John Cech introduced the draft document update for Montana’s Detailed Scope of Work for November, 2010-October, 2011. The document incorporates suggestions received from the last two Implementation Team meetings as well as individual comments received from Sylvia Moore, Bill McGregor, Tom Gibson, Mick Robinson, Tyler Trevor, Margaret Bowles, Stefani Hicswa, Jane Karas, and Joe Schaffer.

As a result of the input and comments during this meeting regarding the Scope of Work, John Cech will take the following “Comprehensive Mission for Two-Year Education” points to the Board of Regents Meeting on Friday to open up opportunities for discussion.

Comprehensive Mission for Two-Year Education

- Identify key purposes and attributes for two-year mission at each of the campuses (Identify gaps).
- Compare role differentiation (e.g. What is the role of the two-year institution in Montana vs. a comprehensive community college? etc.)
- Lay out strategies/timelines for each two-year campus in Montana to achieve comprehensive mission.
- Implement name change – COTS/college programs (statewide consistency)—Rebranding

The remainder of this document is a compilation of comments and questions that helped formulate the above BoR discussion points.

John Garic asked about the status of the one-page Lumina grant document that Judy Heimann was going to prepare and share with the team.

Daniel: The update primarily consists of tasks. Perhaps we could separate some and they could become their own project. He felt that his next steps would be to pull out what his institution needs to do to meet the goals. There are some issues on what “two-year mission” means to others......i.e. presidents, chancellors, etc. Tasks are doable, but we’re changing a historical mindset in the state.
Mission statement gives us a good start to begin to move forward. We’ve been involved with various projects up till now and the mission has helped us refocus. Perhaps we should use the vision as our basis to reconstruct the Scope of Work.

Jane: Regarding Strategy 1—Should we revise the strategy to say COTs instead of “two-year college” mission? Also, with imbedded COT, there are additional challenges to implement the two-year college mission.

Joe: Depending on the metrics, participation in two-year education vs. two-year colleges is different. Also, high schools don’t necessarily have the confidence that some of the classes they offer will transfer. So, this is an inherent problem that we have to correct.

Annaliese: It is important to work together to reach the two-year goals. She likes the two-year strategy statement as an impetus to advocate/create a more solid basis for a two-year mission within the four-year campus.

We need to explain to the people of the state the value of a two-year education. However, it is easy to get into any institution within the state of Montana. What is the value of going to a two-year institution? We need to list WHY a two-year institution is a good place.

John G. suggested that there could perhaps be a symbolic statement from the flagship universities to point students toward two-year campuses.

We get bogged down in history? We need to start with the vision and then go to the details on how to get there. We should decide what we want two year college to look like? (Mission/Vision); create a road map to GET there. Then we should rebrand and communicate what it is.

Frank: Perhaps we’ve limited our scope by saying “two year college”. Community College may be a better target. Semantics may cause us to get bogged down.

Joe: We need to tackle the enrollment standards. Cost is the issue for most students; trying to engage them is a challenge.

Daniel: We need a system — where we’re working together, we’re like-minded, and with a common mission (it is a system under the existing governance structure). We need to put it out there to institutions to make a choice; we are fragmented.

Sue: Having worked at Western through the UM merger with Western, Tech, etc., it was not a perfect process but it was accomplished and people have accepted this and the MSU system changes.

John C: Friday morning, we have an opportunity to communicate this (what Dan stated above) to the Board of Regents. We will be able to have an open conversation with them.

Daniel: We can give them the draft Mission and Vision statement and we will come back in two months with a full plan; one for each institution that we’ll present.
We can define what a stand-alone college looks like, what an imbedded college looks like, and this is what they do (on the vision statement). We need to surgically remove COTs.

Annaliese: We have not had the governor’s office inform us on what the state can do to help promote the value of two-year education. How does the governor’s office help us become more productive? What can the board do in conjunction with the governor’s office to help us succeed? (They are a critical part of helping us meet our goals).

Daniel: We only hear them talk about workforce development.

Bob: Taking the mission vision and key attributes is going to be a very helpful/valuable process for the GCP.

Dave: ISKME meeting we talked about replacing two-year with “college” or some other name. Should we implement something different?