Meeting of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, April 02, 2014
Multiple Locations by Video
Albany, Buffalo, Syracuse, NYC

Attendees:

I. The meeting began with a request to forward any changes to the 03/12 minutes prior to the next meeting in April.

II. The group was updated on the status of the Wave II nomination process including the timeline. A member of the group asked for clarification on the experiential learning component and it was explained that there are multiple questions in the nomination form dealing with experiential learning. Requests for certificates will also be part of Wave II nomination processes. It was discussed that a communication will be sent to campuses that applied for Wave I and were not selected encouraging them to nominate again for Wave II referencing the criteria that will be posted on the website. One
member noted that the process we are using in Wave II is much improved from the process for Wave I.

Courses are a piece that will be added into the nomination process for Wave II; language courses and gen eds. were one example that was given as a possibility for inclusion as potential powered by OS+ courses in the future. The goal with these courses would be to speed time to degree/ensure students reach graduation on the timeline they originally intended. The group felt that this is a win for all involved. One member asked about where we were with e-portfolio because that could be a great possibility for initial OS+ courses. Another course that was mentioned as a possible candidate was probability/statistics. The nomination process this time around will be to have campuses suggest ideas for courses, but OS+ courses will likely not be on the same timeline as the next wave of OS+ programs.

There are three types of services to inform a business model by which Open SUNY could be funded are being looked at: base services through System Administration (COTE membership, etc.), pieces owned by campus (curriculum development, programs, internal processes, etc.), and shared items with costs being driven down with sharing (help desk, online tutoring, etc.). A member of the committee suggested a cost-sharing or revenue sharing template to help encourage participation and better define these services. Storyboarding an example or two was suggested as something that would be helpful. Members of the committee were asked to create a list of difficulties they have seen with students registering in distance courses/programs with the intent of sharing back with the group for additional discussion. It was asked that members also include a
sentence or two on “why” the student was trying to do “x” process in the first place.

III. Discussion with Peter Shea
Peter Shea from University at Albany talked about some campus perspectives around cross-campus options for students. Students can experience residency/full time issues when looking to take a number of courses from a campus outside their home campus. Peter stated that Open SUNY can probably help develop a model for cross-registration and other issues that can be the “new” model to carry us forward vs. the old model. One campus member discussed the issue of financial aid and highlighted this as something the Financial Aid Consortium could address. Right now this process requires a consortia agreement between campuses, but it needs to be done each semester—hopefully the consortium will develop a model that allows for this process to be more efficient. Data sharing between campuses was another issue that was highlighted (both campuses would need to be aware of the student’s full time or part time status to help ensure proper financial aid is calculated). One member of the group highlighted the fact that some on the committee are more agreeable than others in how experimental we can be with existing policies to make processes easier for students. University of Florida was mentioned as an example that other institutions are becoming more flexible and throwing lots of money at recruiting online students from across the country and if we don’t make changes to keep up in an increasingly competitive landscape, it won’t benefit SUNY.
IV. Updates from the Working Groups

a. MOOCs: Christy Fogal, Kathleen Gradel, James Pitarresi and Martie Dixon, and Lisa Stephens – A member of the group provided an update on MOOCs/the Coursera agreement. A process slide is in development and will be shared soon. Levels of responsibility at the campus level vs. system admin vs. Coursera are being outlined to help show who is handling which pieces of the process (and many times they happen concurrently). The MOOC group will take a look at this document too. An RFP for one or two MOOCs in high need areas or interesting areas was suggested to help initiate a process around MOOCs and Open SUNY. This process might generate interest and further the dialogue on MOOCs. An online form that campuses interested in providing a MOOC could complete is being considered to gather information.

b. Multi Campus Programs: Ann Marie Murray, Tina Good, and Lenore Horowitz, Fred Hildebrand – Based on the discussions in the last two meetings, recommendations are anticipated from this group by the end of the semester.

V. The meeting concluded and the Chair asked members to indicate interest in continuing on with the committee beyond this semester. The next meeting of the full group will be on 04/22/14 from 10am-12pm.