Meeting of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Monday, July 21, 2014
Multiple Locations by Video
Albany, Buffalo, Syracuse, NYC

Attendees:
Deb Amory, Cole Campilese, Susan Deer, Martie Dixon, Christy Fogal, Tina Good, Kathleen Gradel, Fred Hildebrand, Karin Hilgersom, Lenore Horowitz, Christine Kroll, Mark McBride, John McDonald, Ken O’Brien, Phil Ortiz, James Pitarresi, Kim Scalzo, Anita Bleffert-Schmidt, Candace Vancko, Star Wallin, Ed Warzala

I. The first item on the agenda was approval of the May and June meeting minutes. Both were approved without revisions and will be posted to the website.

II. The second item on the agenda was a discussion and update about Open SUNY Wave II nominations. Since the first scoring, campuses that met criteria based on their original submission have engaged in webinars and submitted letters of intent to work with the Open SUNY team. Additionally, campuses that were asked to submit some additional material to clarify or expand upon their nomination have also participated in introduction webinars and will provide letters of intent by 08/01 with next steps to follow.
One member asked how Wave II and the SUNY High Needs RFP are tying together. It was explained that Provost’s office staff met and looked at submissions to see where there were duplications/overlap and those programs were noted. Verification of programs is underway in relation to the High Needs RFP, but there is yet to be a definite date for final approval/funding. Coordination of Open SUNY and tangential activities may be an agenda item for this group in August.

One possible path forward on programs powered by Open SUNY+ is to not have a specific “wave” method going forward, but to fold “+” designation into existing Provost’s Office review processes. One member of the group was concerned that we may be shutting down the “wave” process too soon as we still have momentum (it was suggested a third and possible fourth wave be implemented before stopping to keep the process open and transparent). A member of the SUNY team said that we may want to have the current method play more with the development of new programs vs. nomination of existing programs. A member of the committee wanted to ensure that there still be opportunity for existing programs to become powered by Open SUNY+. It was noted that campuses new to this process may need a higher level of support from System Administration in the beginning. It was explained that there will be a much clearer and codified model available to new campuses if we were to begin to move toward a lower-touch type of model.

There is also the possibility of turning on supports and services campus by campus, or department by department, rather than program by program. A member of the POSAC wanted to know if the
group will have a chance to review potential processes going forward. The answer was “yes.” This may be a topic of conversation at the August meeting.

A member of the committee wanted clarity at some point on whether the model Open SUNY is striving for is to focus on existing online expertise at campuses or to turn on/increase expertise at campuses.

It was noted that smaller campuses may be having a difficult time becoming plugged into the Open SUNY+ process. The Open SUNY team should be sure to help campuses of all sizes have a chance to participate if they have the funding/resources to do so.

III. The third item on the agenda was a quick update from the MOOC subgroup. The group created an overview document of the MOOC landscape at SUNY. The group may work to develop a checklist (beyond the FAQ) for campuses to use/consider when thinking of developing a MOOC. The group is also looking into developing a content strategy for what types of MOOCs would be most beneficial/useful/needed across SUNY.

Revenue sharing is another item that will be under consideration by this group. There is also a decision matrix that may be scaled for use across multiple SUNY campuses. MOOCs will be an agenda item at the August meeting.

IV. The fourth item on the agenda was review of the multi-campus framework report. Fair share of effort and resources is key to effective multi-campus programs. The Georgia model was one of the most
informative and interesting models that this group explored. If this model is done correctly, the transcript for the student is seamless and will show which campus offered the course and at which institution. A code could be designated to shared courses/programs to highlight them for financial aid/business office purposes. The HVEC consortium will serve as a test for the model developed by this group. Data from the last couple of years will be filtered through this model to see how everything plays out. One member mentioned that it might be nice to have another consortium (such as OWL) try this model as well.

One member said that the framework for sharing revenue is likely what campuses are looking for (specifically Community College Presidents). Concerns for faculty include academic autonomy. For administrators, it is generally concerns about financial autonomy. The FTE allocation is one item that has proved problematic in the existing cross-registration policy; because of this, Provost’s office is exploring the possibility of other models. One member said that they are generally not concerned about a model that involves providing a portion of funding to SUNY System Administration to help administer background items to make this type of process work smoothly. The complexity in differential tuition between State Operated Campuses and Community Colleges was noted by a member of the group.

Any suggested revisions will be sent to Karin Hilgersom of the multi-campus program group and then circulated with the group again before being finalized.

V. The final item on the agenda was a discussion of the path to 100k. One member said that they think the real focus of this is for SUNY to
serve the citizens of New York as it best can—whether that be 80k or 120k, the mission is still the same. The large number of underserved individuals in New York State does seem to make the 100k goal seem more attainable than if we were not aware of such statistics. One member said that what interests them most about this effort is that SUNY, as a system, brings the promise of quality to the table. A survey is being distributed today to select students in NYS and beyond to better understand what students are looking for in online programs/education options. The survey will also include some brand analysis to help inform marketing enrollment efforts. One member suggested that we might need more fully-online programs to provide students with what they want. Public/private partnerships were highlighted as a way to help move SUNY down the path to 100k.

VI. The meeting concluded. The next meeting of the group will take place 08/18/2014.