



Spring 2018 Core Committee Minutes March 9 & 10 | Atlanta, GA

Minutes approved by Core Committee on April 12, 2018

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

Executive Director Report

E-Minutes (items approved by Core/Exec since Fall 2017): APPROVED

Increase Administrative Assistant's hourly rate. APPROVED (one 3, one 2, the rest 1s)

Governance Committee

Bylaws Changes: Formal Vote: APPROVED by vote (unanimous)

Committee/SIG Changes: Formal Vote: APPROVED by vote (unanimous)

Membership Committee Language Change: APPROVED by vote (one abstain)

Committee/SIG Recurring Expenses and Renewal Requests: All APPROVED

(those also submitting a new request have an asterisk)

All committees/SIGs submitting a report (i.e., all committees/SIGs) were approved to receive \$100 in operational expenses.

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

Awards*: \$650 (\$400 for Stanley, \$200 for Innovation, \$50 for engraving)

Conference*: \$22,000 (Already approved in provisional budget for: plenary, \$12K; entertainment/gifts, \$3K; co-chairs' expenses, \$4K; on-site admin asst, \$2.5K; and \$500 renewal for on-site grad student support)

Diversity: \$20,300 (\$20,200 to allocate between travel and internship grants, \$100 for operational expenses)

GPPD: \$4,275 (\$50 reduced fee conference registration grants for grad students and postdocs)

Grants: \$13,500 (\$12,000 to allocate between Early Researcher and POD Researcher grants; \$1,500 in start-up grants, moved from Outreach)

Membership: \$200 (#engagePOD expenses)

Professional Development*: \$8,900 (\$6,000 INFD loan, \$2,500 needs-based travel for PDC POD-sponsored events, \$400 Getting Started materials)

Scholarship*: \$8,000 for TIA editorial assistant

Committee/SIG New or Increased Requests:

Professional Development: \$100 (new tabletop banner): *discussion about transportation of banner, pop-up banner, branding*: APPROVED

Scholarship: \$300 for printing/promotional materials and buttons: APPROVED (1s & five 2s & five 3s)

Teaching with Technology: \$450 (increase in video transcription request from \$300 in FY17-18) *discussion about purpose; how is this being budgeted; what is being transcribed/how; three webinars; what is our policy for transcribing (ADA requires us as a 501(c)3 has to transcribe all videos)*: NOT APPROVED: six 7s; eight 6s; three 3s: supportive of intention but need to clarify how transcription is done for all committees/SIGs): pending clarification of POD's global policy, what's out there now: shelved for now.

Conference: \$750 for help with program formatting by grad student (40 hrs @ \$18.75/hr) *Should be seen as a project; include the front matter in GuideBook*: APPROVED (1s, nine 2s, one 3s)

Awards: \$900 (increase in Menges plaque costs from \$400 in FY17-18 to \$900): APPROVED (1s; three 3s; six 2s)

GPPD: \$4,000 (increase in networking lunch costs to accommodate 80, from \$750 in FY17-18) *should we get data for how many people stick around?:*
APPROVED (1s; five 2s; one 3)

Executive:

\$2,000 to support design and printing of strategic plan: APPROVED (later withdrawn to make an off-cycle budget request later)

Increased funding of Core travel (Funded through operating reserves, up to \$23,100, beginning Fall 2018 Core) *how do we make sure people really need it; anonymity is important:* APPROVED

Recurring Operational Expenses – Late Report

Adjunct/Part-time: \$3,900 for travel grants APPROVED

2018-19 Budget Discussion and Vote: FORMAL VOTE: UNANIMOUS YES

Accessibility Ad Hoc formed to report back in the fall, chaired by Stacy Grooters and Katie Linder: APPROVED

MINUTES

Friday, March 9

Present: Mary Wright, President; Cassandra Horii, President Elect, Kevin Barry, Past President; Angela Linse, President Elect-elect; Victoria Bhavsar, Chair of Finance; Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director; Jake Glover, Carol Hurney, Roben Torosyan, David Sacks, Stacy Grooters, Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Richard Swan, Lindsay Bernhagen, Carl Moore, Dorothe Bach, Gabriele Bauer, Allison Boye, Jonathan Iuzzini, Kathryn Linder, Isis Artze-Vega, Christine Renner, Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, Greg Siering

Absent: Robin Pappas

Invited by President: Brian Smentkowski, TIA editor

Welcome, Centering, and Superhero Icebreaker

Strategic Planning Ad hoc

PART ONE: Five groups, addressing:

1.) Does Core concur that this Strategic Plan document best reflects the “pulse” of the organization? If not, what’s missing? What should change?

&

4.) What should be included in a final, publicly shared strategic plan document, and what should be incorporated into a more tactical/operational documents for use by Core and other committees?

Report out

Group 1

One thing missing: *increasing visibility and clarity of pathways* to the profession is a topic we discuss a lot but it could be more front and center in this document. Our group affirmed the two cross-cutting priorities.

Group 2

Social justice and equity should not be just words in this document: they need to be real goals with measurable outcomes. Also: categories of evidence that honor a wider range of measuring progress towards our goals.

Group 3

Let's probe the membership about their expectations regarding *advocacy*. There's also probably a component of the pathways discussion that overlaps with our thinking about advocacy.

Group 4

The focus of the strategic plan seems more focused on the teaching & learning piece of our work; organizational development and broader ways of thinking about educational development are less explicit here.

Group 5

Group focused on question 4 about communicating SP: There's no part of this that could be left out of public documents, but there could be two versions -- the shorter needs to be inspiring, perhaps graphical. Perhaps we could think of this process in phases (because it's a relatively long period of time) and use the annual conference to present progress on this plan. Making committee and SIGs visible as places where plan is being operationalized: an invitation to participate in making it happen. Should the members know? How do we share SP? Membership committee is thinking about new members being oriented to the organization. Assessment of SP: how can members help us assess annually? There is room for every stakeholder to play a

role in assessment. Justice and equity, diversity and inclusion: Like Kevin's phrase "Creating an environment where everyone can thrive". Don't think that language reflects that. How do we get this kind of feeling into the language? Documents matter: Audiences will read it for different purposes and will come to conclusions depending on what they see. Different layers to communicating the plan. Internal to members, external to our home campuses constituents; external vis a vis related organizations such as AAC&U (where are we aligned? How do we distinguish ourselves? Sense that we have a lot of new people coming in every year; what is the role of people who are brand new and what does it mean for communicating the SP?

PART TWO: one group, addressing:

2.) We suggest here ways to **assess** the impact of the strategic plan. What feedback does Core have on the outline of this process?

3.) Does the plan help Core **prioritize** how to proceed and implement the plan? If not, how can it be improved in this respect, or what could Core/Exec/Ad-hoc do to facilitate implementation?

5.) How can this plan better **align** the budgeting process with strategy overall?

Report out

Key question: which parts of the SP will be more public facing and which will be more internal? How do we actually do the work of diversity represented in POD leadership and pipeline. What would be the indicators for how people make way into leadership spaces? Actions may need to be incremental, building over time (e.g., recruiting diverse membership, incorporating into committees, then into leadership roles). Success at those steps can be measured incrementally as we build the effort." Just in time, just enough" can be useful thought. Temptation is to give them everything. If I know that I get just in time to get me through the next thing. Think about making it chunk size and not overwhelming. It's fair to ask committees to take action on behalf of specific goals. Wonder whether we are planning for people who will be at POD for a little while. Don't know whether we ask in a survey ... 1/3 new coming to the conference seems to be

the number. do we know how many of our members/conference attendees are in their positions indefinitely vs. temporarily (e.g., for a 3-year rotation). Membership committee wants SP to guide work. What are the things that we are striving to complete vs. things that we are simply moving the needle? We don't have a good definition of who our constituents are (Provosts, Ed developers etc.); we should work on defining. Align SP plan with what's going on in the committees but also want to guide and be aspirational. Help committees to make SP operational. Think about how we as an organization function. There seem to be a number of indicators that speak to diversity, but perhaps not inclusion. "Diversity is being asked to the party, inclusion is being asked to dance." Lay out plan year by year. Here is what we are going to accomplish in year one. Can we use SP to model how to align outcome and assessment for our membership? Could the strategic plan provide a framework for the Committees and SIGs to guide their work? If so, this could represent a culture shift. How should we plan for elasticity while also offering specificity. "Just enough of a plan." Previous comments related to whether we're creating an environment for people to thrive. One core member is doing research on burnout and mentions a quote from her research where someone said that faculty development was a dead-end job. She's thinking about the pathway pieces in the SP and wondering if we have the right metrics in there. We've been talking a lot about pathways into the profession, but we also need to thinking about pathways through the profession, pathways from educational development to other roles. Culture questions and next steps: We are in a good place: Committee structure is put in place, budget can requests can be tied to SP. However, in leadership (CORE and Exec) we do not have a culture that makes the SP part of what we do on a regular basis. Is 5 years out enough? Should we be projecting out 10 years? Something for leadership to consider. A good SP can help executive committee do more intentional fundraising.

PART THREE: Vision, Mission, and Values revision

Some of the values raise the question: are we really living them? (e.g. social justice are we even ready for taking on social justice as a goal?). Create an ascendant narrative for ed development (parallel to AAC&U). We talk about *collaboration* as being an important value, but it's not actually on our list of values. Our mission and vision are very focused on *teaching & learning*. Define

educational development succinctly. We are doing more than “provide community.” Do more than reward teaching & learning. We want continual growth. Mission needs to be memorable: what is it you do, for whom and why AND it needs to guide us in a way that we know what to say yes and no to. What do we mean by each of our individual values (without they seem like buzz words. Next steps:

- Strategic Planning Ad hoc will continue working over the summer
- Will bring this document to committee chairs for feedback/input
- Will have open focus groups for members

TIA Planning (led by Brian Smentkowski)

Exercise preamble:

- strengthening and promoting the Scholarship of Educational Development (SoED)
- Leveraging TIA and other POD Network publications to contribute to SoED
- Make publications broadly accessible to higher education so that SoED informs policy and practice

Part 1: As we consider possible publishers, what values should guide our search? (Pink for Publisher characteristics)

You go, we go. They would have the same skin in the game. Mutually beneficial. Collaboration. Check with others who have published with publisher. Established. Strong intake system, (people in presses move quickly). Interdisciplinary. Diverse voices. A publisher that values what POD offers beyond numbers. Open access (could we maintain a member benefit? i.e., if it's open access, can we have an exclusive window for members to read each issue before it becomes truly open access? Well-indexed (people should be able to find and cite the work of TIA easily). Nimble, proactively looking out for us as an organization. Visibility, utility, value to people outside of POD. Would be great for libraries to subscribe to TIA. Easily navigable/accessible; few clicks to get to everything. Serious commitment to accessibility for disabilities. Reputation. Flexibility (in terms of how it's issued, how often it's issued, length). Publisher capacity. Format and time table/ agility.

Part 2:

Small group discussions

Report out:

- Visibility

Visibility to pod members and others who would find it valuable; Social media presence (us); Good web-presence; Do we know of other people who previously worked with [current publisher](#)?

- Accessibility

Can people find it; Reducing barriers; Can authors find it; Tension b/w member benefit and open access; How do we want to be bundled, what would it look like, and who would we want to be bundled with?

- Publisher Capacity

Do we have references from others who have published with them? What are their back-end systems? How do they help journals promote? What does it take to self-publish? What are the implications of self-publishing?

- Publisher "Gets us"

Can publisher connect us with others in field of higher ed? Publisher has a skin in the game. Appreciation for the wide range of scholarship we do.

- Publication Format

Multi-media options; Accessibility; Reasonable cost/OER; Flexibility with publication schedule; Bundling as a predatory practice. Let's look at examples, such as "Hybrid Pedagogy" and "Journal of Contemplative Inquiry"). How can we nurture researches?

Process going forward:

- Need to identify 3 Core members to serve on the committee
 - Deandra Little has offered her services
- March 24: review 2013 files
- April 10: Ad hoc committee progress report to Core
- May 1: integrate feedback from Core, vetting , formal proposals

- June 1: search committee makes a recommendation to Core

Saturday, March 10

Present: Mary Wright, President; Cassandra Horii, President Elect, Kevin Barry, Past President; Angela Linse, President Elect-elect; Victoria Bhavsar, Chair of Finance; Hoag Holmgren, Executive Director; Jake Glover, Carol Hurney, Roben Torosyan, David Sacks, Stacy Grooters, Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Richard Swan, Lindsay Bernhagen, Carl Moore, Dorothe Bach, Gabriele Bauer, Allison Boye, Jonathan Iuzzini, Kathryn Linder, Isis Artze-Vega, Christine Rener, Sandra Sgoutas-Emch, Greg Siering
Absent: Robin Pappas

Executive Director Report

E-Minutes (items approved by Core/Exec since Fall 2017): APPROVED
Increase Administrative Assistant's hourly pay: APPROVED (one 3, one 2, the rest 1s)

Working on employee handbook and sexual harassment policy for POD members. Oversight for the latter would be Executive Committee.

Governance Committee

Bylaws Changes: Formal Vote: APPROVED by vote (unanimous)

Committee/Sig Changes: Formal Vote: APPROVED by vote (unanimous)

Membership Committee Language Change: APPROVED by vote (one abstain)

Discussion: Question: is it sufficient to say committee only "advises" on membership? Are we being clear enough with committees about our expectations for the work they do for the organization? Response: One way to do that communication is through our roles as Core reps; also think about coordinating with the Presidential liaison in that work, re: idea that came up yesterday—to request committees to do work of strategic plan; we have always done that with some committees, so we need to be clear in expanding that practice/expectation to other committees. ECRC's report suggests there's a lack of clarity on their role -- do they need additional guidance? The more you have on paper that is less person-dependent, the smoother things run. Could we make this clearer in the general description of SIGs/committees in GM? (there is some language already there). Make sure that as we move ahead with clarifying committee expectations, we need to be

sure to involve the committees in making those decisions. Question raised again if the “advising” language is sufficient. Tabling this conversation with expectation that Governance will reflect on the larger question of general committee responsibilities/expectations in the future. Reassure future Membership chair that the GM description is not static, including the charge. It is important for people walking into roles to feel empowered -- perhaps this can help folks with the challenging aspects of asking other committees if they will do particular work (such as on the three top things members wanted POD to help them develop professionally). Take back to MC: Charge currently states “advises” on marketing, which implies it does not do the marketing, etc. Could include “helps craft” each of those elements, marketing, etc.

Committee/SIG Recurring Expenses and Renewal Requests: All APPROVED

(those also submitting a new request have an asterisk)

Awards*: \$650 (\$400 for Stanley, \$200 for Innovation, \$50 for engraving)

Conference*: \$22,000 (Already approved in provisional budget for: plenary, \$12K; entertainment/gifts, \$3K; co-chairs’ expenses, \$4K; on-site admin asst, \$2.5K; and \$500 renewal for on-site grad student support)

Diversity: \$20,300 (\$20,200 to allocate between travel and internship grants, \$100 for operational expenses)

GPPD: \$4,275 (\$50 reduced fee conference registration grants for grad students and postdocs)

Grants: \$13,500 (\$12,000 to allocate between Early Researcher and POD Researcher grants; \$1,500 in start-up grants, moved from Outreach)

Membership: \$200 (#engagePOD expenses)

Professional Development*: \$9,100 (\$6,000 INFD loan, \$2,500 needs-based travel for PDC POD-sponsored events, \$400 Getting Started materials, \$100 operational)

Scholarship*: \$8,000 for TIA editorial assistant

Discussion: how do we decide how to use budget surplus? Do we need to have any of that conversation today? Principle is to “invest in POD”: ex. Offsetting Core travel expenses for those in less-funded centers, accessibility enhancements at conference, TIA publisher change, Social Media manager.

Want to have the strategic plan in place before making too many decisions about how to use surplus -- will have more to discuss in the fall. Our GM-dictated financial safety nets impact these decisions (e.g. need to have 6 mos. emergency fund tied to new expenditures).

Committee/SIG New or Increased Requests:

Professional Development: \$100 (new tabletop banner): *discussion about transportation of banner, pop-up banner, branding*: APPROVED

Scholarship: \$300 for printing/promotional materials and buttons: APPROVED (1s & five 2s & five 3s)

Teaching with Technology: \$450 (increase in video transcription request from \$300 in FY17-18 + \$100 operational) *discussion about purpose; how is this being budgeted; what is being transcribed/how; three webinars; what is our policy for transcribing (ADA requires us as a 501(c)3 has to transcribe all videos)*: NOT APPROVED: six 7s; eight 6s; three 3s: supportive of intention but need to clarify how transcription is done for all committees/SIGs): pending clarification of POD's global policy, what's out there now: shelved for now.

Conference: \$750 for help with program formatting by grad student (40 hrs @ \$18.75/hr) *Should be seen as a project; include the front matter in GuideBook*: APPROVED (1s, nine 2s, one 3s)

Awards: \$900 (increase in Menges plaque costs from \$400 in FY17-18 to \$900): APPROVED (1s; three 3s; six 2s)

GPPD: \$4,000 (increase in networking lunch costs to accommodate 80, from \$750 in FY17-18) *should we get data for how many people stick around?*: APPROVED (1s; five 2s; one 3)

Executive:

\$2,000 to support design and printing of strategic plan: APPROVED (later withdrawn to make an off-cycle budget request later)

Increased funding of Core travel (Funded through operating reserves, up to \$23,100, beginning Fall 2018 Core) *how do we make sure people really need it; anonymity is important*: APPROVED

Discussion: Do we need to clarify expectations to committees about the degree of detail they are providing with budget requests (e.g. say that budget requests won't be considered without sufficient detail)? Suggestion to amend committee report to include request for detailed budget justification. Committee reps could

also take responsibility for giving feedback on insufficiently explained budget requests.

Recurring Operational Expenses – Late Report

Adjunct/Part-time: \$3,900 for travel grants APPROVED

Discussion: do we have a master calendar that shows when deadlines are? Yes:

<https://podnetwork.org/about-us/pod-year-overview/>

2018-19 Budget Discussion and Vote: FORMAL VOTE: UNANIMOUS YES

Discussion: Committee/SIG questions brought to Core

- **Conference Committee**: debating how best to manage the work of formatting the conference program
 - Searchability and sortability can be improved (look for a specific presenter, for example)
 - To give reimbursements, people sometimes need to provide a copy of the program
 - Could other conference organizers provide input on how they've managed this?
 - Importance of being able to archive past conference programs
 - Higher Learning Commission has an effective, integrated process (applying, registering, program, etc.)
 - What problem are we trying to solve?
 - Some participants cannot access a digital version on Fridays because of religious reasons
 - Does Conference Committee need some more people to help make time to pursue investigating alternative formats?
 - Needs to be collaboration with ECRC (GM contains official liaison from ECRC to Conference Committee)
 - Parking lot: look at all the pieces of work that we're supporting piecemeal for conference team (e.g. budget of 40 hours for program formatting) and see what those add up to
 - Summary: good reason to continue with pdf

- **ECRC:** Where does this committee fit in the bigger picture moving forward?
 - Current name doesn't reflect what the committee is actually doing at this point
 - TwT has emerged and siphoned off some who were originally drawn to ECRC
 - Some really like the R&D role that the committee has played
 - Timeline for "how do we test things out"?
 - Take questions about what the committee is/should be back to committee? Having a clear vision will likely help with recruitment.
 - Does social media ad hoc inform this conversation?
 - Are there a lot of little things ECRC are doing that should be part of a staff position (like question asked of conference-related work)?

LUNCH

Discussion continued:

- **EPOC:** Video about POD as an organization for the purposes of outreach
 - Professional quality video needed (\$15k-20k cost), but likely makes sense to wait until the strategic plan is complete.
 - May be possible to leverage media support on our campuses to capture interviews
 - Potential for different videos to reach different audiences (new members, higher ed audience more generally)
 - Need to be careful in deciding how we represent who we are and who gets to speak for us
 - Need to have infrastructure in place to amplify the reach of the video
 - Does it become an annual production that brings in themes/conversations from the conference
 - What's the lifespan of this kind of video for other organizations?

- Do we know the likely usage of a video like this?
Response: we want to imagine this as having a larger purpose than something that just sits on the website -- something that people can use in their home institutions
- Importance of clear message and clear sense of audience in creating a video like this
- **Membership:** feedback on welcome message
 - Are there any glaring omissions or ways to make it more brief?
 - Follow-up will eventually be to provide more information about how to engage with committees
 - This is sent through an automated process when people join POD
 - 1. Who is in charge of making sure **membership tally is updated each year**, and **links** are checked and replaced?
 - Gaye currently sends out renewal reminders (not yet automated)
 - 2. Discuss with Hoag and Ken: directing people to the embedded links isn't working; Build Membership Benefits page that has the links embedded; also bear in mind that people may be advised not to click on embedded links in emails
- **PDC:** Feedback on Mastermind Program
 - Collaborative project between MC and PDC, grows out of buddy program--idea is to provide structured support outside of the conference and form small (3-5 people) open-format accountability groups (not a mentoring program that brings experts and novices together)
 - Recommendation: approach it with a pilot mindset; function best with someone in a leadership role of the group; will need a steward to keep it on track; work best when people are at a similar level/have a shared understanding of what's at stake
 - For first pilot, keep threshold low (e.g. shared time availability); don't overly construct something that doesn't yet have legs

- Distinction between Masterminds and SIGs? Need to make difference clear to membership. Response: Groups are coming together to support each other around their individual goals but not necessarily around common goals/topics
- Other feedback to PDC:
 - PODLive! is an exciting development and also seems to echo work in other committees who are doing more webinars -- should we think about ways to coordinate that work?
- **Scholarship:** plan to gather people who will collect Scholarship of Educational Development resources (i.e. professional development opportunities, databases that are useful, journals):
 - Think carefully about implications of creating a resource that needs on-going curation (what goal are they trying to address? Does this solution best meet that goal?) Need to be mindful of the amount of work that goes into this. Beware creating another WikiPODiA, underused, esp. compared to Google or Google Scholar.
 - Questions about why this is prioritized right now, and whether this is the role the scholarship should play?
 - Is it time for POD to fill the void, what Yelp is to services, Amazon to products, Reddit to discussion boards, finally have a curated and/or crowd-sourced set of SoED resources?
 - Should we have signature initiatives, making us a 'go-to' for certain kinds or topics of resources?
 - Could we have (instead) some kind of regularly updated literature review about the value of ED?
- **POD Sponsored Sessions**
 - In the middle of the process of making selections (9 submissions this year; decisions out by Monday, giving anyone who does not get a PSS slot the opportunity to submit to the regular peer-reviewed session submission process)
 - One hiccup in the process: some confusion between PSS chairs and conference committee about how to implement the proposed Committee/SIG-Sponsored Sessions.

- **SOTL SIG**
 - Seeking to clarify their role as not necessarily supporting members in doing SOTL but supporting members who support *others* (on their campuses) in doing SOTL
- **Executive**
 - Please let us know of things that POD should be aware of/involved in
- **Travel Grants ad hoc**
 - Goal was to align across committees/SIGs who are providing these types of awards
 - Committees/SIGs have agreed to use a common assessment process to measure impact; sharing templates
 - Looking to develop common application -- as first step all are moving to a Google form
 - Also discussed implications of how awards are named and found that there was intentionality behind how those decisions were made
 - Suggestion: write up something for the chairs' manual
 - Was there discussion of visibility of these grants?
Response: there wasn't concern raised that folks aren't getting enough applicants; would need further budgetary commitment to support any push to increase participation in these programs
 - Assessment template:
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd5Ov-TI8DbAXTVVvPpFoGmseg2WkM8AUb1MI2ZNIVAmoj11A/viewform>
 - Vote to accept recommendations of ad hoc: 18 ones, 2 twos
- **History ad hoc**
 - Recommending that we reconstitute the History Committee
 - Suggests that we move into digitizing archival materials so they are more accessible and to make a more usable archive for members to access
 - <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podnetwork/>
 - Could be a team: one who reaches out and curates, one who takes the material and stores/makes material

- accessible (important to clarify how much work this requires and who will be responsible for doing that work)
- When talking to publishers, we will want to ask for rights to archive our materials.
 - What are the budget implications? Work required is significant, so there will likely be budget implications.
 - We need a retention schedule & policy; is ResearchGate a possible host for the archive?
 - Suggests a need to review how well we're attending to the website -- we keep circling back to the website today
 - What are other organizations doing?
<https://www.aacu.org/about/history>
 - Vote to accept recommendation to reconstitute History Committee: 14 ones, 5 twos, 1 four
 - Concern raised: we're voting to reconstitute the committee even though it's not clear that we need a committee (rather than a person or team)
 - Continued conversation:
 - Should the ad hoc come back with a clearer proposal for how to operationalize this?
 - Should we consider hiring an outside specialist to do this work, if it's seen as a priority?
 - Can we broaden the call, something to the effect of finding help to preserve the legacy and past of POD and educational development as a field?
 - Proposal: table conversation for now and revisit in summer
- **Social media ad hoc**
 - Recommendation that committees and SIGs get branding guidelines and style guide 2x/year
 - Time for starting up a social media presence is significant, but after that there is the potential for automation.
 - Can be hard to assess return on investment for the resources we put into social media

- Expectation now is that every social media post has a visual, and this is a time-consuming project (making sure it's on brand, etc.)
- IJAD is a model for doing this well
 - Other models: Educause, OLC
- A social media coordinator could also reach out to committees and support their social media efforts.
- A coordinator could be important in further our strategic priorities around advocacy/outreach.
 - Especially important in reaching younger generations ("this is how the world works now")
- Are we ready to have a greater social media presence: Can we provide attractive benefits to new members? Can we accommodate increasing conference numbers?
 - We are unlikely to see immediate return on this, so there is time to build capacity as needed as an organization
- Does a coordinator need to be an Ed Developer insider?
 - No but we need a process so that it's approved by someone with that background -- more important to have someone with good design/social media skills
- Any suggestions to be put in place now for committees who want to get a start?
 - Follow the brand, tag POD, be actively engaged with audience
- Next stage: make a three-level request (volunteer/some money/significant staff time)
- **Accessibility Ad Hoc** formed to report back in the fall: APPROVED

Parking Lot

- Taking volunteers for open committee and liaison spots
 - TIA ad hoc: Hoag, Katie, Lindsay
 - Governance member: Isis
 - Conference committee rep: Sandra
 - EPOC rep: Dorothe
 - History rep: Erica
 - Membership rep: Gabriele
 - Scholarship rep: Lindsay
 - Small colleges rep: Carl

- TwT rep: Greg
- Accessibility ad hoc: Katie, Stacy
- STEM rep: Richard

Big picture items to bring back to our committees:

- Strategic planning updates
- Significant information from other committees
- Follow the brand
- Dates are chosen for committee chair meetings (Cassandra will send)
- Clarify Committee-Sponsored and Committee-Designated sessions

Mary asks that we use our Presidential liaisons, especially for things that have cross-committee/organizational implications.

Hoag will send survey for Spring 2019 Core Committee location and dates.

Presidential transition.

Adjourn.

APPENDIX: POD Network Levels of Consensus Scale

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.