

AITP EDSIG BOARD MEETING MINUTES

A meeting of the Board of Directors of the AITP EDSIG was held in Wilmington, North Carolina on Thursday 03 November 2011 beginning at 08:30 am, chairman Alan PESLAK presiding.

The following members attended:

Michael BATTIG, Wendy CECCUCCI, Scott HUNSINGER, Susan KRUCK, Brenda MCALEER, George NEZLEK, Alan PESLAK, Li-Jen SHANNON, Michael SMITH, and Leslie WAGUESPACK.

Mary LIND arrived at 8:51am after checking in.

Tom JANICKI and Kevin JETTON ducked in from working on the conference.

Brenda MCALEER arrived at 200pm after her flight from Maine arrived.

WELCOME

- ✦ PESLAK welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for their work.

POSTAL OUTREACH TO LOCAL COLLEGES

- ✦ BATTIG recounted his method of printing and sending out invitations to ISECON/CONISAR and passed out a sample to board members.
- ✦ BATTIG e-mailed the spreadsheet of contacts to BOD members as a point of information and reviewed the probable effect. He sent to small to medium schools that had some IS/IT related programs within 400 miles of Wilmington regardless of presence of grad program. There was some discussion of whether having grad programs would have made a difference. The response rate seems typical of postal solicitations.
- ✦ There was some discussion on whether we want to do this in future and alternative formats. BATTIG opined that the conference was more successful this year because of the location, not the mailing—JANICKI's presence in Wilmington was a huge benefit, for example. We'll need a different game plan next year for New Orleans, where we don't have presence.
- ✦ There was brief review of the envelope and cover letter that went with the invitations and also the questionnaire he plans to give to first-time attendees. Among other things, should be emphasize AITP-EDSIG or ISECON/CONISAR?
- ✦ PESLAK thanked BATTIG for his work.

CONFERENCE ROOM ISSUE

- ✦ PESLAK brought up the issue of whether the master bill should pick up JANICKI's hotel bill. UNC-W will not pick up JANICKI's bill because he lives close. PESLAK wanted a board policy on this issue in general, not just with this year's conference, since it's likely to come up in future.
- ✦ **KRUCK moved and CECCUCCI seconded that local host(s) at a conference site will be invited to submit a request for reimbursement for rooming at the conference hotel at the standard rate. Motion carried.**
- ✦ **PESLAK will discuss this year's situation with JETTON and JANICKI.**

MEMBERSHIP

- ✦ HUNSINGER e-mailed a membership report and passed out paper copies. The current numbers are not accurate since AITP is going through a system change and the report does not include current conference registration. HUNSINGER and JETTON are working on getting the correct information from AITP—the system is currently a “mess”. HUNSINGER and PESLAK

- recounted our ongoing problems with AITP—we're not getting good membership numbers.
- ⤴ HUNSINGER reported on his efforts at contacting potential members via e-mail.
 - ⤴ HUNSINGER opined that the trend in membership is up but it is difficult to get exact numbers because of AITP records difficulties.
 - ⤴ KRUCK mentioned that her JISE subscription numbers are also messed up.
 - ⤴ There was a detailed discussion, instigated by CECCUCCI, of the relationship among AITP and EDSIG membership and conference attendance and JISE subscription.
 - ⤴ HUNSINGER will follow up with detailed membership report as soon as his information requests from AITP are honored.
 - ⤴ PESLAK concluded that “We need to know our membership.”

ISECON PAPERS UPDATE

- ⤴ SHANNON reported that we have 97 submissions, 18 removed from process, 7 rejected → 72 scheduled for presentation. Down some from last year. JANICKI opined that this was due to changes in additional papers policies enacted by BOD last year. Also some papers went to CONISAR.
- ⤴ SHANNON thanked JANICKI and HUNSINGER for their help. JANICKI congratulated SHANNON on doing a great job the first time and also finding an assistant.
- ⤴ SHANNON opined that quality seems to be lower but that the quality of the review work was high—more professional. WAGUESPACK suggested that we think about how we would measure quality from year to year.

CONISAR PAPERS UPDATE

- ⤴ HUNSINGER passed around the CONISAR papers update and reviewed it. Number of submissions up significantly.
- ⤴ HUNSINGER reported that there were some issues with the masters papers and cases. There was some discussion of this whole experience from providing feedback to them to who would present to the fact that masters students do not give reviews.
- ⤴ HUNSINGER reported that except for the masters papers this year's submissions were generally in line with last year's. Review process has improved, owing some to the system requiring comments on some items.
- ⤴ BREADTH OF CONISAR
 - WAGUESPACK brought up the issue of the wide range of topics for CONISAR compared to ISECON and whether our review pool is competent to handle the breadth of topics. HUNSINGER reported that only a handful of reviewers declined to review due to lack of expertise. PESLAK suggested that the option for reviewers
 - HUNSINGER reviewed the process by which reviewers are assigned to papers. JANICKI offered that we however are chasing reviewers down at the last minute option.
 - NEZLEK opined that papers at our conference/journals should be understandable to a general audience of our member regardless of topic.
 - There was a general discussion on what should be the level of expertise required to review and read articles. Should we write to general audiences?
- ⤴ The papers chairs and journal editors accepted to review editorial guidelines.
- ⤴ WAGUESPACK suggested an open discussion later on this topic. . PESLAK agreed.

CONFERENCE UPDATE

- ⤴ JANICKI's excitement is hard to contain and his machine is vocalizing freely--16% increase in attendance when most conferences are declining in attendance.

- ⤴ JANICKI praised HUNSINGER and SHANNON for their excellent work as a chair. Kudos for SMITH and BATTIG as well. He praised numerous local and organizational people for the work they have put in.
- ⤴ People from 6 countries coming as well as Alaska (KRUCK says).
- ⤴ \$4700 has been raised from vendors! Lesson: need a vendors chair in the host city.
- ⤴ JANICKI reviewed the results of various new initiatives like the guest/family packages. BREINER'S 2 kids and wife are all coming on the boat ride! Our guest speaker is running a workshop. Industry keynote speaker tomorrow! Six workshops this year including ½ slot to each vendor to present their products. Eight panels. Thirteen abstracts being presented. Newcomers table and grad students special. Additional paper fee seemed to have work.
- ⤴ JANICKI presented some details on various activities available to attendees and guests including tours, cruises, battleship tour and water taxi, etc.
- ⤴ JANICKI reported on what didn't work this year: PhD symposium—no response from invited schools. Dead.
- ⤴ JETTON opined that JANICKI and his team from UNC-W did the work of a multitude. JANICKI graciously received the applause of the BOD.
- ⤴ JANICKI is looking for a good assistant chair. He will also bring a list of positions to be filled to the Sunday board meeting.
- ⤴ JETTON reported that these conferences will be the first weekend of November for the next 4 years.
- ⤴ “ASIAN STIR-FRY ACTION STATION” - JETTON's suggestion for lunch. JANICKI suggested the beer special at Ruth's Criss. JETTON reviewed some of the use of the facilities through the weekend-what's happening where and suggested that everyone go to the vendor's and exhibitor's rooms and workshops and bring others with you.

VP and EOY UPDATE

- ⤴ CECCUCCI reported on arrival of our guest speaker and associated items and issues.

2012 ORGANIZATION MEETING

- ⤴ JANICKI invited everyone to come to the Sunday morning meeting.
- ⤴ Some issues to be dealt with:
 - Masters submissions
 - Change in system to handle \$100 fee for additional papers
 - Teaching cases – beef up or get rid of it. They are a lot of work!
 - Abstracts – seems to be a way to get more people in, opens door for more participation.

ELECTIONS

- ⤴ JANICKI reported on the elections this year. Two officers, four 2 year general members and one 1 year general member to be elected. Let him know if you want to run.

EDSIG FELLOWS

- ⤴ JANICKI presented and discussed a set of guidelines that he has developed for the fellows based on previous BOD and other conversations along with some of difficulties.
- ⤴ **JANICKI moved and WAGUESPACK seconded that his guidelines be accepted as a standing rule of the organization as edited by various board members and reviewed by JANICKI. Motion passed.**

WEBSITE CHANGES

- ⤴ JANICKI reviewed the changes that have been made to the journal websites. Dynamic search of our conferences and journals! “Issue” publication to increase credibility. New look and feel. New on-line search! Google Scholar tracking.
- ⤴ Coming: Need to revamp e-mail system so it doesn't come from JANICKI but from the editors but it's on UNCW server. BOD had given him permission to test out a 3rd party site and he'll move on this in future.
- ⤴ PESLAK brought up the issue of emergency and succession planning. This will be discussed at a later time. There was discussion on where things are hosted—pdfs etc are on Bluehost but search page (only) is at UNCW although it looks seamless—this all needs to be addressed in future. Papers system goal is JANICKI's copyright.

CURRICULUM WIKI

- ⤴ LIND reviewed status of our Wiki and her intentions for it going forward. Still working on building our base—our critical mass. Some problems with spam but that's normal. Strangely we are higher now in Google Search than the model curriculum wiki is.
- ⤴ LIND reported that we have picked up a lot of traffic since JANICKI added a link to the main site.
- ⤴ LIND invited BOD members to contribute and talked about potential for workshops at the conference on how to contribute.

IS 2010 CURRICULUM

- ⤴ WAGUESPACK reported that AIS appears to have no intention of cooperating with us in any way, shape or form or of opening up the process to anyone. LIND pointed out that this is in contrast to how we are approaching this. Seems to be a strictly academic vs. educational ambition, which suggests a clear role for us as opposed to them.
- ⤴ WAGUESPACK suggested that we need to be more of an organization as opposed to a happening and we need to be around producing undergrads that can actually make systems work. He opined on various identity issues with the field. Should we start to talk more with ABET?
- ⤴ WAGUESPACK will follow up with colleagues who want to consider this as a strategic item to be taken up by the EDSIG board--”What will be the nature of our involvement in the direction of IS education?” LIND suggested her “birds of a feather” discussion would be a good venue for this.

RELATIONSHIP WITH AITP (part of this conversation took place after lunch)

- ⤴ PESLAK held forth on the shape of AITP and the relationship between them and EDSIG. There was some considerate discussion of this including such issues as:
 - we haven't had good member numbers in many years although they are supposed to maintain that data
 - their changes in management system and why should our members enter their own data
 - the AITP financial status
 - the relationship between FITE and AITP
 - our legal relationship with AITP
 - the benefits of AITP membership for EDSIG members
 - AITP's regard for the EDSIG
 - the things they **have** done for the EDSIG recently
 - how we might influence the AITP in constructive ways
- ⤴ WAGUESPACK opined that association with AITP does us no good with the academic end of

our efforts. Most of our members would have no problem with a name change—allegiance is to the EDSIG not to the AITP--although there might be some marketing issues.

- ⤴ PESLAK volunteered to start drafting a polite inquiry about the issue with CECCUCCI and NEZLEK helping. JANICKI will read the draft and he recommends that we involve REITHEL in the process.

ISEDJ/JISAR

- ⤴ CECCUCCI reviewed her work. She will stay on but needs some more associate editors. She is getting inquiries about submitting directly instead of through ISECON.
- ⤴ About 45% acceptance rate. PESLAK asked whether we are computing this rate compared to how other journals do it. There was some discussion on the details of our process. Consensus that we adhere to the “would you tell your mother” test followed by a detailed and spirited discussion of this issue.
- ⤴ She has filled out forms to be listed in CABELL's.
- ⤴ CECCUCCI will review our acceptance rate policy to insure consistency and accuracy, including all the hair splitting. Need a clear non-game-playing set of policies.

JISAR

- ⤴ HUNSINGER passed out a report and reviewed it. 45% acceptance. Journal has been accepted into several directories in CABELL's. There was a round of applause for HUNSINGER who is a stallion among journal editors.

BREAK AT 1140AM FOR LUNCH. RECONVENING AT 200PM.

GENERAL MEETING AGENDA

- ⤴ SMITH recounted the agenda of the meeting and we made sure everyone who needs to present knows to be prepared.

TREASURER'S REPORT

- ⤴ MCALEER presented her report, including losses in 2010, and explained the origin of various figures—we had to catch up with the money we owed Appalachian State and that was all paid in 2010. She answered questions.
- ⤴ KRUCK remarked that she was presenting another check to the organization soon.
- ⤴ There was some discussion and information from KRUCK and PESLAK and MCALEER regarding expected revenue and expenses not yet on report.

JISE REPORT

- ⤴ BUDGET
 - KRUCK e-mailed the JISE P&L statement and explained the figures to the BOD and answered various questions.
 - JISE is being subsidized by membership dues. WAGUESPACK suggested that the subscription cost to the membership should be given to JISE . He suggested other changes to the way we account for our I&E.
 - Dues increase passed last year should be reflected in next year's report.
 - KRUCK announced that volume 3 will be sent this year although we won't get an invoice under later.
 - MCALEER and KRUCK think we'll end up about \$1,100 in the hole, which is what we budgeted anyway.

- MCALEER must present a budget to the BOD. WAGUESPACK suggested that the president and treasurer hammer out a budget and present it to the rest of the membership.
- ▲ GENERAL
 - KRUCK presented changes to the social media presence, website hit origin, changes to policies and procedures regarding reviewing, teaching tips section, indexing, the special issue coming up, etc. NEZLEK made several clever comments.
 - KRUCK reported that the name JISE is not unique, it seems. She requested that the other JISE that sent e-mails out recently spell their name out and they agreed. It was noted that we do control the domain name and should make sure that we control the related one.
 - KRUCK reported that the Australian government is going to be taking a hard look at journal quality. She hopes to hear more about that soon as JISE gets quite a few submissions from Australia. We want to be in their new rankings.

SECRETARY

- ▲ SMITH asked for permission to move the AITP-EDSIG website to Wordpress. JANICKI stated that he thought we had approved that in Baltimore. SMITH just looked at the ground and shook his head sadly. No opposition in any case.

SPRING MEETING LOCATION

- ▲ PESLAK floated ideas for spring BOD meeting: Las Vegas, San Fran, Ft. Lauderdale. Other suggestions: Reno? Orlando? Chicago? St. Louis? Someplace not tawdry or shopworn. Vote was for Santa Fe/Albuquerque, NM on Feb 24-26, 2012 with South Florida as the backup.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS FROM DIRECTORS-AT-LARGE AFTER ELECTIONS

- ▲ PESLAK stated that the board will meet after elections to elect members to specific offices.
- ▲ There was discussion of who must stand for election this weekend and not and who might be interested in which positions if they continue on the board. Members who will not be running again announced their intention.

ADJOURNMENT

- ▲ Meeting adjourned at 345pm UNTIL Saturday after the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael SMITH, recorder.