

1/27/17 – Norfolk ,VA – 1:03pm

In Attendance: Li Jen Shannon, James Pomykalski, Lee Freeman, Scott Hunsinger, Lionel Mew, Muhammed Miah, Rachida Parks, Jeffry Babb, Meg Fryling, Les Waguespack, Jason Sharp

- Update to agenda, verification of travel times. Meeting anticipated to run to 4:15 then tour of facility.

Formal start –

Officer election notification. Request from board members to express interest in positions. Secretary, Treasure, Membership director to be decided.

Introductions, with new members we go around the room to introduce. Much in common. Focus on service, very common theme.

Les continues on this theme to stress to everyone to stay aggressive with ideas and again thank everyone for their willingness to serve.

Muhammed report on papers at EDSIGCON (See report): total submitted – 67, total scheduled 54

- Question – any themes, concerns, etc? – Muhammed says issues with contacting authors and formatting continue, also the participation of peers for reviews has been challenging.

- Jeff – we need to continue to focus on quality, but the challenge is to make sure we keep numbers consistent, it's a challenge.

- Scott – it has always been a challenge.

- Rachida – Burden – 2 authors, 6 reviews? From a newcomer point of view this is a turnoff.

- Anthony – Where do cases fit in? Numbers have to count, they do get presented, where do they count in overall totals, are they included? We had 14 submitted, 12 presented.

CONISAIR Report – Scott (See Report) – 24 final count. Looking for more tracks, specifically in Security, Networks, communications. Possibly Cloud and BI. Should help expansion.

- Talk between Scott and Mohammed on the review cycle in combining the two reviews from the initial conference consideration and the further journal consideration. Currently both are.

ISEDJ Report (Babb) – Acceptance rate approximately 40% Bringing Guido Lang and Mohammed on as associate editors. Back to the cycle of reviews and includes mention of the extra cycle the early submissions for awards consideration get.

- Scott confirms that from those that meet the deadline, top 10% get sent to the best paper's chair who then consider those for the awards. So, only that slice gets that extra review and even then there is no real feedback, just the numbers of the papers that get awards. Mohammed confirms this true for EDSIGCON as well.

- Lionel – Much value in the reviews. We do need to keep good interactions at the heart of the review process.

- Consensus, we also have to make sure that we do not get “raw” submissions, we want finished work that needs polished.

- Jeffry – with associate editors we are hoping to build in an extra check for well improved papers from round 1 to round 2...

JISE Report (Lee) – Rates remain in the 20% acceptance rate. 2017 submission is at 8, which is consistent. Spring 2016 issue came out in December, further ready papers are not being held up, issues being put out as number of ready papers met..... Special issues coming up, Academic Integrity issues is close to completion. Agile Development issue coming next. Thoughts of a “special invitation” issue of leaders and current thoughts on state of IS education...

- Issue brought up from someone outside, there are no EDSIG board members currently listed in the editorial role. 10 to 12 editors, and 16 members as reviewers. Process is that you have to evolve through the reviewer level to the editor level.

- Discussion – yes it’s a problem. Is it an identity issue? We are supporting this, but do we get credit for that? Even if we have EDSIG people sign on as reviewers it would be 1 review in 18 months or so. Discussion continues that this is an issue where the people engaging in the journal are not necessarily the people engaging in the conference.

Lee continues report – Online publishing catching up with past issues, 1 year buffer to encourage the subscriptions till. Eduglopedia has been updated and included, will show in searches.

Survey results – Response rate good. Almost 200 respondents of 652 possible. See PPT for details. Long standing group, actively involved. PPT has much detail. Summary: survey seems to support moving online, however this is contradicted by the view that only online would be viewed as less prestigious. Lee presents 6 options....presents some data as to cost consideration (no much difference in cost depending o number of issues printed, so best to either print or not print...) –

- When is a time for change?
- Cost?
- Website updating – could cost 2 to 10K upfront, but eliminate the printing cost.
- What are other journals doing?

Short break 2:45

Back 2:56

How to address the JISE concerns. Suggested we take some time to let this marinate on our collective thoughts. – Babb – question on money bleeding. Serapiglia – question of integrating JISE into our identity more – James – how long to clear out the queue, not long but need to get input of those authors. Jason – we should talk during this weekend more. Scott – Need to include ISCAP. Les – we will find some time, ruminate over dinner, talk a little more tomorrow.

Excellent briefing by Lee.

Les – resigning as chair of the curricular matters committee. Opening for involvement. Herbert Longnecker had been a leader in this area and recently passed away. Jeffry Babb has also contributed greatly to recent effort. My unanimous assent, Jeffry is new chair.

AITP/CompTIA updates – Scott has served on a transition team between November and now. December a meeting was attended in CompTIA headquarters. 5 reps from AITP attended. Scott was able to give a presentation of EDSIG and who we are and what we do. They seemed happy to let us continue “in place” – with ISCAP and the EDSIG board in control of our conference. Les continues with report of his meeting of the plans of CompTIA moving forward.

So, what does this mean? Les has requested their presence in Austin. We include discussion on impression of CompTIA – From Scott and Les – CompTIA is looking to evolve their image. Serapiglia and Babb express concern on the impression others would have of us if we are associated with CompTIA.

Babb – asks – what do Les and Scott suggest we do moving forward.... Les, continue “as is” – but not commit more without great consideration.

Tom Janicki and Eric Breimer join meeting – 4:00

Les – Report on PACE – Partnership for Advancement of Computer Education – Les does not feel this will be a long term continuing effort. ACM-Ed council was present at the San Francisco PACE meeting – this access allowed Les to become a part of the next working committee. Les has also been invited to Seattle for a CC2020 meeting. We lost this connection in the mid 2000’s and this is a great opportunity to get back as a contributor to these areas. Unfortunately this does cost money. Les is requesting funding for the trip to Seattle.

Motion – Serapiglia – Move that we approve expenditures up to \$2000 to support travel and participation in the CC2020 meetings in Seattle by the Curricular Matters committee. Seconded by Jason Sharp. Passes.

Break for dinner.

### **Saturday Jan 28 – EDSIG Board Meeting – Norfolk, VA**

Li Jen Shannon, James Pomykalski, Lee Freeman, Scott Hunsinger, Lionel Mew, Muhammed Miah, Rachida Parks, Jeffry Babb, Meg Fryling, Les Waguespack, Jason Sharp, Eric Breimer, Tom Janicki

Open – 8:20am

Les – agenda reminder, carry over from yesterday, we will fit in more discussion on the JISE delivery decision moving forward. Lee details some of the mechanics of transitioning to all online publication and ramifications on current papers and subscribers. Target time for possible move would include finishing 2 issues for pub, which concludes the 2016 volume (volume 27) – and in the 2017 volume (28) move to online.

Question to Eric – look into the needs requirements in assimilating the JISE online presence.

Eric – we already have them as part of the servers we already hold – we would just have to plan the build out of features.

Tom – We can work quickly and efficiently.

Les – 8:30, formal start.

Peter – Stepped out

- Temp questions on JISE continue

- Serapiglia, what is the state of our web hosting? Answer – it is a line item to address later in the itinerary

Return – to Peter Wu

CONISAR – Peter Wu – See report in documents – Peter focuses again on the deadlines. Wishes to return to the 15<sup>th</sup> as a deadline date. We will address this question later in the program. Peter reports growth, but slow growth. 34 papers presented in Vegas. Les, question, would it be good to start to address a non “education” crowd to attract non-pedagogy related research. Eric – implementation of separating mailing lists could be difficult. Tom – we should be able to do this. Eric – we have been building the mailing list off of CS department faculty listings as well as previous authors...

Scott – CompTIA has said that they will send out the notice of the conference to their thousands of partners.

Peter – suggestions include possible topic based special issue in JISAR, also expresses need to have more defined categories

TREASURER REPORT – Peter Wu – see documents –

Overall we are in the black. JISE and meeting the primary costs. Also now the participation in Curriculum Matters.

Conversation commences – If we move JISE to free online, what is the purpose of the membership fee? Answer – yes, JISE was a tangible product, but there is the benefit of the work that goes into maintaining the journals online and the actual conference organization. Also, Tom joins in that in the past two years the advertising of the registration for the conference has not stated “Membership Fee to EDSIG” but was branded as “Conference Registration”. Les also rejoins that we are an association that provides service, we are not a retail organization that provides a product.

Reports accepted.

CONFERENCE REPORT FOR VEGAS

Eric Breimer – Papers and panels were down a bit, submissions down by 8 Follow up with members anecdotally show some may have just been turned off by Vegas.

Panels and vendors were up.

Target attendance was met and 121 full pay, 155 attendees. \$13,529 profit in Vegas. \$13,888 profit in Wilmington. Both had factors that allowed for lower costs. Austin will not have this possibility.

Target for 2017 will be 125.

Post conference survey (See documents) – community sense still exists and interaction with peers still greatly valued. People are expressing dislike with Sunday to Wednesday time frame. Mechanics of Vegas annoying. Request for mobile platform of the schedule.

Still vast majority of attendees are presenters, but in Vegas 14 attendees were not presenting. Word of mouth is still the primary way people are finding out about us.

2017 planning – pedagogy and model curriculum still most submissions. What are new hot topics? Peer reach out. Possible incentives for bringing someone in...

- Discussion –

Tom – We should look at dropping the EDSIGCON name and replace to highlight ISCAP and remove the “Education” label.

Eric – Supports the drop of EDSIGCON, it was put in place as an emergency replacement for ISECON

Les – Keynote speaker of importance, great names in Baltimore and Wilmington, but Vegas was not the same. Also Distinguished Educator importance. Finally –if we are going to build specific content areas, we need SMEs (Subject Matter Experts) there to energize it.

Serapiglia – Noted that a couple of the conference committee members that were in place for specific areas reported they feel underutilized and did not do much.

Les – name change would be an EDSIG issue and will be brought up later

Jeff – reports the one complaint about a vendor workshop could have been handled. We do need to vet the workshops a bit more closely. The one vendor was a bit off-putting and aggressive. He (Jeff) will be seeing this person soon and wants to know what to say to him. Response is to be polite but to give feedback that his (vendor’s) approach needs to be softened.

Sharp – Experienced the vendor going table to table at a meal.

Jeff – well, yes we should promote some things but we need to clarify if it is scholarly or vendor promotion.

## 2017 CONFERENCE PLANNING

Les – submission dates.

Eric – we do really need to push deadlines a little later, suggest return to the June 15 and July 15 rather than June 1 and July 1. Moved to accept the new deadline dates. Accepted.

Jeff – Distinguished Educator – Heikki Topi nominated for his work in model curriculum. See supporting document.

Serapiglia – Will we again go to a separate keynote and DE? – We could

Eric – We should. Not sure Topi will draw, we should find someone “hot” – Eric admits he does not know anyone “hot” and self admits “he needs help” – We collectively discuss options for Austin.

Moved to accept Topi for DE – Seconded – Accepted

## AUSTIN ENTERTAINMENT

Tom – Question, who pays? Might make more sense that EDSIG pay for this as a “member benefit”  
Moved to approve the expense for fun night be carried by EDSIG and not ISCAP. Seconded – Passed

Tom – Fee proposed for conference attendance - \$345 – Accepted.

Add on – last year \$75 for EDSIG membership – moved we change to \$50 for EDSIG membership – Accepted.

Fellows – Li Jen was nominated, but ineligible as she is on the board. 5 other names put forth, but all ineligible. Chuck Woratschek only nomination valid. Serapiglia moved to accept their nomination, seconded, accepted.

## WEB PRESENCE / CONFERENCE SYSTEM –

Les, believes the path of EDSIG has been essentially capped with the focus on pedagogy. Les believes growth can be realized through CONISAR

Jeff – reads off the definition of EDSICON to stress that EDSIG promotes and strengthens information systems education by encouraging dialog between practitioners and academic professionals, facilitating linkages and collaboration opportunities between industry and academia

General discussion – EDSIGCON is surely not loved as a name here. Question comes if we make a change does it have to go through membership to effect that change?

Lee – fear that CompTIA will want branding on everything and if that happens on the JISE journal it would lose all audience. Question, who owns the copyright to JISE? ISCAP is listed as publisher. But what about “trademark” and “copyright” – request for ISCAP to validate the trademark

Jeff – fears that we do lose the education audience, it’s what we’ve done and protected for years

Serapiglia – We have shown in the past two years that we have a core membership who know “us” and what “we” do and that is why the attendance and growth has remained and we did not drop off the cliff

## BACK END SYSTEMS specific notes

- Eric – moved off UNCW servers to allow greater collaboration. Smarterasp.net is the new host. Better operation and cleaned up domain name registration as part of move. Work done in re-indexing and key word optimization.

- BACK to AITP questions. Branding is on our site already.

Does AITP exist – yes – for at least 1 year.

Who owns journals? ISCAP.

Danger, what happens when CompTIA sends call for papers to their 3000 partners and we get multitudes of materials on certification issues?

Tom – we have CompTIA already showing up on our websites as branding. When we write checks it goes into CompTIA bank accounts.

James – we need to simply give guidance on papers to journal editors for quality and acceptability.

Scott – There is legitimate academic work being done on certification programs and it is valid.

Serapiglia – Who are we as EDSIG? Are we tech schools/community colleges or 4 year degree programs  
– Les – we are educators all down the line.

-----

Short break for check out.... 10:29

-----

11:00 Rejoin –

Minutes/ etc/

Minutes for winter Austin board meeting found – moved to append to already accepted minutes. Passed

Minutes for Vegas board meeting – minor name corrections for spelling – accepted

Minutes for Vegas members meeting - passed

By-laws – several changes had been approved through the past three years that had not been reflected in the official document. We updated and presented current set of By-Laws.

Question on name of “special interest group for education” – is this backward and should we change.

Investigate San Antonio minutes for standing committee on curriculum matters

Moved to accept current document as official by laws. Passed

ISCAP report – see documents in the folder. Solid financial standing with reserve.

ISCAP MOU – See document. Minor adjustment for 60 day reporting window.

## 2018 PLANNING

- Based on comparisons of membership/costs/etc – preliminary cities pared down to Norfolk.  
Comparison made for several hotels in the area – The Hilton Norfolk presentation/pricing/location best fit. Recommended we approve this location. Moved, seconded, approved.

Dates – should we consider the move to different sliding window of Thursday through Sunday – vs the Sunday through Wednesday. Concerns both ways, especially in 2018 as the Wednesday is Halloween.

Talk centers to have late Thursday start and full day Saturday. Moved – no objections – passed Nov 1 through 3

2019 city options – Cleveland, Orlando, Memphis, DC, Pittsburgh – to be looked into.

Move to assign Tom as facilities chair for 2018. Seconded. Passed.

Extra items –

Tom – acknowledgement of Eric’s efforts with the website and other activities in supporting our efforts. Round of applause ensues.

Open discussion –

Les begins with asking to brainstorm how to push CONISAR more –

Tom – we do not need to abandon pedagogy, it is growing in recognition. The concern was not about the content, but the name and perception by institutions.

Open discussion concludes-

JISE – it is the consensus of the board that we move to the online. Lee details some of the logistics. Will offer to make accommodations for a possible small amount of print editions in an interim basis.

Motion – that we move publication of JISE to a web platform to be unveiled at the November conference. Seconded – passed.

Rachida makes plug for recruiting sponsors for conference

Les thanks everyone profusely.

Motion to adjourn – second – passed.