Charge to the Committee

• General
  • Meet the University Administration (including Global Administration)
  • Discuss aspects of Purdue Global of interest/concern to the University Senate
  • Report findings to the Senate
  • Advocate for changes
What Did You Do This Summer?

• Committee met at least monthly, with *ad hoc* meetings to address specific topics

• Issues of interest
  • Resolving ‘Channel Conflicts’ between PUG, PU programs
  • Need for transparent, side-by-side marketing of PUG, PU programs
  • Common branding
  • How is IP handled at PUG, PU, combined?
  • Global NDA
    • Beaudoin sat on this issue, as it was not deemed most significant
Channel Conflicts

• ‘Channel Conflict’ between PUG Instructional Design and Technology MS, PU Learning Design and Technology MS
  • Conflict resolved collaboratively using an idea from PU LDT
  • PU LDT retains MS program
  • PUG IDT ‘teaches out’ MS program, then teaches PU LDT concentration courses
    • Provides a path to admission into LDT for PUG graduates

• Other channel conflicts remain
  • Waiting for resolution to be reported

  • Nursing (RN to BSN: PNW)
    • Geofence (may have been solved)
  • Krannert (MBA)
  • Education (MS: Applied Behavior Analysis)

  • HHS (Master of Public Health)
  • HHS (Health Care Administration)
  • HHS (Human Development)
  • HHS (Psychology)
Future Channel Conflicts - Governance

How will future channel conflicts be resolved?

- College/Unit level cooperation
  - Deans will be informed of planned new programs
  - Units will meet to discuss plans and develop solutions if conflicts perceived
  - Units collaborate to find solutions

- Agreements about marketing through to-be-developed website which steers candidates to appropriate programs
  - Differentiates via search terms, characteristics of students, machine learning
  - Deans and units will collaborate

- Geo-fencing
  - If there is a sensible geo-rationale, students are channeled to appropriate programs depending on zip-code or region

- Oversight committee comprised of President, Provost, Chancellor and others (unclear to committee) will weigh in as needed
Marketing and Branding

- Multiple discussions about brand blurring
  - Global programs should be marketed as ‘Purdue Global’ and not as only ‘Purdue’
  - Concern that candidate students were routed to telemarketers who pressured for enrollment
  - PUG has marketing budget in excess of $100M
  - How does PU benefit?

- Solutions
  - Retraining of marketers to emphasize appropriate engagement
  - Right message, right product, right audience
  - Plan for a report to committee sometime this fall documenting effectiveness of retraining
  - Committee awaits meeting with PU marketing director
  - PU will implement a single website (one landing place) that will route all prospects to appropriate programs/courses and guidance
  - Website will provide transparent marketing
  - Includes live help
  - In progress, but still waiting for mockup
• Non-Disclosure Agreement, Confidential Information and Intellectual Property
  • Committee was aware of NDA in April
    • Brought to PU administration attention late August
    • Meeting called immediately to discuss
    • B. Vandenbosch arrived at meeting with plan to scrap NDA and move appropriate sections into PUG faculty policy/handbook
    • Replaced with policy in faculty handbook on 9/5
  • PUG faculty and staff must maintain PUG confidential information
    • Committee awaits lists of PUG and PU confidential info
  • Confidential information
    • Student data (FERPA)
    • Details of vendor practices (Wiley, KHE, etc.)
    • Expect there are other categories
• **Intellectual Property**
  - Global course development process
    - Committee of faculty, instructional designers, course designers develops initial course
    - Reviewed by second committee
    - Following iterations, ‘Master course’ is finalized – owned by Global
    - Master course is delivered by a team of instructors
      - If instructors contribute own content to course, they can take own content with them
  - **Global faculty cannot take master course with them if they leave, it is community intellectual property owned by Global**
  - Scholarly work
    - Publications, research results, etc.
    - Individual content that faculty add into a master course
    - **Treated same as PU – individual intellectual property, which faculty own**
Arbitration and HLC Review

- **Arbitration required for PUG students**
  - PU and PUG both have internal processes for resolving various student complaints
  - Last step in most PU processes ends with a committee or a single administrator
  - Last step in PUG processes goes one step beyond a committee or administrator, and ends with arbitration
  - Committee awaits lists of PU and PUG processes for resolving common student complaints for side by side comparison

- **August 30 – HLC mock review**
  - Cheryl Cooky, Deb Nichols, Steve Beaudoin, Natalie Carroll, PUG faculty
  - Host: Tom Flint
    - Experienced with HLC reviews
    - Familiarize panelists about expectations of HLC review
    - NO COACHING
HLC Review

• HLC review
  • Today and tomorrow
  • Faculty committee is called to participate tomorrow
    • Includes reps from PWL, PNW, PUG

• Agenda set by HLC
  • 3 evaluators charged with conducting the visit
    • U of Arizona, Northern Illinois, Walden
    • No open faculty session (per HLC)
HLC Approval, 6-Month Review Details

• There are no preconditions – this is standard
  • “The evaluation will be focused on the appropriateness of the approval and the institutions’ compliance with any commitments made in the Change of Control application.”

• In short, they will be looking for evidence/documentation of:
  • 2A: Purdue Global policies are aligned with Purdue University
  • 2B: Transparency of information in communications to students
    • Seamless handoff of information/students between Global and Purdue system at same level of integration as with WL and Regionals
  • 2C: Formalized governance guidelines for the Global Board
    • e.g., how independent of Purdue Trustees
  • 5B: A larger group of administrators, faculty and staff involved
    • Currently ~25 teams working on administrative details of integration
    • Will expand to include faculty (details not available – will keep asking)
  • 5C: An update to Purdue’s strategic plan to reflect online
    • Our current strategic plan makes no mention of Global

• Will bring an external panel (includes faculty) to perform review
Transfer Credit

• How will transfer credit be handled at UG level?
  • Indiana Commission on Higher Education (ICHE) requested that Global courses be added to the Core Transfer Library (CTL)
  • CTL is a set of courses which should transfer smoothly among partner schools
    • IU and PU both protested (unsuccesfully) Global courses being added to the CTL
    • Purdue faculty determine whether or not a course is accepted for credit, even if it is within the CTL
  • Concern persists that Legislature may pass laws mandating academic matters about the transfer of Global credit (as they did with AP credit)
  • **Committee still learning about this process**
Open Records

• Global not subject to FOIA requests in the same way that PU is
  • Rationale
    • Expensive and time consuming to respond to many open records requests
  • Correspondence that involves PUG and any non-PUG entity is still subject to open records/meetings laws
  • Administration will provide information about PUG processes
    • Committee awaits list of what information will be routinely provided by PUG for comparison with what is provided by PU and for assessment of PUG