UNIVERSITY POLICY AND PLANNING COUNCIL
2011-12 CHAIR: ERIC LIFSHIN

FEBRUARY 17, 2012
MEETING MINUTES


GUESTS: JoAnne Malatesta, Assistant Dean, School of Criminal Justice and Chair of UAC
Rick Fogarty, Associate Professor, History and Chair of Gen Ed Committee

MINUTES: Minutes of January 27, 2012 approved as written

CHAIR’S REPORT

No report was given

PROVOST’S REPORT

Provost Phillips updated the council on new Federal program integrity regulations. Programs (i.e. Certificates) that are viewed as Gainful Employment Programs (GFP) will have new responsibilities. Student enrollment and statistics must be reported and students must be fully informed about expectations of the program; we are required to follow them after completion to track their outcomes. This will impact future program adoption criteria, e.g. these programs will need additional sign offs by Financial Aid. The negotiated rule making process has brought this new regulation down very quickly. State authorization regarding online learning or outposts in other states will now be required to make sure that any educational activity is authorized by any state in which it takes place. This includes internships, students taking on-line classes in other states, etc. We are in the process of obtaining authorization in all 50 states. This may impact our students taking on-line courses elsewhere. The issue for UPPC is to make sure that a gainful employment box is on the impact form so these programs may be identified early on.

Dr. Phillips then handed out an update to the Strategic Plan Implementation Steering Committee. She reviewed the main areas and informed the council that deadlines for the next phase are March 1 for Academic units and April 1 for all others. She characterized this year is a ‘design and get moving’ year.

Provost Phillips then provided a 2020 update – our proposal has not yet been accepted, which has negative financial implications. Some 30 different proposals were advanced to comprise our plan. The plans were reviewed by faculty and Deans. Three proposals have already been funded internally to get them going – the other 27 have been given feedback to strengthen them for resubmittal. Dr. Phillips circulated copies of the ground rules for submitting the faculty hiring proposals. The Provost went on to say that she anticipates the same distribution of faculty across different areas, although perhaps not at the same levels that were previously envisioned. The current round of faculty hiring proposals are intended for fall 2013 arrivals; proposals must be submitted March 15th.

The Faculty Review Panel has been formed across the schools and colleges and intellectual areas – each college/school has at least two representatives, and the libraries and research centers are also represented on the panel. Dr. Lifshin asked about the metrics for awarding the new lines, and whether
it is fair to pin enrollment growth projections on these new faculty hires. Dr. Phillips responded that the individual hires will not be held accountable for enrollment growth, but rather the unit. Dr. Worden asked what will happen if we are shifting enrollment by creating attractive new programs. Dr. Phillips replied that we will have new students that will increase the general size of the pool, but we don’t anticipate tracking student migration patterns. She hoped that the 2020 plan would be complete by April.

Next, Dr. Phillips provided an enrollment update. We fell short of this year’s projection by 500 students, mostly at the graduate level, with was a loss of $3m in revenue. This will potentially reshape our 2020 plan. The usual poor economy/increased enrollment model that normally happens did not occur this time around, possibly due to the length of the recession. The good news is that our typical ‘melt’ from fall to spring has shrunk, mitigating the loss by 150 students. Discussions have occurred with program directors to monitor enrollment projections and enhance marketing strategies. Kevin Williams has done a study of the applicant pool and could not find a reduction in applicant quality – applications were up, although possibly not in the right areas. In admissions cycles, the focus is on student quality and not the dollars they will potentially bring in. As a result, a number of our schools and colleges have ramped up their marketing programs both before and after acceptance, with assistance from Communications & Marketing.

Mr. Williams asked the Provost if we are facing increased competition from other schools, both local and not, that advertise in the area. Dr. Phillips concurred, and added that we don’t do much local advertising, which may be hurting us. Our community college connections have fallen by the wayside, and our graduate advertising has not been historically aggressive. Dr. Lifshin asked if there has been a shift from private to public institutions to save money in light of the economic downturn. We saw a marked increase in applications after the 2008 economic crisis; there are some fields that may not be seen as good investments right now, e.g. teachers. It is difficult to know what the markets are for sure – we are working with the individual programs to do as much as we can to increase our acceptance and yield numbers, especially at the graduate level. Admissions has expressed concern about the potential impact of increased tuition. Affordability is one of our advantages, but that wanes as we increase our tuition.

The Provost also handed out a synopsis of the Chancellor’s State of the University (SUNY): “Getting Down to Business” report. Local impact of some of the initiatives include migration to a new degree auditing system, working to eliminate remediation, opening the door to online learning, and improving completion rates.

OLD BUSINESS

UAC GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL

JoAnne Malatesta, chair of UAC and Rick Fogarty, chair of the Gen Ed committee attended to review the updated General Education proposal and discuss resource implications. UAC took the program, feedback, revisions, SUNY 2020 and the strategic plan into consideration and has boiled it down to what the participants hope is a streamlined, robust program that maximizes student exposure to all of the benefits of a liberal arts degree while allowing timely degree completion. UPPC was provided with a synopsis of the proposed requirements. The development of a UAlbany ‘signature’ course, called Challenges for the 21st Century, incorporates elements of previous courses in diversity and global/cross-culturalism that proved to be unpopular. It is hoped that the new course design will allay the problems experienced with the prior iteration.
Writing intensive courses are a hot button issue – the proposal on the table is that the existing lower level course will remain, but that upper level writing competencies are to be fulfilled within the major. This is a whole new way of thinking about writing on our campus. Historically, we have not acknowledged that a course is writing intensive unless the course has a ‘z’ at the end.

The new General Education Advisory Board will be charged with making the General Education Program flexible for everyone – it will be a support system to guide the program as it goes through implementation.

Dean Malatesta presented the resource implications for the program. Across the board, the increase in seats will occur in the *Challenges for the 21st Century* course. As we increase enrollment, in order to meet the demands, we will likely see a dip in general education requirements – seventeen fewer credits will be required, and therefore fewer seats, will be needed to fulfill the Gen Ed requirement – this will enable students to enroll in more electives and higher level courses in their later years. Chair Lifshin requested that an appendix be developed to flesh out how this will work, and asked if certain courses will be designated as fulfilling the Gen Ed requirements. Dr. Fogarty responded that the qualifying courses will be determined by the majors, and the departments will be required to demonstrate how the writing requirement will be fulfilled to the General Education Advisory Board. Also, this will be an ongoing review process, with a substantial workload up front that will be routinized in subsequent years.

Senate Chair Fessler moved that the resource implications have been explained to the satisfaction of the council, and that the proposal be forwarded to SEC. Motion was unanimously approved.

**Campus Impact Statement Form Design**

Due to time constraints, final council approval of the revised impact form will be discussed via e-mail within the next week.

**Action Items**

Next meeting will be Friday, March 23, 2012

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stacy Stern