Meeting of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Monday, November 04, 2013
Multiple Locations by Video
Albany, Buffalo, Syracuse, NYC

Attendees:

Deb Amory, Elizabeth Bringsjord, Joy Chen, Susan Deer, Martie Dixon,
Christy Fogal, Kaitlin Gambrill, Tina Good, Kathleen Gradel, Carey Hatch,
Lenore Horowitz, John McDonald, Ann Marie Murray, Ken O’Brien, Cyril
Oberlander, Anita Bleffert-Schmidt, Candace Vancko, Star Wallin, Ed
Warzala

I. We began with approval of the 10/07/13 meeting minutes. Minutes were approved with no revisions.

II. A member from the SUNY team provided a quick update on the Open SUNY effort. Regional session follow-up webinar, CAO presentation,
UFS presentation, and ACT Conference presentation were covered.
We are currently staffing up for January unveiling. A question was asked about the degree program narrowing from nominations, and we are currently looking to launch between 4 and 7 degrees in January.
We’re looking at degrees that are unique, have potential to scale, and are of quality (accreditation, etc.), and align with NYS high-needs.
One member asked how additional campuses will become involved after January. It was mentioned that we are still figuring that out, but it’s likely that all degree programs will have opportunity to be part of
Open SUNY, and some will be “Open SUNY Powered” to start. The Provost and the SUNY team discussed the narrowing down process of the nominations (more than 60 programs were nominated), which included input from the Quality Assurance sub-group of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee. January Open SUNY Powered degree programs will cross sectors and the campuses we’re looking at exhibit best practices that may be able to help other institutions going forward. A member asked whether there were faculty members on the selection group and urged that faculty continue to be involved in all future program nomination considerations.

The Research and Innovation sub-group was recommended by one member to be involved in any Open SUNY developments related to research and innovation. It was noted that most of the work we’ve done so far in this area is logistical, so the foundation is being built now. The sub-groups may require some additional staffing resources to be most effective in accomplishing the goals with which they were charged. A faculty member’s assessment of the Open SUNY presentation to the UFS was that generally faculty members do not know a lot about Open SUNY at a base level. The FCCC has a list of questions that they would like to have incorporated into the Open SUNY FAQ. One member said they would focus on helping get faculty more involved and to ensure they are seeing the communications that are going out related to Open SUNY. Members of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee may be asked to help with communications efforts. The group suggested making sure that communications are aligned so that individuals hearing about Open SUNY for the first time don’t misunderstand its intent. One member suggested reaching out to the FCCC and UFS with specific requests.
for feedback. A member of the SUNY team reminded the group that faculty will not be asked to do or participate in ways in which they are uncomfortable in the Open SUNY effort. It was mentioned that online offers a chance to meet populations we are not already reaching; online is not due to the fact that we are not serving our in-person students, it’s an opportunity to reach new students.

III. Updates from the Working Groups

a. Quality Assurance: Candace Vancko, Cyril Oberlander, Tremayne Price – The group will need to meet to narrow their charge and determine next steps.

b. Multi Campus Programs: Ann Marie Murray, Tina Good, and Lenore Horowitz – We already have some programs that are registered and have made it through SED. It can take some time, but the path exists. The group had a few questions for the larger group.

   i. What do we want these programs to be?

   ii. Are we looking at cross sector or in the same sector?

   iii. Need to define cost revenue sharing model.

   iv. Need to determine accreditation issues.

   v. Program maintenance needs to be outlined.

   vi. Who will take the lead on corporate partnerships for experiential learning?

   vii. Is a multi-campus program a formal model or an informal agreement? Perhaps it can be both and maybe there are models we can use. One member confirmed that there are multiple models out there that could be used. Insight into
what barriers are currently preventing partnerships could be particularly helpful.

This seems to be one area where the business model may have implications. However, the range of possibilities out there for partnerships may mean more than one business model is necessary. A member asked what the business model is looking like for January campuses. System Administration will provide some start-up services and campuses will continue to provide resources they previously did along with any necessary additions. Georgia’s e-core model was mentioned as something we could explore, but that’s something that would likely need to be vetted by an advisory group like this one.

c. **MOOCs:** Christy Fogal, Kathleen Gradel, and Martie Dixon – The group had developed some questions including:

i. How will campuses generate revenue from MOOCs?

ii. How will registration costs impact the players?

If campuses want to use the Coursera platform, do we need to have them do something in advance to be able to do that? Financial cost analysis would be helpful for campuses. In the Coursera platform, existing courses fall under “SUNY” and not necessarily the campus on top-level through the search function. One member thought that Coursera may require that the courses be ADA compliant. It was mentioned that MOOCs are basically open educational resources, like a textbook or other additional learning tool. We may want to include a search filter for open courses in the Open SUNY Navigator.

d. **PLA:** Deb Amory, Sue Deer, and Anita Schmidt – The group found an interesting article about a student at a community college that was working at a law office, but was unable to complete her degree in paralegal and it held her back in her professional career
even though her knowledge and skill was exceptional. Stories like this are helping drive the group working on PLA forward. PLA is an opportunity for SUNY to develop and provide a good model for this area. All community colleges are doing PLA, and so are many state operated campuses. This piece fits in particularly well with workforce development and adult learners.

IV. The meeting concluded and the Chair will be in touch with the sub-groups to help continue their work. The next meeting of the full group will be on November 19th.