Meeting of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 20, 2014
Multiple Locations by Video
Albany, Buffalo, Syracuse, NYC

Attendees:


I. The meeting began with approval of the 1/30 meeting minutes. They were approved with no revisions.

II. The Quality Assurance group led a discussion based on their report. The quick form was revised based on recommendations from the last meeting of the group. There was also a change to the listing of the campus leadership team to include program directors and others. Also, data points mentioned in the meeting were added along with links to the Sloan Quality Scorecard and links to applicable Provost’s office webpages. A statement was added to ensure that campuses have evidence of processes used related to accessibility. The Chair introduced a motion to adopt these QA documents and forward them to the Provost for consideration in Wave II of Open SUNY+. The
motion was approved and these recommendations will be forwarded to the SUNY Provost.

One member asked whether the rubric for QA would be included with the call for nominations. The group will recommend that the rubric be included with a call for nominations so that campuses can see evaluation criteria.

A member of the SUNY team provided an update on the Open SUNY project and highlighted the upcoming SOL Summit, some organizational changes, and progress of the COTE teams. A member of the committee said that it may be appropriate for the members to receive an overall project update on a regular basis between meetings so that they can clearly see how their work is fitting into the larger project.

III. The MOOC sub group Coursera FAQ was the next item on the agenda. The group was asked to see if there are any items that need to be added, removed, etc., from this FAQ. There was question about the incorporation between Learning Management Systems (LMS) and MOOCs and it was explained that LMS systems have a limit to the number of students that can log in based on contracts, so direct-in-LMS MOOCs are not ideal. However, there are some tools that can link with LMS like Blackboard that can help connect MOOCs into the LMS environment.

A member wanted to make it clear that the MOOC FAQ is an evolving document that will continue to be refined and expanded.
Some revisions were proposed to the FAQ: A link to more information on flipped classrooms will be incorporated into the document and some grammatical and text changes were made. Multiple revisions will be made to the MOOC FAQ based on the discussion and it is considered approved with feedback to be incorporated on an ongoing basis.

IV. The MOOC subgroup asked if there was any feedback from the group on if they were on target and what they’d like to see this group work on next. The creative commons license for content is something that the group feels is very important and can be modeled. One member said that they had over a dozen agreements for Open Textbooks that faculty have signed. Once faculty realize that it’s non-commercial and that no one can profit from their open materials, it eases some of their concerns, but it also may limit the potential for use of these items. The sharing of revenue for open educational resources is something to consider exploring going forward. One member noted that as a copyright holder, the owner is able to share their content in multiple ways and specify how they are comfortable with others using it (free, for a price, etc.). In the FAQ, we might want to draw some distinctions between course content and OER content to make things clear for faculty.

One member noted that the challenge of MOOCs is probably more of an issue at the campus level because funding, support, etc., are items that could hold up a faculty member from doing a MOOC they want to create. IITG grants could be something that helps incentivize and provide support for MOOCs and other innovative online learning items. A member of the group highlighted that Coursera and other
MOOC options could be a great way to build international or multi-campus collaborations. It was again emphasized that Coursera and MOOCs are just one tool in the toolbox available to faculty.

A member of the group wanted to know where they would begin in starting a MOOC if they didn’t know anyone plugged into these discussions/people in the know re: MOOCs. It was hypothesized that the professor would likely start with someone on their campus, but the different technologies available on each campus make it difficult to have one uniform answer to the “where do I start?” question. Encouragement of collaboration across the system could help address the issue of campus staff not knowing where to go or having limited options available. The Learning Commons can go a long way to opening up collaboration too. The Center for Online Teaching Excellence and some of the best practices from years of experience with SLN are another asset that can help foster collaboration.

One member wanted to know if there is topic on Open SUNY at the shared conference governance meeting on April 23rd and 24th. Deadline for submission is February 28th. It was suggested that members of this group lead a panel on the open process that has been used to develop and implement Open SUNY.

V. The meeting concluded. The next meeting of the full group will be on March 12th.