



Fall 2018 Core Committee Minutes
November 14 &15
Portland, OR

approved by the Core Committee on January 4, 2019

A summary of action items precedes the minutes. The minutes provide more details and highlights of discussion. Unless otherwise noted, approvals are 1 or 2 on the POD Network Levels of Consensus Scale¹. 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

Wednesday, November 14

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

Non-Discrimination & Anti-Harassment Policy: Abbreviated version approved;
Exec Committee will revise and return full version to Core for final approval:
APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Employee Handbook: Adopt with benefits question pending until Spring 2019
Core Committee meeting: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Proposal to vote on Governance Manual (GM) proposed changes without social
media use section: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Four-year audit cycle as proposed by auditors and Finance Committee
(alternating between formal audit and less formal review): APPROVED (1s and
2s)

Formation of Ad hoc on conference costs: APPROVED (1s AND 2s)

¹ See Appendix for the Levels of Consensus Scale used for most Core Committee votes.

Proposed GM change for Spirit of POD Award to allow for multiple awards:
APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Proposal to move forward with limited partnership and MOU with COACHE:
APPROVED (1s and 2s).

Proposal to pursue the publication of a new version of *Guide to Faculty Development*, possibly titled *What it Means To Be in Educational Development*:
APPROVED (1s and 2s with one 4).

Proposal for new TIA publishing platform with University of Michigan Publishing Services (UMPS): APPROVED (all 1s)

Proposal for Captioning Ad Hoc to continue: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Proposal to transition History Committee's work to a POD Office-administered function and to remove the History Committee from the GM: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Proposal to change the duration of the Organizational Development Institute to one day in the GM: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Proposal to form Ad Hoc on Strategic Plan Implementation: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Thursday, November 15

Proposed GM changes to the bylaws: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Proposed GM changes to sections 1 and 2: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Proposed GM changes to Guidelines section: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

(See "GM Summary of Changes_F18_11_14_18" in Fall 2018 Core Committee folder in DropBox for full details. Not publicly available.)

MINUTES

Wednesday, November 14

Present: Cassandra Horii, President; Angela Linse, President Elect, Mary Wright, Past President; David Sacks, Chair of Finance; Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director; Stacy Grooters, Richard Swan, Lindsay Bernhagen, Carl Moore, Dorothe Bach, Gabriele Bauer, Jonathan Iuzzini, Kathryn Linder, Isis Artze-Vega, Christine Rener, Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, Greg Siering, Robin Pappas

Welcoming & Centering Exercise

Ice-breaker

Overview & Meeting Process

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

Non-Discrimination & Anti-Harassment Policy: Exec Committee will revise and return to Core for final approval: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Discussion: what to do in the moment, i.e., if it happens at the conference? What about witnessing of harassment? What about POD members at non-POD settings; training for advocacy, how to be an advocate, how to intervene. Should have more guidance about reporting (what will actually happen when a complaint is filed); what if someone on Exec is the problem? Maybe separate note about what to do at the conference (go to reg desk (but what if it's a reg desk person?). More about process. Restorative justice? Do we have legal obligations to report instances? Revoking membership: for how long? What have other orgs done and how? If membership is revoked, can that person still attend the conference (maybe also ban the person from the conference (can we do that?))

Employee Handbook: Adopt with benefits question pending until Spring 2019 Core Committee meeting: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Discussion: Make sure the anti-discrimination language matches the non-harassment policy above.

Implementing the Strategic Plan

- implementing
- tracking/measuring
- finance and capacity planning

Discussion: What's next: infrastructure, capacity, resources? What actions should Core do to advance the plan? Membership retention (under the enhance member benefits). How to embed the SP into our discussions so it's not an add-on. Have a brief separate template/check off report that we send to all committee/sigs in January? Reach out to committee/SIGs: look at reward system? How to increase accountability in committees/sigs (who are volunteers)?

Proposal to form Ad Hoc on Strategic Plan Implementation: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Proposal to vote on Governance Manual proposed changes without social media use section: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Discussion: Perhaps say that POD social media accounts are the only official voice of pod? Responding to media: perhaps list our reps and areas of expertise, topics, & issues. & contact info, an "expert list". Create some content/material so it's ready; expand the pool so it's not just current Core members (great venue for former POD presidents). Maybe some logistics fall on Exec Dir: at least as a main contact to initiate phone tree or email tree. How do we decide who's an expert? Representing POD network when we're in a POD-sponsored context, we're leaders of pod in the context of pod so we need to be mindful of what we say & the implications; how other roles we play impact each other.

Four-year audit cycle as proposed by auditors and Finance Committee (alternating between formal audit and less formal review): APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Formation of Ad hoc on conference costs: APPROVED (1s AND 2s)

Discussion: How we can diversify & get more people involved? What about international members? Diversifying revenue would be helpful. Graduate student fees should be central to conversation.

Proposed GM change for Spirit of POD Award to allow for multiple awards: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Conference Committee

Discussion: Clarify with conference team the designations & sponsored session types in January (Stacy G. willing to assist).

Diversity Committee

Discussion: There is not a formal DC liaison w/ conference team: should there be? Re: a DC position paper, might it fit within any current publication: POD Speaks or POD Talks?

Proposal to move forward with limited partnership and MOU with COACHE: APPROVED (1s and 2s).

Discussion: How does Core feel about pros and cons of a module for campus climate for Ed Dev? Access to data; find out from COACHE (what's their strategy?). MOU discount for POD members?

Proposal to pursue the publication of a new version of *Guide to Faculty Development*, possibly titled *What it Means To Be in Educational Development*: APPROVED (1s and 2s with one 4).

Discussion: Guide to FD seems to be outdated; how might we create a new book? Will there be a shift in the purpose of the new book? What format(s) will work best (electronic, print, combination)?

Proposal for new TIA publishing platform with University of Michigan Publishing Services (UMPS): APPROVED (all 1s)

Discussion: Will likely be a way to enhance member benefit by making TIA more widely accessible, so that the scholarship of educational development is more often cited by other researchers.

Proposal for Captioning Ad Hoc to continue: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Discussion: Should include Exec Dir going forward; clarify workload piece of captioning (who does it? diversity coordinator?). This would have to include webinar captioning. Do we have budgeting for live captioning/live capture during the conference?

Proposal to expunge the History Committee from the GM: APPROVED (1s and 2s)

Discussion: We're shifting the focus from historical research to archiving and are in the process of developing guidelines for the POD Network office to use.

Social Media Ad Hoc

Media Coordinator could help members use their own social media; will be important good to tie Media Coordinator proposal to the Strategic Plan. If we

decide not to do this, what are the alternatives? Will bring formal proposal to Core in Spring.

Reports with No Requested Vote or Discussion

Operational Committees:

Digital Resources and Innovation Committee: Formerly ECRC, DRI name change approved before Core

External Partnerships and Outreach Committee (EPOC)

10+ partnerships (see list in report); very busy year, worked on POD Speaks #3; tracking opps for a vendor kit at other orgs: are we willing to pay for a vendor table for POD at other events?

Grants Committee

Had record number of applications. There is a GM change request, which we will vote on Wednesday, about the Startup Subcommittee.

Membership Committee

Work on 1st timers event & new hashtags. Buddy program is growing. The care team reaching out to groups impacted by tragedy. We're creating resources for supporting universities and colleges in crisis. See improving report template comments at the end of the report:

"We recommend increasing accessibility of the template. Steps include a) having committees change the document title at top to be the committee name, as ours does; b) using the "Headings" function so that headings are formatted at a larger font and make each report more readable [this report from MC uses such formatting, and may serve as an example], c) inserting a table of contents that can be automatically refreshed [again see above], d) inserting horizontal lines between major sections in the template, as this document does. Another idea is to increase the use of the strategic planning process by recommending some way that committees can report on alignment, or struggles trying to align, with Core's emerging strategic plan. Ideally a matrix, perhaps an Excel or Google Sheets insertion, would allow easy mapping. Here is an example from [my own institution's leadership](#) to understand my center's work."

Professional Development Committee

Collaborative adventures include: AACU, ODI, collaborations with ACAD, PODlive! webinar series; INFD; just launched mastermind groups; consider renaming the INFD to INED?

Proposal to change the duration of the Organizational Development Institute to one day in the GM: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Thursday, November 15

Present: Cassandra Horii, President; Angela Linse, President Elect, Mary Wright, Past President; David Sacks, Chair of Finance; Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director; Stacy Grooters, Richard Swan, Lindsay Bernhagen, Carl Moore, Dorothe Bach, Gabriele Bauer, Jonathan Iuzzini, Kathryn Linder, Isis Artze-Vega, Christine Renner, Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, Greg Siering, Robin Pappas

Reports with No Requested Vote or Discussion

SIGs:

Adjunct and Part-Time Faculty

Reflected on importance of planning leadership around pending life changes. Still managing bipartite mission of supporting educational developers who are adjuncts as well as those who are specifically tasked with supporting adjuncts. Pre-conference session this year on supporting adjunct faculty, and a couple of others. Presented at ICED this summer. Awarded 3 travel fellowships this year for conference attendance. 2/5 adjunct faculty sessions at conference are in the same timeslot (SIG will provide feedback to conference planning team after the conference); suggestion that emerging/trending topics get a little extra attention from conference committee in order to make sure there isn't conflict.

GPPD

Robust and regular activity. Zoom webinars to orient audience to the conference.

Mindfulness and Contemplative Pedagogy

Creating quarterly(ish) newsletter (*Mindful Moment*); trying to get people together at other conferences (Boston). Shepherded proposals through the conference process. Adjusting governance structure from co-chair model to chair/chair-elect model; will vote on required GM changes later. Question about the difference between a committee and a SIG. SIGs are new within the past 4-5 years; Committees are more functional in nature: Administrative committees (e.g., Finance), operational committees (e.g., Awards, Conference), SIGs are focused on special populations/topics within the organizations (GPPD, Small Colleges, Adjunct, TwT, etc.). The SIG model allows us to

be open to more SIGs being created as interest/need arises. Discussion about how we share our history with new Core members (Parking Lot). Question about how threshold of 20 members came to be; it was a first attempt to ensure there was sufficient interest/participation to sustain a SIG.

Healthcare Educational Development

Getting up and running, still a new SIG, getting folks access to listserv. Trying to figure out who will be chair-elect. Talked to conference committee about getting knowledgeable reviewers for healthcare-related proposals. Possibility of bringing SIGs together to address common challenges and solutions (e.g., governance structures, getting reviewers that are knowledgeable reviewers, etc.).

SoTL

Laura Cruz is mentor to our SIG. Membership to 87 members. Developing a process to determine which sessions should be designed/tagged SoTL. Plan to have a POD Live session (Katie Linder is doing a POD Live session SOTL sig should leverage); designating a member to run social media. Mills Kelly, President of ISSOTL interested in collaborating with SIG. Question about how a SIG can establish a connection with another organization. Answer: Contact EPOC. Encouraged to do a trial period, and then see if it is worth establishing a more formal relationship. EPOC has some examples and MOU templates, so it might be worth talking with EPOC about what next steps might be. Possible topics for future Committee/SIG chairs meeting--establishing new partnerships and leveraging existing ones. Resource folder on Google Drive available to all POD members.

STEM

Doing fine. Possible partnership with Network of STEM Education Centers.

Small Colleges

Small colleges session on first day used to be three hours (two back to back sessions), but was only one session this year--purportedly to make room for other sessions (was actually part of the POD sponsored session rethinking); Hoag will talk to SIG Chair about it. Several SIGs have mentioned that they want something early in the conference to generate community/buzz.

Question about what constitutes the kind of membership that needs to be included in the report; suggestion that it's the leadership that gets listed. GM has some language about specific membership qualifications for some SIGs.

Teaching with Technology

Group conference proposal didn't get accepted, felt there was some bias against technology in the reviews. Question about how much our webinars should be distinct

from or integrated with POD Live (current content hosted on an external website). SIG can be proactive about mentoring proposals and pre-reviewing proposals for feedback.

Regarding external/internal website: POD Network Webmaster has put together a forthcoming document to help SIGs/Committees to put materials on POD site; nowhere near ready for this to be a requirement, but get this resource out now, and start nudging committees and SIGs soon. Resources will need to be searchable & expectations for what goes there need to be clear. POD Live behind POD login makes a member benefit (might not make sense for all SIGs). Can we make committee/SIG reports available to each other? This connects to earlier discussion about conversation among SIGs, in support of each other. Another topic for Committee/SIG Chairs meeting.

Governance Committee

Proposed GM changes to the bylaws: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Proposed GM changes to sections 1 and 2: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

Proposed GM changes to Guidelines section: APPROVED by formal vote (unanimous)

(See "GM Summary of Changes_F18_11_14_18" in Fall 2018 Core Committee folder in DropBox for full details. Not publicly available.)

Parking Lot Items

Strategic Plan implementation ad hoc: Greg, Isis, Carl, Sandra, plus exec member(s) and possibly other at-large or committee/SIG participants.

Conference Fees ad hoc: Hoag, David, Jon (Discussion of phrase "unique constituencies" and whether it precludes a more "universal design" approach (e.g. sliding scale). Would also help with the conflation of need-based awards and merit-based awards. Cassandra revised the charge to reflect the above conversation.)

Themes:

1. Content creation
2. Professional development for Core, Committees, SIGs, etc. (leadership development, barriers, bias, etc.)
3. Procedures, etc.

4. Data analysis

Areas to explore further, tagged by theme numbers 1-4:

- Online orientations to POD Network (1,4)
- How do we communicate organizational structures? To whom? When? (1)
- Clusters of SIG challenges, solutions, practices, etc. How do we get SIGs together to learn from each other? (2)
- Policy vs. procedure (POD Network broadly) (3)
- Volunteer expectations--where do those sit? (2)
- Confidentiality/access issues in Google Drive--archiving vs. confidentiality (esp. in voting about grants) (1)
- Professional development related to media, branding, representing the POD Network (2)
- Diversifying POD Network income/revenue (4,SP?)
- "Non standard publications" (one time reports, etc.) (1,3)
- Committee/SIG leadership (vs. just chairs) (2)
- Membership of Committees and SIGs (3)
- Presidential election process (3, exec)

APPENDIX: POD Network Levels of Consensus Scale (1-7)

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.