Minutes of the Regular EDUCAUSE Board Meeting

MARCH 3, 2015—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Attendance

- **Board members attending:** Kara Freeman, Joy Hatch, Bill Hogue (Treasurer), Marc Hoit, Bruce Maas (Chair), Susan Metros (Vice Chair), Diana Oblinger (President and CEO), Laura Patterson, Kay Rhodes, Tracy Schroeder, Jack Suess, Justin Sipher (Secretary)
- **Staff attending:** Joanne Dehoney, Susan Grajek, Julie Little, Thad Lurie, Stacy Ruwe (by phone)
- **Guest attending:** John O'Brien

Call to Order

Maas convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. (ET).

Consent Agenda

Metros called for a motion to approve of the consent agenda; Hoit seconded. The motion to approve the consent agenda was carried by unanimous agreement.

President's Report

Oblinger welcomed John O'Brien, the incoming EDUCAUSE CEO, to the board meeting. She then provided an overview of the EDUCAUSE program and activity portfolio and emerging work, highlighting:

- The breadth and complexity of the portfolio, which between content releases, conferences and events, and member engagement opportunities, has hundreds of member-facing activities annually
- The challenge—and necessity—of streamlining to clarify the value proposition for members, including how determining which activities to grow and which activities to stop will depend in the future on member needs, the EDUCAUSE value proposition, the association's business model and service philosophy, and the market landscape

Oblinger provided an overview of early 2015 events. EDUCAUSE Connect San Diego took place January 28–30, with 209 attendees. Event highlights included:

- 33 EDUCAUSE Institute New IT Manager graduates
- 10 CIO Experience participants who met daily throughout the event
- 66 content leaders
- 119 institutions from 38 states as well as the United Arab Emirates and Canada
- 73 individuals who had never attended an EDUCAUSE event
- 96% overall satisfaction

Rhodes asked whether the Connect participation numbers compared favorably to participation in Regional conferences. Oblinger responded that in comparison to the largest regional (Midwest Regional) the number is low,

but it is still in line with the Western Regional Conference. We do not yet know if the numbers are part of the growth trajectory of a new event, marketing, the location, or other factors. Little noted that registrations for the upcoming San Antonio event are better and explained that we also suspect that the timing for "early bird" registrations—ending during the December holiday season—may have affected participation.

Oblinger provided an overview of the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative (ELI) Annual Meeting, which took place in Anaheim, California, January 9–11. Highlights included:

- 2015 saw the second largest ELI participation with 582 attendees, 41 states, and seven countries represented.
- The online conference had 102 participating institutions (individuals and teams), 28 states, and four countries represented.
- One of our strategies for increasing engagement with EDUCAUSE and for expanding EDUCAUSE influence is to promote the major conferences as places to convene. This year groups convening at ELI included:

    - Breakthrough Model Academy 2013 and 2014 cohorts
    - Breakthrough Models Incubator 2014 cohort
    - BMGF Next Generation Learning Courseware Challenge winners
    - NGLC Wave IIIb-Breakthrough Models grantees
    - University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee Distance Education and Technological Advancement (DETA) Grant Summit
    - Public Agenda's CBE landscape discussion
    - CIO/Senior Academic Leader Roundtable
    - Leadership Seminar

Metros complimented Oblinger's keynote, reporting that she had heard positive feedback from numerous members.

Oblinger reported on the *2015 Horizon Report* video competition, part of the ELI Annual Meeting, noting that the video competition brings the *Horizon Report* to life and brings effective practice to the forefront.

- In this second year of the competition, 23 videos were submitted from 18 different institutions.
- The videos received a total of 5,041 votes; three emerged as favorites:

    - The Ohio State University: Bring Your Own Device Category
    - George Mason University: Flipped Classroom Category
    - Western Carolina University: Bring Your Own Device Category

Little suggested that board members might take a look at the videos and recommended especially paying attention to the emergent technology submissions covering topics like maker spaces, wearable technology, and adaptable learning technologies.

Oblinger completed the ELI 2015 report by highlighting ELI 2015 content anchors:

- The ELI community crowdsources a list of teaching and learning challenges. The top issues frame ELI programming throughout the year.
- The 2015 content anchors were the topic of a special session at ELI in which community members presented the top issues in brief "TED talk" style presentations.
- ELI released a conference edition *7 Things* issue on the 2015 ELI content anchors.

- An infographic, also released in advance of the annual meeting, creates a compelling visual summarizing the anchors.

Oblinger introduced the topic of EDUCAUSE conference revenue and expense. She explained that:

- The new accounting system is allowing us to track area expenses and revenues with greater precision and that one area that we have been examining more closely is the conference portfolio. Also, we have agreed not to include corporate revenue in our conference profit and loss statements. The conference portfolio—without corporate contributions—is losing nearly $1M annually. Historically, the conference events team raised prices 2–3% a year without a market comparison.

    - In response to a question from Hogue about the logic of removing corporate revenue from conferences, Oblinger responded that corporate dollars are fairly fixed based on corporate annual marketing budgets, so removing them lets us examine the real costs of events.
    - In response to a question from Hoit, Oblinger defined the sources of corporate revenue as dues, sponsorships, and ad sales.
    - Schroeder observed that it seems corporate dollars would be tied to specific events. Ruwe responded that many corporations invest across multiple events but that overall spend doesn't change much no matter which events they are linked to.

- Oblinger continued by reporting that operations and finance performed a market assessment of our conference fees. We are below market for similar size and type events.
- In 2016 there can be a more robust conversation about conference pricing. The only change for 2015 registration fees will be the annual conference because registration prices were not yet set. Oblinger noted that setting conference pricing hinges on the philosophy behind membership benefits, such as what we subsidize.
- Suess drew an analogy between EDUCAUSE setting registration fees and campuses setting tuition and determining financial aid. He expressed concern that by raising fees, we could lose the institutions that are financially strained. He suggested that any new models should include scholarships and discounting to enable less affluent institutions to continue to participate in the annual and other conferences. Suess suggested that EDUCAUSE watch closely for patterns of decrease in participation to then develop appropriate incentives. Lurie concurred with Suess.
- Metros noted that in setting prices, EDUCAUSE should attend to the registration cost split across days in the conference, citing as an example ASU/GSV, which exceeds what her institution will pay per day.
- Schroeder asked how EDUCAUSE will message a price increase for the annual to members, wondering if the best strategy is to simply institute the change. Rhodes responded that in her view this is correct as managers don't track the costs of events year to year but rather work within their institutional professional travel budgets.
- Lurie mentioned that his team will develop talking points for member services to help them handle any questions.
- Ruwe noted that another angle on the decision is that the member impact of raising conference registration fees is less than cutting costs, which would affect the quality of the member experience at conferences.

Oblinger introduced the topic of portfolio activities that require long lead times, in particular research, policy, and external relations.

- Oblinger explained that for example in research, such as the student and faculty studies, institutional participation trends can only be understood over the long term.

- With policy, it is important for an association like EDUCAUSE to know its place in the ecosystem of organizations working on higher education policy. EDUCAUSE cannot jump ahead of the groups whose missions put them on point for a particular issue. Coalitions are the most effective way to influence the policy process. EDUCAUSE has recently taken the lead in crafting a response to two major policies, NFB TEACH Act and net neutrality, receiving accolades for its efforts from groups like the Association of American Universities.
- In response to a question from Maas about the net neutrality policy effort, Oblinger clarified that Internet2 chose not to be part of the coalition.
- Oblinger closed this section by citing external engagement as another area requiring long lead times. External relations allows EDUCAUSE to extend its influence through other associations. For example, in the last trimester, executives and/or staff presented at events or collaborated with:

  - American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU)
  - American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)
  - Achieving the Dream (AtD)
  - Council of Independent Colleges (CIC)
  - Jisc
  - National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)
  - NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
  - University Professional & Continuing Education Association (UPCEA)
  - U.S. Department of Education (ED)

Oblinger updated the board on the progress of the IP address block sale. She noted that we had followed up on Patterson's suggestion that we talk with Merit and, as a result, we are working with them to clear the block and put it on sale in the spring.

Oblinger summarized a number of other items, including:

- The decision based on member feedback to change the name of the Administrative IT program to Enterprise IT.
- The progress of the Gates Foundation–funded Next Generation Digital Learning Environments research project, which is wrapping up this month with a white paper and investment recommendations to move the field forward.
- The online *Buyers Guide*, which will launch in March, summarizing vendors and products related to higher education IT; it is expected to net about $35K in income in 2015. Thereafter income is estimated to be $55K per year.
- In response to a question from Schroeder, Ruwe responded that the initial version of the guide will not have a recommendation system but that this could be a future development. Schroeder commented that the guide will be useful for seeing who is in the space and could serve as a foundation for a larger service to members.
- In response to a question from Hogue about potential 501c3 implications, Oblinger responded that this product will not cause us to incur unaffiliated income tax.
- In response to Schroeder, O'Brien suggested that a function allowing members to know who is using which product could be helpful.
- In response to O'Brien, Grajek noted that the EDUCAUSE Core Data Service provides some of this information by tracking the use among respondents of 20 core systems. Responding to a question from Hoit, she clarified that non-EDUCAUSE members can use CDS if they contribute data.
- Freeman observed that the service could have interesting intersections with member expectations for contemporary recommendation and rating services.

Financial Report

Oblinger invited Ruwe to provide the financial report. Ruwe reminded the board that unlike most campuses, the EDUCAUSE fiscal year runs on the calendar year. She reported:

The unaudited year-end results for 2014 beat the budget with a $601K loss versus the planned loss of $1.5M.

- The positive variance was due to several factors including underspending in the capital budget, good investment performance, less travel, and lower self-insurance health costs than anticipated.
- Unfavorable budget variances included the Drupal 7 write-off and failing to meet corporate revenue targets.

The high-level sources of revenue and expense for the association, as well as revenue and expense for each of 10 EDUCAUSE departments and for annual conferences and events, were shared.

The net loss in 2014 versus net gain in 2013 has to do with investing in foundational activities, including:

- SITAR research and analytics investment
- Creation of the Admin IT initiative
- Marketing contract with PR firm
- CEO search
- Conference portfolio net costs increased

The 2015 budget includes a planned draw down on our reserves of $2.8M to improve our foundational investments in systems, SITAR, as well as the CEO transition. We expect to meet or beat the 2015 budget.

- In response to a question from Hoit, Ruwe explained that staff record actual time on projects in the ten departments as opposed to allocating their costs as they have in the past.
- In response to a question from Rhodes, Ruwe clarified that the conference income and expense picture presented includes only direct costs and revenues of conferences, not allocations from dues income or overhead expenses. Oblinger concurred, adding that not fully loading conferences with overhead is philosophical and that the view provides a starting point to make decisions about conference business models. In response to a question from Sipher, Ruwe confirmed that the material presented depicts conference profit and loss, not costs and inputs.

  - Suess observed that the approach removing corporate contributions to events is healthy in that it highlights hidden subsidies and lets us have the conversation about whether we are comfortable with them. He noted that corporate was obscuring the true costs. He suggested that as we start to take a look, our questions should address what should be the right costs, that maybe some events should be retired and others have a higher registration fee. It will be important not to make assumptions about subsidizing. Oblinger concurred with Suess, noting that the board will have finer detail next year than it does now.

Ruwe reported that the reserves investment performance was $.5M better than anticipated at the last board meeting. She informed the board that:

- EDUCAUSE is in compliance with the investment policy at 35% equity holdings and 65% fixed income.
- Investment returns beat the benchmarks.
- Reserves include $8.6M in grant revenue for future activities.

Ruwe reported that the fiduciary committee met in February and summarized the meeting as follows:

- The new portfolio performed well in 2014.
- TIAA-CREF announced new fees on the CREF annuity funds effective April 2015:

    - The committee placed these funds on watch.
    - The committee authorized the CFO to reach out to TIAA-CREF to see if costs could be reduced. Ruwe has already done so and is optimistic that TIAA-CREF might be willing to reduce the costs.

- Less than 1% of employee holdings are in Valic.

Remarks from John O'Brien

Incoming EDUCAUSE President and CEO John O'Brien offered comments to the board. He thanked Diana Oblinger for her assistance orienting him to EDUCAUSE and observed that due to the complicated political situation in Minnesota, he has been unable to spend as much time as he had hoped preparing for the transition to EDUCAUSE on June 1. O'Brien thanked Maas and the board for arranging and supporting his upcoming participation in the I2 Global Summit and the RUCC meeting.

- Hoit observed that Minnesota's political challenges echo those in states like Florida and Wisconsin.
- Patterson agreed with Hoit, adding that it is an interesting to see technology driving change in the context of higher education, where institutions are so entrenched. She observed that all state institutions are experiencing troubling times, but that some are feeling it more—and that the perspectives and lessons learned will be important and helpful as John guides EDUCAUSE in the future.
- In response to a question from Schroeder, O'Brien reported that reactions to his new role are, in general, positive.
- In response to Patterson, Maas observed that we are at the nexus of unprecedented change in teaching and learning and that part of the challenge for EDUCAUSE is being the rational and reasonable voice for technology-driven change that is already here. He suggested that this is particularly sensitive in the context of shared governance, which is very important to our faculty, staff, and students.
- Hogue reminded the board that many institutions have been operating for years in a context of poor political and legislative support for higher education, but that it is deeply troubling when institutions are undermined that have stood as emblems of strong systems operating in the public interest.
- Sipher observed that higher education should also be watching K–12 to understand the direction of change, as it is also struggling.

Membership

Oblinger opened the topic of the EDUCAUSE membership model by saying that it is a complex subject that will entail several conversations before any broad changes are made. She pointed out the July to June dues cycle, which means that changes do not go into effect immediately and, depending on timing, could take more than a year to be introduced.

Oblinger presented four questions for board discussion:

- What should the membership model be designed to achieve?
- Should EDUCAUSE continue to strive to be as open as possible with its content?
- Are the Carnegie classifications still relevant determinants for dues?
- Is EDUCAUSE willing to absorb a potential loss in dues to rationalize the structure? Are we willing to lose members due to increased fees?

Oblinger described general elements of member models as benefits, inclusivity/exclusivity, influence, governance, and revenue. She described key elements of the EDUCAUSE model as:

- Institutional membership (not individual)
- Inclusive and affordable
- An emphasis on open content
- Large size results in influence
- Little differentiation among membership categories
- Regular membership limited to accredited U.S. colleges and universities
- Voting rights limited to regular members

Oblinger cautioned the group that almost any new direction will have a set of unknowns, citing as an example the unknown effect on membership of raising dues rates, and may raise questions for which we cannot get answers. She noted that our objectives may sometimes be in opposition, for example when the cost of recruiting new members exceeds the revenue those members would contribute.

In response to a question from Maas, Oblinger explained that international members are not regular voting members. In response to a question from O'Brien, Oblinger clarified that national accreditation is required for voting membership.

Oblinger opened the floor for discussion, asking what the EDUCAUSE membership model should be designed to achieve.

- Freeman described some facets of the ACE membership analysis, which has looked at inclusiveness as a guiding factor in membership as well as the pros and cons of offering discounts. ACE asked itself, "Are we "HBO" or "PBS?" and spent more time making distinct and thoughtful decisions about what is available to all of higher education versus members. The work was a several year debate with attention to unintended consequences.
- Hoit asked Freeman if ACE concluded it was HBO or PBS. Freeman clarified that the ACE model is a hybrid; the important point is to know when you are operating under which paradigm and being consistent.
- Suess observed that we are in a time where technology should be a critical element of institutional success and that he would like to see EDUCAUSE focusing on what that means and requires. He suggested that we might first decide what role we want to play in the ecosystem and then what would it take to sustain that role. He further commented that our ability to influence will not be materially affected by a 10% dues change up or down, so we should make decisions based on mission, even if the member numbers decline.
- Freeman shared that ACE also recognized that it was a second-tier organization in the sense that ACE members will join organizations such as AACC or CIC first, then ACE. They also examined who in institutions were responsible for membership decisions, learning that the invoices were not going to the president, so someone else was making the membership decision—a finding relevant to marketing.
- Metros observed that if you start with the CIO and draw concentric circles out, the influence of EDUCAUSE declines such that those removed from the CIO may not even know about it. Metros suggested that individual membership may have a role to play.
- In reference to Freeman's comments, drawing a parallel to "seat at the table" discussions about CIOs on campus, Hoit observed that EDUCAUSE is known primarily to IT groups and identified a challenge expanding influence to provosts or presidents if this is a strategic goal. Maas responded that by addressing teaching and learning and the core mission, EDUCAUSE becomes more relevant to campus leadership. He suggested that if the value proposition is clear, nearly any president can find the EDUCAUSE membership fee within his or her

budget. Hoit extended Maas's point, saying that unlike topics such as research and policy, teaching and learning are common to every institution.

- Hoit noted that viable competitors to universities are on the rise in teaching and learning, like MOOCs and other third-party offerings, wondering how this trend will affect EDUCAUSE. Maas argued that the messiness just increases EDUCAUSE's potential value as a trusted information source and clearinghouse.

Oblinger summarized the conversation thus far by saying that inclusiveness is not questioned as a core goal, but that clarifying the value proposition may be.

- Hoit suggested that clarifying the business model is crucial.
- Schroeder agreed, noting that Carnegie classes may become irrelevant and that the EDUCAUSE "big tent" could include purveyors from sectors that are not part of traditional higher education. Oblinger agreed noting that traditional higher education could be seen as a subset of postsecondary education overall. Referring to the EDUCAUSE slogan, "the best thinking in higher education IT," Schroeder agreed with Oblinger, saying that in the future we may not be focusing on just the "best thinking," but rather "all the thinking."
- Rhodes spoke to the importance of the enterprise side, reminding the group that while students are the motivation for working in higher education IT, institutions would not run without the core systems that allow the mission to go forward. She noted that the enterprise IT conference with NACUBO is an example of an upcoming EDUCAUSE event that she values.
- Freeman cautioned the group that opening membership more widely requires thought and new screening rules to manage the risk of institutions that EDUCAUSE would not want to be members.
- Grajek described two questions EDUCAUSE clarifies for the community: "How do you apply technology?" an example being for teaching and learning, and, "How do we manage technology?"
- Suess agreed and suggested that EDUCAUSE expand its circles of influence without dropping the core values. He observed that higher education is generally realizing that the business models are failing and suggested that EDUCAUSE has the opportunity to shine the spotlight on IT's role if we have legitimacy with presidents and other campus leaders.
- Sipher agreed, citing the example of hype about the cloud that he sees directed at senior leaders in a shallow fashion that fails to clarify the difference between IT as a utility and as a strategic asset. He noted that other entities are trying to capture the market for being trusted advisors of institutional leaders in this space.
- Hogue described the conversation as confusing but rich. He agreed with the general consensus toward inclusivity and "big tent," and observed that that variable pricing prompted him to wonder if EDUCAUSE could learn from development professionals, in the sense that they have long recognized they cannot achieve aggressive capital campaign goals with $25 donations. He described a value triangle used by development officers where broad engagement is available with relatively low investment, with exclusivity and depth of engagement increasing toward the tip of the triangle as investment rises.
- Hoit suggested that we uncouple membership from revenue, observing that the association could have other revenue sources that are not based on membership or the customer base.
- Patterson drew attention back to the earlier financial report, pointing out that the only conferences making money are the online ones. Oblinger concurred but suggested that we do not yet know whether the value lies in online conferences or online learning.
- Suess observed that a small set of institutions are dominating revenue across all revenue categories such as general membership, membership in all the sub-brands, and sending folks to events, so EDUCAUSE is actually more exclusive than we may appear on paper. Suess suggested watching Education Advisory Board (EAB) as an instructive model, noting that they are doing a great job repackaging information that EDUCAUSE developed years ago, making it more clear and accessible to institutional leaders, with whom they are gaining great

traction. Maas concurred with Suess, noting that he joined EAB as a defensive move when he realized that his CFO and Provost were getting information from EAB without context.

- Rhodes asked how EDUCAUSE might broaden its services within institutions to include emerging leaders whether or not their institution is deeply integrated in EDUCAUSE. Metros agreed and cited another example, suggesting that internationals could be equal voting members in the current climate.
- Citing Freeman's earlier remarks, Schroeder observed that the "big tent" conversation suggests that we need a new way of evaluating membership boundaries that is based in neither Carnegie classification nor accreditation status.
- Maas recommended a purposeful conversation about underrepresented institutions such as HBCUs and tribal colleges, noting the overall diversity challenge in higher education and wondering what EDUCAUSE might do in this area.
- Suess, agreeing with Metros, reiterated that EDUCAUSE is widely recognized internationally and that there should be a way to let them participate as full members. He noted that this is an opportunity for EDUCAUSE.
- In reference to Maas, Schroeder suggested that EDUCAUSE could develop interesting partnerships around diversity with organizations specifically working in the diversity arena.
- O'Brien wondered if incremental changes could be identified to move us more quickly, suggesting that the international membership could be a safe space to experiment.
- In response to a question from Metros about franchising, Oblinger replied that we have considered it previously and can review it; the challenge identified with the franchise model has consistently been quality control.

Oblinger summarized that EDUCAUSE should remain a "big tent," noting that, for the most part, the discussion centered on the idea of a crisp value proposition rather than changes in the philosophy of membership.

Oblinger summarized the conversation's main takeaways as clarifying the value proposition and business model and realizing that influence and membership are not necessarily tied, suggesting that EDUCAUSE could potentially address influence without tackling membership by working with presidents and internationals, for example.

- Metros suggested also evaluating what you do not receive if you are not a member.
- In response to a question from Hoit, Oblinger reported that EDUCAUSE worked with a branding consultant in 2009 to develop some of the tag lines that have stood us well, but at the time the association was not ready to capitalize on an expensive branding engagement.
- Metros observed that the board did not discuss corporate engagement but that this is also relevant. Oblinger concurred and informed the group that a corporate plan is under development.
- Suess suggested that he would be interested in seeing a metric around institutional engagement that describes who is participating, at what level.
- Schroeder, citing Hogue's earlier comment about development, suggested that EDUCAUSE fully embrace open content in defining the business model and how we move "up the triangle" to provide value-added services and opportunities for engagement.
- Rhodes suggested the importance of attending to how individuals get involved with EDUCAUSE by marketing to the individuals who wish to be engaged as well as to institutions.

Competitive Landscape

Oblinger introduced the purpose of the competitive landscape analysis as an opportunity to identify aspirational models and new niches, assess potential partners, and track potential competitors. She suggested three questions for board discussion:

- What lessons can EDUCAUSE learn from the examples?
- What about EDUCAUSE do other organizations consider a competitive threat?
- Do these organizations suggest any aspirations for EDUCAUSE?

Hoit described SXSWedu as a compelling new model to watch and suggested that EAB is a competitor, noting that EAB gains visibility and knowledge by participating in and leveraging others' events such as domain area gatherings.

- Suess agreed with Hoit, noting that EAB is active and providing value to higher education. He suggested that, if our goal is to promote IT strategically, perhaps we could find a way to partner with EAB, citing as an example the possibility of feeding ECAR results through EAB.
- Schroeder noted a parallel with Huron, which recently purchased Click so that they are not only providing consulting but selling a service. Schroeder noted how crowded teaching and learning space is becoming and suggested that a partnership strategy could infuse new energy into ELI and help clarify the value for members.
- Hoit provided an example from his professional society, which every year partners with another group to co-offer a conference, yielding benefits to the field.
- Schroeder suggested as a partnership example that perhaps Gartner could add the rating system to the previously mentioned "higher education buyers guide."
- Maas reported his concerns that some groups are not just competitive with EDUCAUSE but pose threats to institutions and higher education, having seen pandering and misinformation that take advantage of leadership worry about costs. He identified EDUCAUSE core competencies in five areas: teaching and learning, cybersecurity, enterprise, leadership and management professional development, as well as potentially, consultation. In this latter category, he suggested the important role EDUCAUSE might play due to its objectivity and agnosticism toward specific solutions, and its core values and willingness to engage tough conversations. He also suggested that to support the field, partnerships with groups such as IMS are investments for long-term change and sustainability.
- Hoit, citing the work of Dan Ariely, suggested the importance of selling the short-term win in order to keep people on board.
- Sipher suggested attending to the history of scholarly communication and library models for lessons in how partnerships can go wrong.
- Metros suggested clearly defining what participants are getting out of EDUCAUSE events, citing her own choices to attend ELI to see what is happening within the field and ASU/GSV to obtain an outside view of higher education that shows where the field is headed. She noted that EDUCAUSE has lost the edgy space and that others are coming in and taking it over.
- Schroeder speculated that EDUCAUSE may be running a risk by moving more aggressively into teaching and learning, that observers will see us as reaching out of our space, especially with the background of the new CEO. Maas noted that he used to hear that until he began bringing VPs from other areas to the annual conference.
- In response to Schroeder's earlier suggestion about Gartner, Grajek observed that partnerships are difficult and require clarity about your value proposition so that you know what you can give up and share, citing as an example that Gartner would love access to CDS and EDUCAUSE would like access to vendor ratings—but both organizations have held back these core elements of value.
- Hogue observed that EAB operatives are notably young and wondered if one of the messages is that, even among the membership, EDUCAUSE is not tapping into a key demographic that we want to engage. In response to Hogue, Oblinger mentioned a previous "2020" EDUCAUSE activity that sought to bring in the perspective of younger members. The group did not suggest many changes, perhaps because those selected for the 2020 group were already acculturated to EDUCAUSE and active members.

- Maas reiterated the importance to the EDUCAUSE value proposition of being seen as the place that is trustworthy and willing to tell the truth about the long term.
- Freeman noted that, in terms of lessons learned, the ASU/GSV marketing was effective and did catch her eye in a sea of marketing she receives. If not for a conflict she would probably attend.
- Rhodes, in response to the point about generational differences, described her need for leadership training to promote the next cadre of leaders and suggested that EDUCAUSE could expand its Institute opportunities to better serve the market.
- Metros suggested that in describing our objectives and market it would be helpful to untangle age and traditionalism.
- O'Brien cited TED as another example from which to take lessons. Little agreed, noting that EDUCAUSE has incorporated TED-like talks in its programming.
- In reference to Rhodes, Suess agreed that a core competency of EDUCAUSE is professional development. He noted that none of the competitors that we've identified are our long-term competitors in PD, but that we are hitting capacity boundaries. He suggested that EDUCAUSE rethink the PD pipeline and approach it more aggressively. He further observed that we can leverage PD pathways across the event portfolio, leveraging preconference workshops, for example.
- Hoit suggested that to attract a different group perhaps we could we "flip" the conference or form a board subcommittee that empowers a small group of youth-minded people to help plan.
- Freeman suggested diversifying membership by bringing in individuals that are earlier in their careers and becoming thoughtful about opening things up a little bit more.

Oblinger summarized that, again, the conversation focused on the value proposition and the importance of answering the question, "EDUCAUSE is the place you go to for _____."

Web Project Update

Lurie provided a lunch update on the status of the web project. The board stressed the urgency and importance of getting our web presence fixed to address member frustration with the site.

Remarks from Diana Oblinger and Board Reflections

Diana Oblinger reflected on her career with EDUCAUSE and the "state of the state" of the association as she approaches retirement. The board honored Diana's service with individual tributes, and by acclamation passed the following resolution:

Resolution for the Creation of the Diana G. Oblinger Innovation Forum

As president and chief executive officer of EDUCAUSE, Diana G. Oblinger has provided exemplary leadership to the higher education information technology community. She has served as one of the community's primary visionaries, highlighting the technology trends and innovations that hold the greatest strategic implications for higher education. Her capacity to recognize technology developments likely to have the most significant impact on the mission, structure, and practice of higher education—and to articulate them in clear and compelling ways—has allowed Diana Oblinger to keep EDUCAUSE and its members "looking past the edge" toward where higher education must be in the digital age.

In recognition of these unique contributions, the board of directors of EDUCAUSE unanimously proclaims the creation of the Diana G. Oblinger Innovation Forum. The Oblinger Innovation Forum shall be a theme in the

EDUCAUSE Annual Conference dedicated to exploring technology's ever-evolving role in higher education as reflected in emerging trends, innovations, leadership practices, and business models. The forum will initially comprise a set of featured sessions led by invited speakers at the EDUCAUSE Annual Conference.

Diana Oblinger has made a lasting impact on the success of the EDUCAUSE community. On behalf of a grateful community of higher education IT leaders and professionals, the board hereby establishes the Diana G. Oblinger Innovation Forum both to honor that impact and to sustain it into the future.

Signed this day, March 3, 2015, by the EDUCAUSE Board of Directors assembled.

Adjournment

The business meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m. (ET).

Executive Session

Executive session began at 2:00 p.m. and adjourned at 2:30 p.m. (ET).