

UCAP Sub-Meet & Confer Notes
3:00pm
2nd floor Conference Room - Memorial Library

Present: John Lindberg (FA, Co-Chair), Ginger Zierdt (Admin, Co-Chair), Pat McKinzie (FA), Jennifer Turner (FA, notes), Andrew Roberts (FA), Pat Nelson (FA), Marcius Brock (Admin), Dan Cronn-Mills (FA, Ex Officio), Anne Kuzma (FA), Paul Wyss (FA, guest), Michael Gustafson (Admin, guest)

Meeting start: 3:05pm

1. Status of undergraduate levels/learning outcomes/BA-BS distinctions (follow-up from January's Sub-meet) (John Lindberg, FA)
 - a. Shared a handout regarding learning outcome and class level guidelines.
 - b. Paul Mackie sent suggestions.
 - c. We actually have guidelines, but they aren't linked anywhere. It's buried.
 - d. FA: like the revision. Good to point out that you should not include assessment tools.
 - e. Admin: so, are we recommending these?
 - f. FA: this should really go to the executive committee. This has already gone to the Dean's Council (will verify this with Kim Greer).
 - g. Ultimate outcome is we're recommending to move this on.
 - h. Only have undergraduate-level expectations, no grad-level expectations.
 - h.i. It's nice to have these separate. Would be good to have both, but ok to consider them separately.
 - h.ii. They had good definitions for MA vs. MS.
 - i. Motion and second to move forward to FA.
 - j. FA: move to policy? Admin: that would be the next question (policy vs. guidelines).
FA: composed to be guidelines, not policy.
 - k. FA: "current policies will be maintained" under BA/BS...do we have current policies? If someone challenged, how would we defend? Admin: that was part of the impetus for this. FA: change "policies" to "standards?" FA: language requirement? FA: it's listed in the bulletin. FA: MnSCU policy line (2.a and 3.a) could it be removed? Is there any reason to keep it in there? FA: MnSCU policy is ineffective. FA: so, why keep it? FA: leave it in to demonstrate "good faith attempt" to follow policy. FA: but it's wrong! FA: that's a bigger question. FA: avoid confusion by leaving it out? FA: brings up question of what is "liberal arts." FA: bigger question: is this point adding clarification or adding confusion? This is a document to help us here. Does this provide guidance? FA: have we ever had anything kicked back by MnSCU because it doesn't fall into policy of BA

vs. BS? Admin: not that I can remember. FA: can we remove those lines? They don't add value. FA: ok, strike out. With modification (strike 2.a. and 3.a. and line on p. 1) we move forward to next stage. APPROVED.

- l. FA: There could be departmental guidelines added to these. We want flexibility.
 - m. Admin: if this moves on to FA/admin, what is our desired timeline? Comments for March sub-meet? FA: yes. Lindberg will send to Mary Visser. Zierdt will send to CoD for pre-reading.
 - n. FA: add line saying these guidelines don't supercede guidelines in specific disciplines for both BA/BS and 100/200/300/400 levels. This should help.
 - o. Suggestion to move line about BA/BS differences to an overarching statement.
 - p. FA: was HLC looking for this? FA: no, but it will probably be asked about. We just need to show we're addressing the issue.
2. HLC discussion/preparation (Pat Nelson for HLC Assurance Committee)
- a. HLC probably won't ask to meet with UCAP. Part of assurance document is that UCAP and CDS exist to approve proposals with FA and admin.
 - b. It's good we're standardizing objectives—this question would probably come up from HLC.
 - c. HLC visit will be scheduled out, but there are open listening sessions. Attend and be honest. They expect us to have some flaws; talk about these and address these.
 - d. Assurance document is us explaining what we do/who we are. Draft is being locked down next week.
 - e. If you don't want to have contact with HLC reps, you don't have to. They'll be camped out in the CSU.
 - f. Subcommittee wanted to make sure they touched base with everyone
 - g. We get their schedule 2 weeks before. Who they want to talk to and when they want to talk to them. They might pull in multiple groups for conversations (e.g. UCAP, Planning)
 - h. Come March 28 and leave March 29. Two full days.
 - i. FA: Is it possible they will want to speak to committee chairs? A: yes, will likely want to speak to chairs in a group. If you can't make it, you can't make it. We'll be as accommodating as possible
 - j. Assurance document is still up on the website for review.
 - k. Admin question: federal compliance document and HLC assurance are complimentary, have you reviewed the federal document? A: No. HLC is much less locked down—our opportunity to tell our story. Federal document is saying our policy

and whether we are able to follow them (are you doing it like you said you would do it?)

Example: Federal compliance: why are some of your classes more than 5 credits?

HLC: Do you have a system for tracking curriculum changes? Describe.

3. Extended Education visit - UE definitions | Academic Partnerships overview

a. UE definitions—handout (Paul Wyss for Jean Haar)

- a.i. Shared a handout of definitions. These were created because prior list was convoluted and difficult to understand
- a.ii. These definitions fit with definitions used by HLC
- a.iii. Admin: Think through how these definitions link to our program inventory. Location is important to MnSCU, delivery mode is not so important.
- a.iv. HLC is also interested in these things. It doesn't matter what our definition is—it matters what they say/use.
- a.v. FA comment: this has implications for CDS. With Lynne's approval, we modified to make them more faculty-friendly. She is ok with these changes and convert info back into HLC/MnSCU terms once it is received.
- a.vi. FA question: student a long time ago needed proctored exams for a correspondence course. Where would this example go in the definitions?
FA: predominantly online? FA: this doesn't seem to match completely. FA: not sure this is something we really offer. Admin: pedagogy for online learning is a moving target. FA: If you wanted to offer this kind of course, you couldn't with these definitions. FA: not sure if you can offer these courses without an instructor. FA: if this does pop up, you could fit it into one of these definitions.

b. Academic Partnerships (Michael Gustafson)

- b.i. IFO bargaining group recommended we meet with all sub-meets to field questions about Academic Partnerships. Make sure there is clarity.
- b.ii. Lots of misinformation. No one has made a recommendation yet...trying to find a balance between bringing information too early vs. too late. We're trying to put together all information to determine the economics model—asking "does this make sense?" What roles will Academic Partnerships play vs. us. All of the questions are on the Extended Learning website (FAQs: <http://www.mnsu.edu/ap/faq.html>).
- b.iii. Growth is scary to some people—what happens if we grow as some of the numbers say we might? Trying to work through this to make a recommendation. It might not go.

- b.iv. One of the terms used is “coaches”—this might mean they should be IFO. If this is the case, it won’t make economic sense.
- b.v. There are differences of opinion. Healthy disagreements.
- b.vi. FA: it’s messy.
- b.vii. Admin: looked into it because it might meet a student need (distance students without ability to come to campus). It might not make sense, but the rationale for looking into it is strong.
- b.viii. Admin question: can you provide high level summary of the program?
 - b.viii.1. Admin: Master’s of Ed, MBA, Nursing are the three programs. On the website you can view the presentation, next steps, etc. for more investigation. High level: looking at doing a pilot with the RN to BSN nursing program. Looking to meet an unmet need. There will be a legislative requirement...this company has identified this need and proposed using our product and using their channel to distribute via a carousel delivery model. They are good marketers; we just don’t have the money. Bring what we each have together. Constraints: faculty, teaching-student ratios. Model AP uses is student-coaching/TA model, similar to our gen ed model. AP puts in money, we put in time. Shared risk/shared reward model. They get half the tuition, but put up all the money. Can buy something from Pearson’s, but we have to put up the money. It’s so complex—it’s hard to give an executive summary. Go to the website. Let’s not forget what this is about—helping a student.
 - b.viii.2. FA question: If we pursue this, will it go through an RFP process? A: yes; another organization (not AP) could get this.
 - b.viii.3. FA: how many similar organizations are there? A: we know of seven, but might discover more through RFP process. There’s only one other company that offers the shared risk/shared reward model, there’s one hybrid, and the rest are “you pay for it” model. Need to see what MnSCU is willing to do.
 - b.viii.4. Admin: potential MnSCU engagement...we might not be the only 4 year program to pursue this. Response: multiple questions here. They are not talking to other MnSCU schools, and they don’t want to put up so much money. BUT, we are only looking at nursing, so they might look at setting up another program at a different school (e.g. MBA elsewhere). But they know we have the best nursing program. They specialize in working with public institutions. Theory and hope is that we’re on the leading edge and can make a fact-based decision. It wouldn’t make sense to put effort at multiple institutions toward developing this sort of program.

- b.viii.5. Part of this is also how students want to learn today. AP shared market stats on how students make decisions: how soon can I start? How long will it take? How much does it cost? And THEN brand of the institution. AP has designed their approach to meet this decision-making process (thus 8 week classes, instead of semesters). Idea for meeting student need is there. MnSCU has the opportunity to meet student need, if it makes economic sense.
- b.viii.6. FA: I don't think this has much UCAP impact. Classes are already there/approved. It's scheduling and staffing. Challenges are from the mechanical side (how delivered, impact on faculty). Admin: someone is going to do this somewhere, so we should think about what can we do, how should we do it. FA: concerns have been around roles of faculty and coaches. We don't have guidelines in the contract... but the contract isn't set in stone. FA: this slows down the process, but could approach with a memorandum. Admin: an analytical approach like this is great...we need to do due diligence. FA: need to think about how we do what we do differently. Support from administrators for online learning is diminishing according to a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* article. They are thinking in ways that work for them right now, instead of what might work in the future. This might be a way to help other programs grow.
- b.viii.7. Admin: sometimes we forget, and we need to remember, that the student is the decision maker. Millennial students want education their way on demand. Someone needs to meet this need. As objective as I can be, I ask "do we meet their need?" New opportunities will not eliminate what we do here.
- b.viii.8. Admin: what have been other institutions value-added upside? What is the win for other programs in doing this? "How soon can I start? How long will it take? What will it cost?"—will help with this. It won't do harm. We would get their experience—touchpoint, frequency of review—they market and advertise the program...they have the data and could help us use and leverage this model in other areas.
- b.viii.9. FA: you've talked about what the students want. What about what they need? How does the quality of education compare? Admin: these measures do exit...surveys and board certification pass rates are good. I would not compromise quality...we should design the approach that meets student needs and meets or beats quality expectations.
- b.viii.10. FA: seems like this is meets needs of non-traditional students (i.e. not right out of high school). It won't necessarily be the same

experience. Admin: this isn't instead of, it's in addition to. I'm not going to get into a philosophical debate, but it's important to see this as "in addition to."

b.viii.11. FA: number of potential students is astounding. Admin: Case study at University of TX Arlington had 150 students and grew to 5000. This is a job security/professional development issue. FA: there is huge market demand. The company sought us out because we have the curriculum and reputation. Nursing department will have to figure out how to add this with the resources available. Coach idea: we forget we have a variety of teachers—grad assists, teaching assists, adjuncts—so there isn't a rigid structure.

b.viii.12. FA: did the school that expanded hire a bunch of people? Admin: they used the money to hire some faculty, but this includes support people. The key to this operating model is coaches. FA: this isn't for us to decide, it's for nursing. Admin: RN program requires clinical. AP helps us find these connections/opportunities.

b.viii.13. FA: I hire grad assists/teaching assists. Who hires these coaches? Admin: we do. We interview/talk to/hire/fire. We own everything...whatever we want or don't want. But the model is what is different for us.

b.viii.14. Admin: on the support side: as we scale, there's a tipping point where you make due with where we're at. Admin: AP will help. We can also talk to other institutions who have done this to see how they dealt (what went well, what didn't). We don't have to reinvent the wheel.

b.viii.15. FA: comments I've been getting have been that quality doesn't seem to be the focus of these conversations. Admin: we value this type of feedback. Uncompromised criteria is that we never compromise on quality. FA: should publicize this commitment to quality more. Get this statement out front/center.

b.viii.16. FA: It takes a team to produce a high quality product. Two different experiences we're providing. Credential should show this. Attending a brick and mortar university will give different experiences than online program. Admin: I'm not going to touch this debate. FA: we also have on campus students that just show up for class and don't engage with the rest of campus. Admin: students will still be held accountable to the same student learning outcomes. Employers will hold them accountable to these outcomes. Admin: won't hire them if they don't meet the needs. If we ever compromise quality, we'll hear

about it. FA: nursing will also scream, if quality is compromised.

Admin: it's important this is led by faculty.

- b.ix. This is just a pilot/an idea. I've been called a radical. Thank you for your time. Talking to you teaches me what I need to make sure I cover. Thank you.

4. Other

- a. March sub-meet is March 15th.
- b. Still have a few curriculum proposals. We may do an electronic vote, if appropriate.

Meeting adjourned: 4:48pm

Notes respectfully submitted by Jenny Turner