A summary of action items precedes the minutes. The minutes provide more details and highlights of discussion. Unless otherwise noted, approvals are based on the POD Network Levels of Consensus Scale (see Appendix at bottom of the minutes). Items that require a formal vote (in favor/opposed) are indicated. Parking Lot items (items postponed to the end of the meeting) follow the minutes.

**SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN:**

**Tuesday, December 14, 2021**
- Approve the e-Minutes for Fall 2021 - APPROVED (1s, 2s, and 3s)
- Support the formation of an ad hoc committee to create a volunteer recruitment board for committees and SIGs - APPROVED (1s and 2s)
- Support the formation of an ad hoc committee to create a Change Advisory Team - APPROVED (1s and 2s)
- Approve the proposed GM language from the Earth-Centered SIG - APPROVED
- Approve the proposed GM language from the Co-Creation through Partnerships SIG - APPROVED
- Approve the proposed GM language from the Scholarship Committee - APPROVED
- Approve the proposed GM language from the Membership Committee - APPROVED
- Approve the proposed GM language from the Awards Committee - APPROVED

**Wednesday, December 15, 2021**
- Support distribution and use of the Finance Committee’s “below $10,000” rubric to assess funding requests - APPROVED (1s and 2s)
Support distribution and use of the Finance Committee’s “above $10,000” rubric to assess funding requests - APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Support use of a hybrid/blended model for the 2022 conference concurrently with the in-person conference - NOT APPROVED (1s, 2s, 3s, and 5s)

Support use of the Assume Acceptance model for the 2022 conference - NOT APPROVED (2s, 3s, 5s, 6s, and 7s)

NOTE: The discussion with the conference team continued after the Core meeting with a subsequent vote taken in January 2022, with the following results:

Consensus Vote: I support offering an online conference that runs concurrently to the in-person conference in Seattle in 2022. - APPROVED (1s, 2s, and 3s)

Consensus Vote: I support replacing our traditional conference proposal review and acceptance model with the proposed "assume acceptance" model as a pilot for the 2022 conference. - NOT APPROVED (1s, 2s, 3s, 4s, 6s, and 7s)

Support the DRI proposal to move forward with a POD Network PODcast, pending the creation of transparent criteria for recruitment and selection - APPROVED (1s, 2s, and 3s)

Approve the off-cycle budget request for $1,600 by the SOTL SIG for the creation of a SOTL dashboard on the web site - APPROVED

Incoming President-Elect vote: Stacy Grooters elected as incoming President-Elect - APPROVED
Welcome and Centering Exercise (Fran Glazer and Hoag Holmgren)

Ice Breaker (Carol Hurney)

Executive Director’s Report (Hoag Holmgren)

Hoag highlighted the following from his report:

The POD Network is on solid financial footing due to the revenue from the conference, which was higher than projections. Traditionally, we budget revenue conservatively. In response to a recommendation from our financial advisor, we transferred some cash assets from our bank account to another investment fund to diversify our holdings. Membership numbers are up, though it’s difficult to determine why, at just over 1,700, compared to about 1,500 this time last year.

Current plans are to have an in-person conference in November 2022 at the Seattle Hyatt. We are estimating to have a lower number in attendance, about half of the last in-person conference in 2019, where we had just under 1,200. We are in conversation with the Conference Committee about the feasibility of offering an on-line version as well.

We are planning to have the Spring Core meeting (June) in person in Washington, DC. Depending on COVID, we may need to switch to virtual again. Details are forthcoming.

He asked for a consensus vote on the acceptance of the e-Minutes which reflects the actions taken by the Executive Committee since the last Core meeting in June 2021.

Consensus Vote: Approve the e-Minutes for Fall 2021 - APPROVED (1s, 2s, and 3s)

Executive Committee Report (Fran Glazer)

1. Recommendation to Create an Ad Hoc Committee on Recruiting Volunteers for Service Opportunities

Discussion: Due to the shortage of volunteers for our committees and SIGs, Fran will be including a plea for volunteers in her January email to the membership. In addition, the chairs have suggested a creation of a “volunteer opportunities board”, similar to the POD job board on our website. The Executive Committee is recommending the creation of an
ad hoc committee to determine how to structure the board, draft a template for collecting content, create introductory language and develop processes and procedures. Chad suggested that the charge include a process to integrate the board with our existing communication channels, and not just on our website.

**Consensus Vote:** Support the formation of an ad hoc committee to create a volunteer recruitment board for committees and SIGs - APPROVED (1s and 2s) (See Attachment A: Charge for Ad Hoc Committee on Recruiting Volunteers for Service Opportunities)

2. Recommendation to Create an Ad Hoc Committee to support the DEI work in conjunction with our work with Think Again Training and Consulting (TATC). Discussion: Carol Hurney, President Elect, is our primary liaison with TATC. The consultant is recommending the formation of a “change team” which would meet regularly with TATC in an advisory capacity. Exec is asking Core to approve the draft “charge” (Attachment B). As the work evolves, the draft charge may change.

**Consensus Vote:** Support the formation of an ad hoc committee to create a Change Advisory Team - APPROVED (1s and 2s) - (See Attachment B - Charge for POD Network Change Advisory Team)

3. Feedback on Core Handbook  
Discussion: Hoag and Donna have created a Core Handbook that provides a quick overview of the resources for Core members. Please review and provide your feedback to Past President Donna Ellis. This is a “living document” and will be updated as needed.

There is a discrepancy between the language in the Governance Manual, the new Core Handbook and current practice regarding the frequency of Core meetings. Historically, Core has met twice a year (in person, prior to COVID) – once in the spring and once in the Fall (in conjunction with the annual conference). Recently, Core has agreed to have more frequent (quarterly) and shorter meetings (via Zoom) to allow time for professional development and strategic planning (referenced as “blue sky” meetings). Page 10 of the Governance Manual allows for the removal of Core members who miss two regularly scheduled meetings during their 3-year term and must petition the Core Committee in writing in order to continue as a Core member. Before Exec recommends changes to the GM (to be considered at the Spring meeting) about the number of meetings to attend, and the number that are required, Exec wanted to seek Core’s input.
Should the shorter, quarterly meetings be required or strongly encouraged? If required, should we increase the number of allowed missed meetings?

Comments: Strategic Planning is just as important as conducting “POD business”. What is decided needs to be communicated clearly to those self-nominating for Core. More meetings are required to meet our increased leadership responsibilities. Plan the meetings as far as possible in advance, or maybe set a specific date/time for the quarterly meetings, e.g., Friday afternoons at x time (quarterly). More frequent meetings would allow more time to accomplish our work. One thing to remember, if someone doesn’t complete their term on Core, they cannot self-nominate for President-Elect.

This conversation will continue over email or at our March meeting.

Governance Committee Report (Donna Ellis)
Past President Donna Ellis (and Chair of the Governance Committee) reported on the proposed changes to the Governance Manual as requested by Committee and SIGs that require votes by Core. The approved changes (majority required) will be integrated into the GM.

Reference: Proposed GM Changes for December 2021 Core Meeting in Core Team Drive

Discussion: The Governance Committee reviewed all the submitted proposed changes and worked through any questions in advance with the committee or SIG chairs and made adjustments based on our discussion with the chairs. Therefore, the wording in the “proposed GM Changes” document is the most current even though it might be different from the wording in the respective committee/SIG reports. Each committee/SIG request was open for discussion and voted on. As a point of information, The Governance Committee is planning a full review of the GM in the winter to flag inconsistencies.

Two new SIGs requested new additions to the GM – No discussion; results of voting:

1. Earth-Centered SIG
   Yes/No Vote: Approve the proposed GM language from the Earth-Centered SIG - APPROVED
2. Co-Creation through Partnerships
   Yes/No Vote: Approve the proposed GM language from the Co-Creation through Partnerships SIG - APPROVED

3. Scholarship Committee
   The Scholarship Committee proposed a new editorial structure for the *POD Speaks* publication, which includes having an Associate Editor, an Editor, and an Editorial Board and implementing an open call for nominations for these roles. The purpose in making these changes is to add transparency and build more equitable pathways to leadership.
   Yes/No Vote: Approve the proposed GM language from the Scholarship Committee - APPROVED

4. Membership Committee
   The Membership Committee requested changes address two key areas: 1) removal of the membership survey from the responsibilities of this committee, which aligns with the Survey ad hoc committee’s recommendation to strike a special task force to do surveys (approved at Spring 2021 Core meeting); and 2) the addition of the start-up grants that the Executive Committee asked Membership to take on as part of the Core-approved dissolution of the Grants Committee (approved at Fall 2020 Core meeting).
   Yes/No Vote: Approve the proposed GM language from the Membership Committee - APPROVED

5. Awards Committee
   The Awards Committee identified two main problems they were trying to solve with their revisions: 1) to make sure that they are recruiting the Awards chair from a large enough pool of people with the right skillset/institutional knowledge; and 2) to make sure the division of labor makes sense given folks’ roles (e.g., charging subcommittee chairs with ensuring smooth transfer of leadership within the subcommittee). They also wanted to shift how new award proposals are received and reviewed — suggesting that instead of just asking the Awards team to review new proposals, they assemble an ad hoc review committee (based on relevant expertise and experience) to review new awards. That ad hoc would include at least one Awards member but would also bring others in who have knowledge specific to the focus of that award. Please note that new awards are rarely proposed. Finally, they proposed removing the Presidential Liaison (the Past President) from being an active member of the committee and subcommittees due to workload.
   Yes/No Vote: Approve the proposed GM language from the Awards Committee - APPROVED
Election of President-Elect (Donna Ellis)

The presidential election is typically spread over two days. On the first day, the candidate(s) qualifications are discussed, using the list of guiding questions from the GM as a guide for conversation. The vote is held the next day, so Core members have the chance to re-review materials overnight.

Core members held a confidential discussion.

External Partnerships and Outreach Committee (EPOC) (Chris Price)

EPOC respectfully requested that Core provide the committee with guidance regarding prioritization of partnerships. Given the great number of partnerships that are at various stages – dormant, active, pending, potential – there is significantly more work for EPOC (and the POD Network) than time available. Rather than have EPOC make prioritization decisions on its own, EPOC members seek Core input on how best to do that. There is a balance between partnership effort and impact and the committee would not want to miss the mark and focus on “easy wins” at the expense of more complex, impactful partnership conversations. There is a partnership rubric that has been developed by the committee, but even applying the rubric to new partnerships leaves out the finer detail of strategic directions as determined by Core. The rubric reveals whether an organization meets the criteria, but it doesn’t give guidance as to whether the partnership should be pursued. Perhaps a different rubric is needed for profit and nonprofit organizations. Traditionally, the committee has been “reactive” to requests, rather than being proactive in choosing our strategic partners.

Other items to be considered include:
- The impact of the partnership on national and international levels
- POD Network Core values and strategic goals that would be enhanced by the partnership
- The impact on POD’s budget
- The reciprocity agreement – who is “helping” and who is “dominating”
- POD and partnership resources needed to implement the agreement
- The sustainability of the partnership

Perhaps, a subset of Core (2-3 members) could meet with EPOC and flush out some of the issues and report back to Core.

Teaching with Technology SIG (Kem Saichaie)

Due to lack of details about their request, this item was not discussed. Kem will reach out to them again.
Conference Team (Fran Glazer)

President Glazer introduced Committee Co-Chairs Tammy McCoy and Jerod Quinn to share their ideas about the 2022 POD Network Conference, specifically about a possible new model for proposal review and acceptance. After a question-answer session, President Glazer expressed Core’s appreciation for their innovative ideas and for taking the time to present their recommendations to Core. She indicated that Core would continue the discussion during the second day and keep them updated of its actions.

MINUTES, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2021 MEETING

The meeting started with a one-hour focus group meeting of Core members (excluding the Executive Committee members) with Think Again. At 3:10 PM Eastern, the meeting resumed, including Executive Committee members.

Present: Riley Caldwell-O’Keefe, Preston Cumming, Lynn Eaton, Donna Ellis, Steve Hansen, Fran Glazer, Chad Hershock, Hoag Holmgren (Executive Director), Carol Hurney, Mays Imad, Katie Kearns, Danny Mann, Michael Reder, Kristi Rudenga, Chris Price, Kem Saichaie, Carol Subino Sullivan, Toni Weiss

Timekeeper: Carol Subino Sullivan
Notetaker: Transcript feature enabled

Absent: Laura Pipe

Finance Committee (Toni Weiss)

Discussion: Prior to the pandemic, budget requests may not have been as much scrutiny as they might have. Routinely, requests were added to the budget and removed or reduced only when new information became available. Because of the uncertainty of income and expenses for a virtual annual conference, the Finance Committee recommended to Core that all budget requests related to the conference be rejected until an intentional discussion warranted their inclusion. The Finance Committee discussed the feasibility of a rubric for Core to use as it makes decisions about budget requests in future years. The Finance Committee, spearheaded by member Chad Hershock, developed two rubrics—one for requests of $10,000 and less, and one for requests over $10,000—to present to Core for approval as a pilot.

If approved, in the spirit of transparency, the rubrics would be made available to the committee/SIG chairs to assist them in preparing their budget requests.
Thus, the chairs would be intentional in asking for funds that support POD’s strategic plan and core values.

Advantages of using a rubric include:
– identifying areas where collaboration among committees and SIG might be useful
– professional development of leaders by showing how the budget ties into the strategic plan and embodies core values.

Consensus Votes:

- Support distribution and use of the Finance Committee’s “below $10,000” rubric to assess funding requests - APPROVED (1s and 2s)

- Support distribution and use of the Finance Committee’s “above $10,000” rubric to assess funding requests - APPROVED (1s and 2s)

The Finance Committee will ensure that the rubrics are available to Core members in preparation for the Spring Core Meeting, with suggestions on how to use them.

Conference Committee - continued (Hoag, Fran)

After further discussion on the recommendation of the Conference Committee Co-Chairs, Core held the following votes:

Consensus Vote: Support use of a hybrid/blended model for the 2022 conference concurrently with the in-person conference - NOT APPROVED (1s, 2s, 3s, and 5s)

Consensus Vote: Support use of the Assume Acceptance model for the 2022 conference - NOT APPROVED (2s, 3s, 5s, 6s, and 7s)

The Executive Committee will share the results with the co-chairs and ask them to respond to specific questions that Core has about their proposal which have been gathered in a Google document.

NOTE: The discussion with the conference team continued after the Core meeting with a subsequent vote taken in January 2022, with the following results:

Consensus Vote: I support offering an online conference that runs concurrently to the in-person conference in Seattle in 2022. - APPROVED (1s, 2s, and 3s)
Consensus Vote: I support replacing our traditional conference proposal review and acceptance model with the proposed "assume acceptance" model as a pilot for the 2022 conference. - NOT APPROVED (1s, 2s, 3s, 4s, 6s, and 7s)

Digital Resources and Innovation (DRI) Committee (Steve Hansen)
Discussion: The DRI Committee proposed the creation and implementation of a podcast project that explores the work of Centers of Teaching and Learning and the vision and insights of educational developers in higher education. The proposal grew out of an interactive poster session at the 2019 POD Conference which asked participants to propose and vote for ideas for enhancing the work and value of the DRI Committee with the POD Network. The DRI proposal is aligned with the committee's and POD Network's strategic goals.

The Core Committee expressed positive support and will ask the DRI Committee to ensure the recruitment and selection criteria are transparent and communicated to POD members.

Consensus Vote: Support the DRI proposal to move forward with a POD Network PODcast, pending the creation of transparent criteria for recruitment and selection - APPROVED (1s, 2s, and 3s)

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) SIG - (Riley Caldwell-O'Keefe)
The SoTL SIG requested $1,600 (an off-cycle budget request) to work with WTW Design (POD's Network website provider) to design, create, and implement a dashboard for the POD Network website. The SoTL SIG has created a questionnaire for POD members regarding their work in the scholarship of teaching and learning. The dashboard will provide the results in a searchable format to be used by POD members to find helpful information and resources on implementing SoTL programming.

Yes/No Vote: Approve the off-cycle budget request for $1,600 by the SOTL SIG for the creation of a SOTL dashboard on the web site - APPROVED

Presidential Election (Donna Ellis)
Past President Donna Ellis facilitated the election of the incoming President-Elect.

Incoming President-Elect vote: Stacy Grooters elected as incoming President-Elect

Committee/SIG/ad hoc Reports not requiring discussion
- Affinity Groups ad hoc
- Awards Committee
- Data Governance ad hoc
President Fran Glazer asked for volunteers to be Core liaisons for the following:
  o Co-Creation through Partnership SIG – Preston Cumming volunteered
  o Strategic Planning Committee – needs 4 Core members
  o Volunteer Recruitment Board Ad Hoc Committee - 1-2 Core Members, with one as Chair

Closing

President Glazer expressed her gratitude to the Core members for being engaged in the discussion and for the accomplishments made. She shared information about the next Core meetings:
  ● Wednesday, March 2, 2022, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time: strategic discussion (zoom)
  ● Monday and Tuesday, June 13-14, 2022, all day: Core Business meeting (in person, Crowne Plaza Dulles Airport Hotel, Washington D.C.; $109 / night; financial assistance available if needed)

Respectfully Submitted,

Gaye Webb, Administrative Assistant
Attachment A

Charge for Ad Hoc Committee on Recruiting Volunteers for Service Opportunities

The POD Network relies on its members to advance the work of the organization through an extensive structure of committees and special interest groups (SIGs). Each committee and SIG requires members to serve in leadership roles and/or as general members, but the organization lacks a transparent, equitable, and consistent mechanism for notifying members about these opportunities and inviting their participation. The concept of an online advertisement board that committee and SIG chairs can use to connect with members via the POD Network website has been identified as a solution to this issue. This functionality is currently available via our website (see the Job postings).

This *ad hoc* committee will recommend:
- A template that identifies expected content for the advertisements (development of the template may include reviewing examples from our own committees (see, for example, the recent request from DEI committee) and from other organizations such as: [https://teachpsych.org/getinvolved.php](https://teachpsych.org/getinvolved.php)
- Introductory website text for the advertisement board
- Processes for:
  - Soliciting advertisements
  - Curating the board's content
  - Increasing member awareness about the opportunities
  - Assisting chairs in making selections from applicants
  - Recommending integration into current communication channels

Composition of the *ad hoc*:
A small team of at least 5 people is proposed for the *ad hoc* itself, with the understanding that they will reach out to others as needed to gather input, information, and get feedback on their recommendations. Composition is flexible, but should include:
- 1-2 members of Core
- 3+ current or past committee/SIG chairs
- 1-2 at-large members

The *ad hoc* will provide periodic updates to the Executive Committee over the next 6 months, and aim to bring recommendations back to the June 2022 Core Committee meeting.
Appendix B

Charge for POD Network *Change Advisory Team* — January 2022

Overview

The POD Network is partnering with Think Again Training & Consulting (TATC, https://www.thinkagaintraining.com/) to engage in a yearlong audit of organizational practices with the goal of supporting our growth as a multicultural organization that embraces and welcomes all individuals.

The *Change Advisory Team* Charge:

The charge of the *Change Advisory Team* is to guide Think Again’s work as they apply tools such as the Multicultural Organizational Development framework to both the POD Network organization — the policies, roles, and services — and the community — the network of individuals in relationship. To accomplish this charge, the *Change Advisory Team* will engage in the following tasks to ensure alignment of Think Again’s work with the mission, vision and values of the POD Network.

The *Change Advisory Team* tasks:

- Meet monthly with the Think Again Training and Consulting Team to review results obtained from the consulting team.
- Prepare materials to update the Executive team on emerging ideas and recommendations related to the consulting work.
- Support dissemination efforts to provide POD members with transparent and timely information regarding the work of the *Change Advisory Team*.
- Prepare materials to update the Core Committee for the June 2022 Core Committee meeting.

The *Change Advisory Team* Composition:

- Think Again Training Consultant - T.J. Jourian
- POD Network President-Elect - Carol Hurney
- POD Network Executive Director - Hoag Holmgren
- POD Network Administrative Assistant - Gaye Webb
- POD Network Members at-large - 6-8
APPENDIX C

POD Network Levels of Consensus Scale (used for Consensus Voting)

1= I can say an unqualified “yes” to the decision. I am satisfied with the decision as an expression of the wisdom of the group.

2= I find the decision perfectly acceptable.

3= I can live with the decision. I’m not especially enthusiastic about it.

4= I do not fully agree with the decision and need to register my view about why. However, I do not choose to block the decision. I am willing to support the decision because I trust the wisdom of the Core.

5= I do not agree or disagree with the decision but need more time to think or discuss the issue.

6= I do not agree with the decision and feel the need to stand in the way of this decision being accepted.

7= I feel that the Core has no clear sense of unity in the group decision. We need to do more work before consensus can be reached.