LEAD Conference Call
Meeting Minutes
8/3/16
2 pm EDT

Attendees: Mike Erdman, Steve Klosterman, Becky Komarek, Simon Pitts, Gregg Warnick

1. Recap, format and timing of conference survey…would like to get out soon – SK and Rebecca (10 minutes)
    - Who attended, general impression, what did they like, recommendations for improvement
    - Decided not to ask whether people will pay dues to be part of the division
    - Send to entire division list
    - Open ended questions – what would you like to see the division do?

2. Incoming Program Chair and Chair Session held by Patti Greenwalt at conference (attended by Steve and Gregg)
    - Good venue to learn what is going on in each division
    - Asked about fast early growth, other divisions saw membership degradation over time
    - Challenge to sustain numbers moving forward
    - Charging a fee to be part of the LEAD Division
        o ¾ of divisions charge some sort of a fee
        o What is a nominal fee? $3, $5?
        o Some divisions are $10 and use funds to sponsor student scholarships to attend conference
        o Be able to sponsor social, gifts/awards, social events
        o Will membership go down if we institute a fee? Membership will go down, but is that a good thing to get people who are more committed
            ▪ Another measure of that is unique attendees to events is about 120 but we show ~800 in our list
        o At the meeting, they discussed the relationship between charging and size of the group, didn't really discuss whether it resulted in more dedicated members
        o Should we focus on industry sponsorship instead? 800 members is more appealing to industry sponsors than a lower number
        o Does charging hurt or help the division?
            ▪ How do we measure?
            ▪ Technical sessions are assigned to divisions is based on # of abstracts, not number of members - with more members, Steve did not see (nor does he expect) a larger number of abstract submissions (based on 2015 to 2016 membership growth)
        o $1 per member from ASEE

3. Bringing in industry sponsorship

- What challenges exist with getting industry sponsors on board?
  - Won't be easy but Lockheed Martin, GE, etc people who are tied into ASEE are likely interested
- We may not be in compliance with ASEE's financial rules; even for industry sponsorship; ASEE takes .90 of the $3
- We need to understand what ASEE's expectations are when we begin courting potential sponsors – do they have a bigger ask in hand and do not want a division undermining that with a smaller ask
- If we're doing corporate fundraising, we need to come up with a plan to do that, connect with Dave Bayless for Ohio connections

4. Call for papers format, due this Friday to be posted on ASEE site. (10 minutes)
   - Do we want to continue that call (which is broad and general) or make it more aligned with the strategy initiative
   - Call for papers 4-6 weeks; abstracts through Oct 16
   - Gregg and Steve will get together to organize reviewers – we have over 90 people who have offered to review
   - Wide variety of reviewer styles, could be 6 pages or 3 bullets of feedback
   - Call for papers has been the same for the past couple of years
   - Categories outlined assessment, curriculum, innovation, and "other" topics
   - We can change the call to be more specific - relate to our strategic plan
   - Preference for papers with true assessment data rather than "we have this great idea" without any results or data
   - ASEE acceptance rate was about on par with the rest of the conference
   - Review the call for papers - should we have high level categories with examples below it?
     - Right now, somewhat unfocused
     - Everyone look it over and provide feedback by tomorrow to Gregg
     - Have an option to allow novel topics
     - Opens it up to more cross-division sponsorship, support
     - Work in progress welcome/not welcome? Not consistent with higher quality directive

5. New schedule and format for next year's conference…one plan was to have COMPLETE host workshops. Does this significantly change our ability to do so? (10 Minutes)
   - Moving tech sessions to Sun, Mon, and Tues
   - Move workshops to Weds
   - Able to schedule sessions on Sunday but not obligated to
   - Lots of change elsewhere in conference on when things will be offered; program grid is available
   - There are 4 tech session timeslots on Weds
   - We'd prefer not to have any on Sunday
   - International Forum will now be on Weds
   - P-12 sessions will be on Saturday

- Sunday starts with technical sessions and then division mixer with plenary on Monday at 8
- We could have an active session instead of listening to papers, to get more attendees on Weds
  - Will people stick around until the afternoon on Wednesday?
- Weds workshop overlaps with 2 tech session timeslots
- Coming in on Sunday isn't appealing, neither is traveling on Thur after Weds workshops
- We pay to have workshop space, panel gives you flexibility, pay for workshop
- Panel could be members of COMPLETE that present demo on what they consider to be best practice (to avoid additional workshop costs)
- Leo and Joel did a workshop a few years ago, but the concept where you had an hour to do active workshop and demonstration of best practices was really valuable

6. ASEE Strategy Initiative. What do we need to get started? (10 minutes)
   - Simon: I don't know if we actually NEED anything to get started like access to membership list
   - List of volunteers for each strategic plan focus area
   - Strategic plan committee hasn't started or discussed the implementation phase yet
   - Becky will send out strategic plan group volunteer list again
   - We will continue this discussion at next meeting

7. Timing and format of future ASEE officer meetings (10 minutes)
   - In the past, we have tended to meet every 8 weeks last year – the group agrees that this seems appropriate
   - Most work on Gregg in the short term as Program Chair
   - 8 weeks would be around October 16th, Steve will send out Doodle
   - Next meeting: discuss abstract submission, quality status