Fall 2017 Core Committee Minutes
October 25 & 26
Montréal, Québec

A summary of actions taken precedes the minutes. Parking Lot items follow the minutes. Parking Lot items may be unresolved and need to be discussed further.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN

<u>Wednesday:</u>
E-minutes (summary of actions taken by Core and/or Exec since March: APPROVED (all 1s)

Formation of **Ad Hoc Committee on Social Media Coordination and Branding** (Katie and Hoag) to report back in March: APPROVED (seventeen 1s with one 2)

POD Sponsored Session Ad Hoc: vote on the spirit of the GM language : YES (unanimous) with the understanding that the exact type of a group—actual committee or something more like roundtable coordinators—would be clarified later on Thursday.

Proposal to dissolve the **Institutional Membership Ad Hoc** because its work is finished: APPROVED (all 1s)

Executive Committee proposal to change the GM bylaws to expand the definition of advocacy was withdrawn pending further discussion.

Vote on **EPOC Committee** proposal to revise description of EPOC in GM: YES (unanimous)

Vote on **Finance Committee** proposal to revise fiscal policy language in GM: YES (unanimous)

Proposal by **Professional Development Committee (PDC)** to offer the Institute for New Faculty Developers (INFD) every year instead of every other year: APPROVED (1s and 2s with a single 3)

Vote on proposed **Governance Committee** GM Bylaws changes: YES (unanimous)
Vote on proposed **Governance Committee** GM Guidelines changes: YES (unanimous)

INFD language revisited from Wednesday:
Proposal clarifying INFD hosting where the **Professional Development Committee** (PDC) can offer the host institution the option of hosting again the following year, after the conclusion of an INFD, contingent upon factors such as data, budget, and enrollment: APPROVED (mostly 1s and 2s with two 3s)

Advocacy language in GM revisited from Wednesday:
Vote on Proposed Corporate Purpose/Advocacy language change in GM: YES (unanimous)
Vote on Guidelines change in language: YES (unanimous)

Vote on revised GM language proposed by the **POD Sponsored Session Ad Hoc** to establish POD Sponsored Session Subcommittee Chairs: YES (unanimous)

POD Presidential discussion and election

MINUTES
Wednesday, October 25, 2017
Present: Mary Wright, President; Cassandra Horii, President Elect ; Kevin Barry, Past President; Victoria Bhavsar, Chair of Finance; Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director; Dorothe Bach; Erica Bastress-Dukehart; Gabriele Bauer; Lindsay Bernhagen; Allison Boye; Jake Glover; Stacy Grooters; Carol Hurney; Jonathan Iuzzini; Katie Linder; Carl Moore; David Sacks; Richard Swan; Roben Torosyan
Missing: none

Welcome & Centering Exercise

Introductory Exercise

Overview & Meeting process

E-minutes (summary of actions taken by Core and/or Exec since March: APPROVED (all 1s)
Executive Director report

Discussion: Looking into 2 or 3 year contracts with conference sites (Seattle & Louisville, for example) in order to obtain cost savings; perhaps repeat no sooner than every three years and make sure to have different excursions when repeating. Conference continues to grow, but modestly after the jump to 949 in San Francisco in 2015 (Dallas was 731 in 2014). In 2016. Louisville was 955. 2017 in Montreal was 964.

Retainment of members remains the goal. Roughly 30% of conference attendees are new members but membership growth is nowhere near 30%.

TIA Report (Brian Smentkowski)
Digitization of back issues complete; second special feature almost finished (great response): recommends more proaction in terms of targeted calls for manuscripts rather than just open, rolling submissions

Wiley dropping TIA effective January 2019; three issues remain; POD to get back content "at a reasonable fee"; Wiley cites low sales though expectations were never communicated; nonetheless, readership going up, submissions are stable; access-publish-mentorship-scholarship-publication: how do these all fit together?); should we/can we promote or advertise? (visibility?); TIA is rarely cited outside of TIA; editorial board and Scholarship Committee are investigating options for next incarnations/platforms; how can Scholarship Committee, Core, and membership work together to drive more scholarship?

Questions as we proceed: Are there publications with similar readership numbers? How might the SoTL SIG inform TIA and help it grow? Can we prioritize evidence-based practice (strategic goal 4)? What are the best things we get from a publisher? Scholars find a publication more palatable when represented by a publisher (reputation / status) -- on other hand, Physics and other fields have for years shown how a quality publication need not have a name like Wiley behind it. Are there respected/cited journals in humanities/social sciences not backed by major publisher? Visibility: in one visibility study we did, all the journals TIA cited were not citing TIA back; our download rates are now 32,000 in 2015, so we have to compare to similar journals (not IJAD because it's global and bigger)

Strategic Planning Exercise

Group 1: Internal Service to Members
What objectives are in this area? What quantity and quality of data do we need to better serve members? Strategic Plan should address services and resources. Main service is to foster collaborative relationships. Does our internal service clearly, obviously accomplish this and well? Need to continue to foster members serving organization also. Targets: maybe conference is where it should be. Membership: do we need/want a specific target? How to reach not just Ed Developers but instructional designers, not just faculty but grad students. When does conference go from not enough to way too much (or should we not be afraid to be too big)? Should we be concerned about participants thinking, "There are so many things at this conference, it's overwhelming so I won't come again?" Do we need an external review of conference and membership needs and numbers? Also, members need ongoing engagement throughout the year and through the changing stages of their careers: not just when they begin.

Group 2: External Visibility
Where are the good POD things happening and how can we highlight and build impact and presence? Need to market and brand the work of POD:
—Build relationships via EPOC
—Need to differentiate ourselves from other organizations: How are we different from Teaching Professor, and from Lilly, and from regional orgs like New England Faculty Development Consortium
—Have ready-made POD-blazoned materials (PDFs: workbooks, handouts) for members to use on campus
—What do POD Members do to showcase/refer to POD in their own contexts (campus to state to national).

Group 3: Diversity
Does everyone in POD understand diversity in the same way? There are layers to what we mean (demographic diversity within the POD membership; building capacity for members to do diversity (race/religion/justice) work on their campuses; furthering diversity and justice in higher ed more broadly)

POD leadership, POD membership:
—Establish aspirational benchmarks? We can base this on what other organizations are doing well in this area. What would it look like to set an aspirational benchmark?
—Are we measuring, monitoring, fostering leadership diversity?
—Are we actually cultivating/encouraging people on pathways to committees, chair-ships, Core, presidency? Do we need more sustained intention?

Regarding topical foci on campuses & part of everyday work on campuses for many educational developers:
—Build visibility outward to move higher ed forward (could also help with recruitment of new members)
—Move toward diversity, inclusion, and justice (If we were an org *devoted* to justice, what would we do?)
—Seek out collaborations with other organizations doing this work
        e.g. NCFDD: They're very successful. National Ctr for Fac Devt and Diversity, Rockquemore's group. How should we work with them?

Group 4: Evidence-Based Practice
Pathways through the profession:
—to TIA, issue for new voices, other platforms?
—Cultivating pathways into E.D., but also *through* E.D.

Pathways to practice:
—not just evidence, but how do we *use* data we collect; how will survey be used afterwards -- design it accordingly making sure we are action-based; have actual indicators of our work on each goal.

Pathways to process:
—Pause points to reflect on now what we did, but:
        How do make sure we practice what we preach?
        How did we do, how can we do even better?
        Particular standards for evaluation
—We need to make our criteria transparent and give developmental feedback:
        If someone's proposal, grant, manuscript submission, Core election, is rejected, how can we support a process from rejection to renewal of efforts?
        Create a means for session-specific feedback:
                --We need to create our own E.D.-specific evaluation metrics, measures, criteria for evidence, instead of standards predefined by corporate or other areas.
                --Inform how administration responds to ED and not vice versa.

Group 5: Overarching questions

How can we be strategically leaner and meaner?; pursue controlled growth; finding balance; more focus on strategy; pathways to and through the profession; how to draft an SP? (resources: Four Disciplines of Execution; Essentialism); nothing wrong with growth: we shouldn't fear getting too big; revisit why we exist & how do we codify this (how does justice fit in with teaching & learning); what do members need?; how does POD stay relevant to all member in various stages of their careers; relationships & community: how are these things central to what we do; advocacy for the profession: how do we become more visible and valuable to the institution and in higher ed?;

AERA as model of huge organization; alignment and responsive organizational theory; who are we / where are we as an organization in a higher ed universe that is constantly changing?, consistency among the parts: all parts reflect the same brand; have/create a map of sorts perhaps a SWOT analysis, allow for flexibility of organization, evolution; the virtue of being nimble and setting precedent rather than reactive; do we need decision trees?

Formation of **Ad Hoc Committee on Social Media Coordination and Branding** (Katie and Hoag) to report back in March: APPROVED (seventeen 1s with one 2).

Discussion: we need to align all social media (including all committees/SIG communications) to have consistent messaging and imagery, in sync with email call for proposals, for example, and with the general calendar of events (call for conference proposals; call for Core self nominations, etc.). Budget implications?

POD Sponsored Session Ad Hoc: vote on the spirit of the GM language : YES (unanimous) with the understanding that the exact type of a group—actual committee or something more like roundtable coordinators—would be clarified later on Thursday.

Discussion: Summary of three types: 1.) Presidents' sessions: up to the presidents; 2.) Professional Development Sessions (help further the prof'l dev't work of our members), (acceptances and rejections should go out before blind review so people can submit through blind review and still have a chance to have a session, no arbitrary cap on committee/sig number of possibilities though not every committee will necessarily get a slot. 3.) Committee/SIG sessions (to be blind-reviewed).

Proposal to dissolve the **Institutional Membership Ad Hoc** because its work is finished: APPROVED (all 1s)

Travel Grant Ad Hoc
Summary/Discussion: Originally concerned were there too many travel grants programs. Now we want to give more grants, so these guidelines (serving underrepresented populations, having an assessment plan, etc.) are very helpful. Great they're being termed awards not grants. Next steps: Think about GM guidelines: should this be codified so it exists beyond the folks here?

History Ad Hoc
Summary/Discussion: Need to continue to think about what we want from a History Committee, and from a history or histories of POD. If we walk into the POD archives as and create a narrative: what would it be? What do we want to preserve and why? We should be able to walk into a well organized archive knowing what you're looking for and able to easily find it. Do we want all in a digital archive? Currently half is boxes of stuff. What story or stories do we want to tell? Quantitative and qualitative stories.

Conference programs or changes over time. A keynote address Dee Fink gave on where we came from, and where we are going was moving; it hit me at that time I had no context, of the individuals who started the org. Digital storycorps: interviewing those figures who've had significant historical impact (like NPR, PODStorycorps!). Who is our audience? Future generations may want to look at different items. We have some oral histories, but it's unclear who owns them. History of the website itself. Digital archiving is a highly specialized skill; may be worth hiring out. See "way, way back machine" to see early iterations of the POD website: https://web.archive.org/ Think of our archive as a museum: what will we put on permanent exhibit? What will we keep hidden in the basement? What might go on temporary exhibit?

Conference Committee
Visit by four co-chairs. Acceptance rate: 48%. Current size now takes us to the limit of this size of facility for room capacities, some sessions might be really tight this year. Fielded a lot of emails asking why proposal was rejected. Idea: Have a POD-Sponsored Session on Backwards Designing a Session Proposal or a pre-recorded webinar, or flip it with both an online resource and a live discussion of it.

Executive Committee proposal to change the GM bylaws to expand the definition of advocacy was withdrawn pending further discussion.

Discussion: Propose bylaws change: Advocacy
Why are we removing any qualifications from the kind of advocacy we do in GM language? Do we risk becoming politically biased? (Some people see a lack of "viewpoint diversity" in higher education; do we risk only being inclusive of so-called "progressive / liberal" agendas? cf. Haidt's *The Righteous Mind*, and heterodoxacademy.org)

Is the addition in 1b sufficient to constrain/funnel the kinds of things we way/do? Exec's ambition was to not just put out fires but have a process, to not put out statements every day etc.; and then, to have the bylaws match our process too.

We are already doing things that are in violation of the current language (e.g. 9/11 statement, post-election 2016 statement, post-Charlottesville statement), which is an argument in favor of adopting language that reflects our practice.

Who defines what may "significantly impact the work of the vast majority of members"? Some context: After the fall presidential election of Trump, it was challenging for one core member to abstain from the statement Core sent out (owing to discomfort with its perceived partisan nature; after all, Core may not have sent out a statement had Clinton been elected; lone voice may not always be willing to speak up). It was discussed that the statement was

not in response to the election result but rather to events that were happening on campus around the country.

A lot of these statements need to be timely, so how can we build in some time without delaying the response and depleting its meaning/impact? Suggestion to require a ⅔ vote before a statement can go forward. What is the difference between advocacy and a statement of support? Do we need separate categories/criteria/processes? In what other ways can we follow up beyond lip service, and should there be other response modes codified in the bylaws? If not putting Core's name behind it, comes from Exec, it'll be perceived as coming from Core and POD. Does POD have a responsibility to provide members with language that they can use to guide their work and their own "statements"/positions on campus?

Vote on **EPOC Committee** proposal to revise description of EPOC in GM: YES (unanimous)

Discussion/summary: Charge is being revised again on the basis of lived experience of the committee. Work of committee is being streamlined, clarified, and broadened. Actually want as many POD members to be able to do that outreach; like be able to staff a table with POD materials (that's the EPOC Ambassador role). Some of our best programs started out as a pilot. Definition of advocacy being used by EPOC fits within current and potential formulation of the word in GM. Does process need to be codified in GM language, or can there just be a reference to EPOC establishing a process? It's helpful to have it in GM for those who might want the information without having access to EPOC or its internal documents.

Vote on **Finance Committee** proposal to revise fiscal policy language in GM: YES (unanimous)

Proposal by **Professional Development Committee** (PDC) to offer the Institute for New Faculty Developers (INFD) every year instead of every other year: APPROVED (1s and 2s with a single 3)

Discussion/summary: Pitfalls of doing INFD each year? Amount of work (but it's less in second year); POD fronts $6000 so could lose money if Institute doesn't make; might depress some turnout for 'Getting started' workshop; some institutions might not be able to commit to contributing to institutes, so potential institutions would be inhibited from proposing (POD may need to offer more startup money to mitigate this institutional risk); new faculty may need to be recruited in a second year, which would shrink the labor savings. Should we look at this as a POD investment that could grow membership, make POD exist more than just one week a year?

<u>Thursday, October 26, 2017</u>
<u>Present</u>: Mary Wright, President; Cassandra Horii, President Elect ; Kevin Barry, Past President; Victoria Bhavsar, Chair of Finance; Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director; Dorothe Bach; Erica Bastress-Dukehart; Gabriele Bauer; Lindsay Bernhagen; Allison Boye; Jake Glover; Stacy Grooters; Carol Hurney; Jonathan Iuzzini; Katie Linder; Carl Moore; David Sacks; Richard Swan; Roben Torosyan
<u>Missing:</u> none

Vote on proposed **Governance Committee** GM Bylaws changes: YES (unanimous)
Vote on proposed **Governance Committee** GM Guidelines changes: YES (unanimous)

Proposal clarifying INFD hosting where the **Professional Development Committee** (PDC) can offer the host institution, after the conclusion of an INFD, contingent upon factors such as data, budget, and enrollment, the option of hosting again the following year: APPROVED (mostly 1s and 2s with two 3s)

<u>Discussion:</u> PDC chairs believe this will be feasible relative to the current timing of the proposal process. Recommendation to PDC to have past hosts and POD share experiences, advice, guidance to decrease decision fatigue.

<u>Advocacy language in GM revisited from Wednesday:</u>
Vote on Proposed Corporate Purpose/Advocacy language change in GM: YES (unanimous)
Vote on Guidelines change in language: YES (unanimous)

Vote on revised GM language proposed by the **POD Sponsored Session Ad Hoc** to establish POD Sponsored Session Subcommittee Chairs: YES (unanimous)

Committee/SIG reports requesting discussion:

Awards Committee
Possible Menges changes: confusion about what the award recognizes, rigor of award, what are we trying to do (not yet peer-reviewed). Where does SoTL fit in this award? Is the bar so high that the award is no longer developmental/focused on supporting and nurturing POD members? We already have a place for peer-reviewed publication. Stanley Award last year went to a researcher not involved in POD; why award a paper just to highlight it, vs. nurturing work from our community? SoTL SIG, newly formed, can help write down parameters; talk to Michael Palmer, knows this history well. We invite the committee to backwards design it, think creatively, collaborate w/ SoTL SIG.

Diversity
Looking for ideas about how to bring conversations to a wider group such as:
- Committees who are doing webinars
- POD Speaks, now with EPOC

- Have a category focused on conversations
- Follow example of removing the video and turning audio into a PODcast, informal, easy; e.g. Women Who Whine (currently tech side of fac dev.)
- Travel Award winners and Educational Grant winners (articles, videos)

GPPD
Working on relationship with National Post-Doc association. Looking for social media guidance. Having a hard time planning for lunch at conference (gauging interest, anticipating costs, planning for dietary needs, etc.). Suggestion to put a higher (more realistic) budget number in the spring request. Suggestion to add a checkbox to the registration form (Hoag can facilitate this).

Membership (MC)
How to respond to membership survey?
- Responding members wanted to learn most about 1) measuring impact, 2) running a CTL, and 3) SoTL. How can MC make it easy for people who are new(er) to see a few key answers to these top questions? How can what already exists be highlighted? The challenge is aggregation: can we get crowdsourced synthesis?
- Send Google group once a month? Membership can share out a top resource.
- How does Wikipodia fit in? Do we need more deliberate orienting of entire membership on how to use Wikipodia? Or are we moving away from it for sure?
  - Exec: Website is Wordpress architecture. Searchable but Wikipodia is not.
  - ECRC moving away from Wikipodia
- Social media is the place for evergreen content: We have IDEA paper collaboration, upated; could link to Wikipodia.
- We have books on these topics, relatively new, written by POD members; here are books and resources on X, Y, Z. Book of the month?
- Send the Member List as a benefit, not the Discussion group, because a significant number find Google group overwhelming. Use a format like Mindfulness and Contemplative Pedagogy SIG newsletter.
- MC identified the needs (our charge) but does not need to serve the membership (charge of other respective committees)
- ACTION: Ask Committees and SIGs to curate resources on the topics:
  - Measuring Impact: Scholarship Committee
  - Learning center management/leadership skills: PDC
  - SoTL need: SoTL SIG
- What's the process to suggest things for website? ECRC

- Create a system of where the recommended work will be archived, in the categories
- ACTION: Propose a POD-Sponsored Session so the membership can come and discuss dreams of what they want, and make connections across the ideas from the whole conference
- Membership Welcome Email updated

POD Presidential discussion and election

Parking Lot
- Cassandra recruited several Core members to the Strategic Planning Stage 2 ad hoc
- PSS subcommittee: Jonathan Iuzzini agreed to chair, Gabriele Bauer has agreed to serve as co-chair.
- Menges Award: several suggestions given, Katie as backup
- Discussion of how to share and curate resources will be included in the strategic planning and social media ad hocs.