Meeting of the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 23, 2014
Multiple Locations by Video
Albany, Buffalo, Syracuse, NYC

Attendees:


I. The first item of the agenda was an update of the powered by Open SUNY+ Wave II nomination process. A member of the SUNY team mentioned that the Open SUNY team had received 70 nominations and how those nominations were categorized for next steps/possible partnership discussions. Two webinars have been held and campuses have said that they feel that this is a much more transparent process than the last round of partnership discussions/nominations and that the expectations were clear. Additional follow up with some campuses for exploring partnership will occur around July 11th.

Some campus nominations required additional information. This request for additional information was due as of today (06/23).
Volunteers were requested to review the 17 campus nominations requiring additional information. Kathy Gradel, Ed Warzala, and Ken O’Brien volunteered. Members were asked to notify the chair by the end of this meeting by email if they would like to volunteer. Additional review of these nominations will likely be mostly qualitative as these nominations already went through a quantitative review.

A member of the SUNY team highlighted how helpful the nomination scoring and feedback from the committee was to the process.

II. The second item on the agenda was a discussion about reactions from CIT. One member said that they noted a rather large increase in attendance, which was a positive to see. It was also noted that there was quite a bit of activity and energy around the IITG projects. Another member noted that many campuses seem to be doing blended or hybrid programs and not fully-online; this was concerning, because that will likely make the goal of 100k new students difficult.

A member of the SUNY team heard that the keynote from Daphne Koller was well received. The CAO meeting that occurred at CIT was mentioned as a piece that members were glad to see. Some of the featured speakers at CIT may not have been presenting at the right level for the audience at CIT—with a mix of people that have been in online ed. for years and newcomers as well, it was a tough audience to speak to as a whole.

The UUP presentation was noted as being “full of misinformation.” Another member that attended the UUP meeting noted that there was
a large group of folks that were comfortable with online education and were interested and committed to the medium. This highlighted a divide between the union and the faculty they represent; they did not understand that the audience they were speaking to had a different take than they were expecting.

III. The third item on the agenda was a review of the multi-campus programs group report. It was noted that the recommended model included a 20% share of tuition revenue to fund administrative coordination and support. One member noted that this type of model may not work for all campuses because campuses with robust online delivery may already be doing the coordination on their campus and the 20% would not be something beneficial for them. A member of the SUNY team mentioned that consortium models that already exist in SUNY have a similar flow of funds to support coordination when multiple campuses are involved (e.g., OWL/HVEC). Membership fees into such consortiums could be reduced if the share of revenue is done correctly.

The SUNY budget office is looking into models like this to see if adjustments to the way we currently distribute FTE allocation should be made. One member asked if there would be a way to determine how students are discovering programs (campus marketing or Open SUNY supported marketing/channels). With current SUNY infrastructure, there is not. A member mentioned that there is continued anxiety over the Open SUNY business model. The August meeting will feature an update from the HVEC consortium on testing some elements of the model outlined in this report. The HVEC consortium cross-registers the entire program at with participating
IV. The fourth item on the agenda was a discussion of the PLA and CBE report. This report will be the focus of a future meeting. PLA was the first focus of this group and CBE was second. Mastering of competencies and learning is at the core of PLA and CBE rather than just seat time. The group discovered that there was a policy implemented in 1976 at SUNY on PLA. Institutions can accept up to 30 credits according to the existing SUNY-wide policy. The PLA group supports many of the revisions in the TAACP-PLA report. The group recommends creation of a center for PLA to be housed at Empire State College.

CBE was described as being similar to a video game as you are at a certain level and remain there until you master the skills to move on to the next level.

The group will hold on making additional recommendations until the recommendations of the other group working on PLA and CBE are final.

V. The final item on the agenda was a discussion around some questions related to the path to 100k. The group will share thoughts
and ideas around these questions between now and the next meeting.

VI. The meeting concluded. The next meeting of the group will take place 07/21/2014.