixed income portfolio. A laddered maturity approach is utilized, providing reinvestment opportunities through different economic cycles. No single issue will comprise more than 10 percent of the portfolio.

Target Range:	60 percent to 75 percent of FISN investment portfolio
Purpose:	Provide financial stability, maximize returns, and reduce the volatility of cash flow streams without undue risk
Guidelines:	Guaranteed US Agencies, FDIC insured CDs at the insured limit, and corporate bonds with S&P/Moody’s ratings of A+/A1
Terms:	Two to twenty years

Long Term Equity—held exclusively by FISN

The equity portion of the portfolio is invested in mutual funds diversified by market capitalization, investment style, and geography (domestic and international). The portfolio includes large, medium, and small cap investments in both growth and value categories.

Target Range:	20 percent to 35 percent of FISN investment portfolio
---------------	---

Purpose:	Provide for long-term growth of funds to meet future obligations
Guidelines:	Participation in the equities market with a diversified portfolio of mutual funds
Terms:	5 years and longer

Motion: That the proposed Wells Fargo and First Internet Securities Network (FISN) Investment Policy Statement be approved. Motion made by Lucinda Lea, seconded by Peggy Plympton, and passed by unanimous vote.

2009 Budget (Action: review and approve)

- Diana noted that the 2009 budget proposal included among board handouts requested an 8.7 percent draw on reserves. The president had previously been authorized to draw 5-7 percent; the request to draw more than 7 percent relates to two calculations: (1) the way the reserve is calculated (we are now using a more conservative approach to calculating the reserve, which yields a \$3M reduction); and (2) a change in how we budget membership dues—the previous approach showed a full-year at the higher membership rate for the next year, rather than 6 months of the previous year and 6 months of the new year, which is more accurate. The favorable preliminary enrollment at this year's conference may lessen the amount we need to draw.
- The budget includes new positions, but we will monitor fiscal conditions. If pressures arise, we will consider not filling new/open positions as necessary.
- *Question: On page 2.23, should the numbers in parentheses indicated as negative be positive?* No, the numbers reflect expense to be deducted from available funds.
- *Question: Are we seeking a permanent increase in the draw on reserves?* No, just going above the established draw rate for this year; in the future, we will continue to stay within the established draw rate of 5-7 percent.
- We have a reserves target of 8.6 percent and current reserves of more than 10 percent.
- *Question: On what is the established draw rate based?* It is a fixed rate, not based on changes in the rate of return. *So it will not adjust automatically if investments continue to decline?* No, but the draw has to be reviewed and approved by the board each year.
- Peggy said that our conservative investment philosophy has helped to shield EDUCAUSE reserves from the full impact of the market. Diana noted that we will reevaluate our revenue structure, but that work has not been done yet and, therefore, we will stay with a conservative draw rate for the time being.
- *Question: Will this information be presented at the Annual Business Meeting at the conference?* Scott, as treasurer, will present a limited overview.
- Michelle explained that all EDUCAUSE funds earn money, even those in cash accounts.
- *Question: On page 3.23, the line on planning and analysis looks like we'll spend \$294K more than we spent in 2008. So why are we seeing that represented in the 2009 budget in parentheses?* It is a greater expense, which is added to the other expenses (adding two negative numbers) and then subtracted from available funds.

Motion: That the proposed 2009 budget be approved. Motion made by Tracy Mitrano, seconded by Carrie Regenstein, and passed by unanimous vote.

- *Question: How does our rate of dues increase for 2009 compare with previous years?* The increase of 1.9 percent is not significantly different than increases in prior years—very conservative. The increase does not reflect the rate of inflation, so we will have to repurpose funds from other areas to hold down the rate of increase in our membership dues. However, we will have to revisit the rate of increase in dues as we move forward so we do not undercut our fundamental capacities.
 - Peggy noted that three states in the northeast have already imposed travel bans on personnel from state institutions. We will have to anticipate the possibility of more states adopting such bans and how that may affect EDUCAUSE annual and regional conference attendance and revenue.

- Dave said that his institution is already reviewing its market assumptions to adjust revenue and spending expectations even though Hamilton is an institution well positioned to weather the economic crisis.
- Large institutions, public and private, have generally sent the most people to our conferences, an important revenue source. We don't know how changes in institutional budgets will affect conference revenue. EDUCAUSE has two main revenue sources—conferences and investments. Investments have declined and may continue. We will want to get the board's perspective on the possibility for significant declines in conference attendance based on institutional budget cuts.
- Lucinda said that MTSU has already instituted budget cuts for 2008-09 and is looking at more budget cuts for 2009-10. She noted that, at institutions in similar positions, the commitment of key people such as CIOs to EDUCAUSE membership will be the determining factor in maintaining membership and attendance. Carrie said we will have to continue efforts to demonstrate to CIOs the value of EDUCAUSE membership even if travel bans prevent conference attendance.
- *Question: Have we lost any members yet?* Overall membership numbers are up. We always have some modest fluctuation in gains and losses from membership. Some small institutions come and go; we also have some international institutions that join for a period and then end their membership.
- Tracy indicated that, at Cornell, both the land-grant and private sides of the institution are looking at cuts. The state side is impacted by the crisis more than the private side, though, so Cornell is looking at how the private side can help support the public side.
- Kathleen said that everyone is hearing about institutional budget freezes and cuts, and that in some ways this is analogous to the impact of 9/11—associations didn't start feeling the impact of the issues from that until a year or two later. As we think about membership and event planning, we have to look at scenario planning and prepare worst case scenario budgets. NACUA has established worst-case scenario budgets reflecting a one-third reduction in conference attendance as well as a one-half reduction. She believes the associations least likely to be impacted are those that are the primary organizations for their core constituencies—like NACUA and EDUCAUSE. NACUA is planning a survey of its members on the impact of the economic crisis on institutional budgets and members' financial capacity to continue attending and participating. She wants quantitative data, not just anecdotal evidence.
- Tom said the Georgia state system is seeing much greater emphasis on virtual meetings to reduce travel costs (out-of-state travel is currently not allowed). EDUCAUSE needs to look at the possibility of virtual events with revenue components.
- James is seeing similar impacts in Virginia. He said conference attendance is up this year because of the delayed impact of cuts. EDUCAUSE needs to anticipate significant reductions in annual conference attendance. Strategically, does that mean that EDUCAUSE needs to focus on regional conferences as well as expanding online collaboration and community?
- Becky said they are not talking about budget reductions in Texas at this time and are actually seeing a budget increase for next year. However, that will likely change next year as the impact of the crisis takes hold, particularly on the public side. We are likely to see significant reductions in conference attendance from large institutions that send the bulk of the conference attendees.
- Peggy said we should differentiate between the actual impact of the financial crisis and its psychological aspect. *Perceptions* of budget cuts and program adaptations by the community will be equally important to continuing strategic (and survival) planning.
- Scott said he is working with Kenyon staff members to get them to engage in conferences; if they had the option of virtual conference attendance, they would take it. EDUCAUSE probably needs to be concerned about the possibility of virtual attendance eroding conference attendance over the long term. We also need to be concerned about how it might impact corporate involvement.
- Dave suggested the group consider the good ideas in a forthcoming e-book and blog series, *Winning in a Down Economy: A Pragmatic Guide to Getting Tuned In* <<http://www.tunedinblog.com/blog/2008/10/winning-in-a-do.html>>. The major premise of the book/series

is that such an economy is not only a survival challenge but an opportunity to invest in the new and good for your community.

- Lucinda said that EDUCAUSE and its membership, as IT-based, may be seen as having a special responsibility to show how technology can help address some of the limitations arising from the crisis. She noted it would be a mistake for us to not set an example for how we can operate in a different way. Scott concurred, saying we will have to look at where and how virtual meetings do or do not work.
- Becky suggested the group consider making one of the board's quarterly meetings virtual. Peggy said that if we look at that, we need to characterize it as an experiment so we can explore what constitutes an effective board meeting—what do we really need to accomplish and how can we do it effectively virtually?
- Richard said we have to aggressively rethink what constitutes professional development. Should we look at developing professional development materials and models that institutions can take and use to offer on-campus professional development themselves? Carrie concurred, saying we may need to look at providing new models and strategies for institutions to use to redevelop themselves in relation to the new environment. Likewise, we might consider options for the individual—helping people think through how to change their thinking and approaches to help their institutions adapt to changing conditions.
- Kathleen noted that NACUA is starting to offer professional development on how to implement budget cuts and pursue retirement planning. Cynthia indicated these types of issues are on the priority list for EDUCAUSE Institute faculty.
- The League for Innovation conference last week experienced a 50 percent drop in attendance from the year before; we're not seeing that yet, but we have to anticipate reductions in conference attendance.
- *Question: Does this year's conference evaluation ask about plans to attend next year?* Dave said he wasn't sure it would be useful, accurate information—folks may not know yet how they'll be impacted.
- Ted suggested we need to facilitate member knowledge-sharing about what institutions are doing to address the impact of the financial crisis. Practical information of that type would highlight the value proposition of EDUCAUSE—being part of an effective, knowledgeable, collaborative community. Also, if it's possible, next year's annual conference in Denver should pursue flexible contracts with the conference venue and hotels as a contingency for low enrollment.
- Dave said we need to start highlighting decision timeframes in relation to when we're likely to know more.

Selection of Board Officers and At-Large Member

- The following are the basic rules for selecting officers: New members may stand for election since the officers don't take their positions until the start of 2009. Outgoing members may vote, but not stand for office. To be chair or vice chair, the member must have been elected by the membership; appointed members may not hold those offices but may serve as secretary or treasurer.
- The following officers were selected for one-year terms that start January 2009:
 - Chair – Lucinda Lea
 - Vice-chair – Tracy Mitrano
 - Secretary – Tom Maier
 - Treasurer – Carrie Regenstein
- *Question: Do we need to identify the audit committee members for next year at this meeting?* Diana said yes, but the board did not return to this discussion in its regular session. She explained that another board with which she was familiar had experienced difficulty in finding a member with the expertise to serve on the audit committee. So, that board decided to have an expert participate in the audit committee meetings to provide the requisite knowledge and skills. That is something the EDUCAUSE board might consider as well.
- Diana presented two nominees for at-large board member. Following discussion, the board unanimously selected Brad Wheeler of Indiana University for a four-year term starting in January 2009 and tasked Diana with notifying him about his selection.

Internationalizing EDUCAUSE (Action: open discussion)

- Diana referenced Tab 5 of the board book. Many member institutions are establishing overseas campuses, and many international institutions are expressing interest in EDUCAUSE participation and/or adopting the EDUCAUSE model for their communities. Kathleen indicated that globalization was one of the NACUA membership's top issues.
- The last board discussion of internationalization was in 2006, when the board developed a set of principles but no action plan. Diana asked for a general discussion of globalization to enable the executive team to begin developing options.
- Marilyn suggested a number of domains in which EDUCAUSE has the opportunity to support members' ongoing efforts to become more globally connected/savvy, and to help create the same kinds of interactions for institutions in other countries. The big trend NYU sees is that the flow of researchers and graduate students has changed from US-centric to a much more diverse array of destinations, not all of which are English-speaking. US institutions can't think they have a corner on the global higher education market. We need to help EDUCAUSE members become more thoughtful and conversant about international issues and trends.
- Ted suggested two ways to approach this: (1) Those institutions that are building physical campuses around the world, e.g., Carnegie Mellon, are leading the effort to address the practical, real-world issues one would face in global operations; EDUCAUSE needs to capture and share their knowledge. (2) In terms of building the international higher education IT community, given the number of nations represented at the annual conference, we might consider EDUCAUSE as already having a significant international reach. His recent international travels with Richard indicated that there's great commonality among institutions worldwide on the issues that keep CIOs up at night. There is also tremendous global interest in openness—in leveraging the power of the global higher education IT community to address shared issues and needs. He encouraged EDUCAUSE to consider more fully engaging with organizations like CAUDIT that do interesting things in similar areas but are not well-known in the US.
- Tom suggested we need someone in a leadership position with a focus on international issues to look at them from both a theoretical and practical perspective; it's very important to identify institutions and organizations that have similar interests and concerns.
- Carrie indicated that Common Solutions Group agendas tend to be a little ahead of the curve, and this is a set of issues CSG has been exploring. We need to take this discussion to the larger EDUCAUSE membership. How does this all lead to not just better institutional management, but also to advancing the research agenda around the world—both faculty and students?
- Scott indicated that the small liberal arts college touches on internationalism from the off-campus studies perspective, so we need to remember that they are part of the equation as well.
- Tracy suggested EDUCAUSE consider how Internet2 and InCommon have addressed federated identity management and asked if the next level up is where EDUCAUSE needs to play, e.g., partnering on a global scale to develop organized, community approaches to major issues. When the Cornell CIO went around to colleges to discuss what they wanted from IT, the faculty indicated they wanted greater support for connecting internationally. This is particularly important in the liberal arts—the sciences have been pursuing global collaboration for years, but the liberal arts are just beginning—and they need greater international collaboration around major human challenges.
- Peggy said there are two considerations from the EDUCAUSE perspective: (1) the whole conversation about what services EDUCAUSE can offer to international organizations and institutions; and (2) the policy aspects of internationalization are very complex, and EDUCAUSE has expertise to bring to bear in that area.
- Kathleen said the hard part is narrowing the focus of globalization. For NACUA, members want to learn from each other in terms of professional development, e.g., NACUA created an exchange program with Australian university lawyers. Members also have to support their presidents and senior executives on international issues with legal implications for their institutions. There are so many directions in which an association can go that you have to carefully define where you want to play internationally.
- Dave said we have to target and try to achieve something meaningful; we also have to look at impact and the existing organizations/relationships in other countries.

- James suggested there might be an appropriate bias in favor of countries where you can find organizations with which you can collaborate. China, for example, poses a host of legal and policy issues.
- Diana said the staff will take the board's input and try to define options. She recently had a meeting with JISC and SURF about common ground. Board members were invited to attend an international focus group at the conference to get feedback from international participants on what they want from their EDUCAUSE conference experience.
- Diana noted that the board materials include a draft concept paper on options for EDUCAUSE-sponsored international study tours: (1) overseas tours with US and international participants; and (2) tours in the US scheduled around the EDUCAUSE annual conference to allow international participants to leverage their travel.

Internet2 and EDUCAUSE (Action: review)

- Diana explained that the question of where and what Internet2 does vis à vis EDUCAUSE has been out in the community for some time. She and Mark met recently with the Internet2 leadership to discuss opportunities for collaboration. The document in Tab 5 outlines how Internet2 and EDUCAUSE differ in what they do, as well as opportunities for collaboration.
- One area for collaboration is policy. Internet2 agreed to take its policy leadership from the EDUCAUSE Network Policy Council as opposed to establishing its own policy group.
- Diana said that NSF recently called to ask EDUCAUSE to host an event on cyberinfrastructure. Is that something EDUCAUSE should do, or does it fall into Internet2's domain?
- Tom suggested that EDUCAUSE focuses on the "why" of advanced networking, and Internet2 focuses on the "how." There is concern about the need to clarify the overlap between the organizations in identity management projects. Diana agreed that that is an area in which discussion needs to continue.
- Tracy added that there is the physical layer (Internet2) and the conceptual layer (EDUCAUSE), and both meet in the area of middleware. There is significant overlap between the organizations in the area of middleware; we need to focus on collaborative projects in that area, bringing in other organizations such as NSF when appropriate.
- Carrie suggested that EDUCAUSE may have the opportunity to redefine the middleware discussion in a way that's more productive and useful—many don't get how it impacts teaching, learning, and research, so there's a programmatic opportunity to work with Internet2 in this area. There may also be vendor opportunities for collaboration.
- Marilyn agreed about the possibility for collaboration around middleware. She was at the Internet2 member meeting in New Orleans where Diana and Doug Van Houweling discussed their clarification of the EDUCAUSE-Internet2 relationship. Audience feedback was that the position paper didn't seem to have much substance, but Marilyn felt the concern was mitigated by the recognition that the current statement just clarifies the basis for future dialogue and collaboration.
- Marilyn suggested that, to move forward, we may need to establish a working group with members from both organizations. It's probably not realistic to think EDUCAUSE and Internet2 staff can fully carry the ball; we may need to look at a CIO working group with activities commissioned/endorsed by both organizations' boards. A similar construct might help propel EDUCAUSE's international engagement, e.g., having member CIOs working with counterparts from other countries on specific issues.
- Mark said one of the major topics of the proposed NSF meeting on cyberinfrastructure will be federated identity. Lucinda pointed out that it's not just an issue of some folks not understanding middleware issues; they may understand but need help in participating and implementing. Carrie suggested that federated identity may be a good idea for a *7 Things* piece. Mark explained that Internet2 is now trying to determine how to take research developments on middleware and make them available for practical implementation.
- James said it seems like middleware is still caught in the gap between the organizations at this point. He has seen vendors come along and pick off campuses with effective sales pitches, but not necessarily good products. Seems like an area in which the higher education community should be investing to establish effective, high-quality options.

- Ted said that middleware is a very important focus area for EDUCAUSE and other organizations. He can think of two other community source organizations involved in middleware – JASIG and Kuali. Kuali is in the midst of developing its Rice middleware application suite. EDUCAUSE and Internet2 could help organize, coordinate, and bring some coherence to the various middleware projects.
- Dave asked that any further thoughts on this be sent to Diana; it will be an ongoing topic of discussion.

EDUPINION (Action: discussion of preliminary ideas)

- Richard presented the EDUPINION project concept, with board members having a brief on it in their materials. The concept arose from the Advisory Group on Enterprise Information Systems and Services (AGEISS).
- EDUPINION would be "a product evaluation site for the higher education community," a concept that is fairly well-established in the commercial marketplace. It would aggregate community perspectives on IT products and services.
- Vendors might support, or at least not oppose, the site since it would help them discover what their customers are thinking and saying about their products and services. The site might also stimulate the development of new providers in areas that are currently poorly served, in either the number of providers, the quality of their products, or both. AGEISS also thought that the service would have to take care not to oversell itself; it would bill itself as "a" source of information, not "the" source of information.
- The proposed service could have potential professional development benefits, as well. It would not only provide an avenue for professionals to share their expertise on different products and vendors, but it could also help them learn how to effectively share their knowledge through a "rate the rater" feature. EDUCAUSE could give the top raters public recognition to highlight the role's importance and what effective contributions look like.
- Dave said that organizations typically do very good analyses of products they're interested in buying, but often don't think to make them available to the community at large. This is a missed opportunity for the community as well as for the institution in terms of garnering recognition as a good source for this type of analysis.
- Lucinda felt the proposed service could help community members identify potential sources of consulting/consultants within the community and provide an avenue for recognizing members who are making major contributions to the community as a whole.
- Carrie said we might also want a feature to capture contributor demographics (e.g., institutional type/size, etc.). Richard said that has been part of the group's discussions.
- Carrie asked about concerns from university lawyers regarding potential institutional liability. Richard said that AGEISS members believe those issues have to be considered. There would need to be a process for controlling contributions to the site. James also worried about this. Having CIOs say, "Who's licensed to speak?" is very problematic in higher education; also if they're chosen by the CIO, then they may have to speak to university counsel since they could be seen as representing the institution.
- Marilyn said she thinks it would be useful to have this type of information available more transparently. It would help larger institutions see if there's more recent thinking on different products and vendors, and it would provide a source for smaller institutions to get such information. Tom added that while such analysis is going on within the community, the results are not accessible in a systematic, easily searchable way. It's very informal.
- James noted that this can't be about vendor bashing. On the other hand, vendors need to know the extent to which they may have reputation problems, and many probably don't.
- Ted suggested integrating members' EDUCAUSE profiles with their contributions so people can learn more about who made a particular contribution. He also suggested that the potential developers consider how the service could be structured to reduce the overhead associated with RFP processes. In addition, he noted that, as with other Web 2.0 applications, what the community ultimately does with something like this may be very different than the original conception.
- Richard indicated a number of other questions remain on the table: Do you let vendors respond? How much opportunity for response do you give them? How do you handle "flaming" contributions? He noted that many policy issues would have to be resolved in pursuing something like the EDUPINION concept.

- Richard also noted that this exploration highlights the various issues EDUCAUSE will have to consider with any social application. Carrie asked whether a service focusing on vendors was the right place to start. Cynthia said that rating professional development programs was a concept floated a couple of years ago.
- Kathleen said the concept is great, but we probably would need to have legal counsel involved to help develop a "safe" service. We would have to address not just potential vendor bashing, but also concerns about favoritism, conflicts of interest, etc. The current draft of the concept does show that the group is thinking about these issues.
- Kathleen also stressed the importance of recognizing that the difference between something like this and Trip Advisor is you would have institutional employees providing the ratings (and thus possibly creating institutional liability), as opposed to Trip Advisor where participating individuals are not affiliated with an organization.
- Tracy indicated that outsourcing is a hot topic in higher education, but one on which the community doesn't have a complete grasp. She thought something like EDUPINION would help with exploring and understanding the options. Tom suggested those points extend to sourcing in general.
- Dave said this will be an ongoing discussion; Richard and AGEISS will continue exploring and will report back.

New Business

- EDUCAUSE is not moving forward with The Seminars – Cynthia reported that when SAC ended in 2007, the concept was for EDUCAUSE to offer a CIO leadership seminar in summer of 2008. We delayed that due to the presidential transition. In planning for 2009, EDUCAUSE staff researched the concept and gathered member feedback. The executive team concluded that there's not a need for another "must attend" CIO event—a better option is to look for other ways to engage/support CIOs and then revisit The Seminars concept in the future.
- Mark reported on the Warner Music Group (WGM) proposal to pilot “Voluntary Blanket Licensing” for online access to music with higher education institutions. The goal is to allow students to access music any way and from anywhere they want, while avoiding the negative impacts of illegal file-sharing on industries, institutions, and individuals. Institutions would try to estimate the amount of downloading, differentiated by file, and pay for the rights to use it. An entity would be established to distribute the funds among the various rights holders.
 - WGM has the major labels and independent labels onboard, and is trying to get music publishers onboard.
 - It is not really a collective license, but more along the lines of a covenant not to sue.
 - WGM wants to know if any institutions are interested in pursuing the proposal; Mark indicated some institutions are interested in getting a better understanding of it, so he is establishing a series of conference call for that purpose.
 - WGM has indicated that the price for institutions is TBD, and whether the covenant would cover residential or all students is TBD.
 - James said the proposal still has elements of trying to get higher education to solve the industry's problem; instead, the industry needs to indicate what the price per student would be and then handle the organizational and revenue distribution issues. On the plus side, the proposal establishes illegal file-sharing as a money issue, not a moral issue, and provides a way to deflect the assault on the university as a venue for the free flow of information. He expressed concern, though, that it would entail another student fee.
 - Marilyn said she was troubled by this idea—we don't buy subscriptions to the *New York Times* for students, so why would we buy media subscriptions for them? However, she noted that we could look at this in the same way we look at licensing for media access through the libraries. James pointed out that institutions are already paying BMI/ASCAP so music can be performed on campus; this proposal extends that model to online file-sharing of music files.
 - Diana said she wanted to get this idea in front of the board; Mark will continue to work on the proposal, and we will probably revisit at the January board meeting. Mark asked that anyone who wants to join one of the WGM calls to let him know.
- Ted suggested the board consider recognizing staff and volunteers for their outstanding work in making the annual conference a success. Diana indicated a board resolution thanking staff for their hard work might work best. Dave said he would draft a resolution and distribute it electronically for other board members to refine.

- Diana recognized the outgoing board members, Becky King, Peggy Plympton, and Dave Smallen, thanking them for their service and asking them to share their final thoughts.
 - Becky thanked Dave for his service as chair and head of the presidential search committee. She also said she felt it was important that most board members be CIOs—not all, but most—since the broader perspective they bring to bear is important for addressing the wide array of issues the board faces.
 - Peggy echoed Becky's appreciation and thanks to Dave. She noted that, as someone coming from another board and another professional perspective, she wasn't sure what the best balance on the board should be. However, there are different types of boards. Some are more actively involved in running the organization and others have a more advisory capacity. The EDUCAUSE board falls into the latter, so that may make outreach to non-CIOs as board members more realistic.
 - Dave stated that EDUCAUSE and its predecessors have been so important in providing him with opportunities for growth. He previously didn't know much about running a national search, but he knew that appointing a president is the most important activity an organization can undertake.
- Diana reminded board members about the Board-Recognition dinner on Tuesday as well as the need to complete the board meeting evaluation.

3:00–5:00 p.m. **Executive Session**

5:00 p.m. **Adjournment**