Preliminary Discussion of TAACCCT Grant Implementation Conference Call  
July 24, 2013


Discussion

- Matt-This grant’s intent is to create systemic efficiencies.
- Putting content online regardless of where students are located.
- Plus hands-on component: giving students some centers around the state for, e.g., weekend access.
- Different models exist; we chose the one used for health information technology model.
  - This includes course sharing (shared fees, financial aid logistics); enrollment (e.g., financial aid), and teaching.
  - Colleges doing the actual teaching would get the fte and actual coursework portion of the grant.
- John gave the example of FVCC as the teaching institution (providing the actual coursework) and Billings as the enrolling (e.g., financial aid).
- Susan-E-learning needs to be involved in this conversation.
- John said this will eventually happen, but for now, we need to iron out the basics.
- Dena discussed her experience working with informatics at Great Falls College (GFC).
- Tyler- pointed out we need to know how to count fte in colleges other than the teaching one.
- Dena-At GFC, students enrolled in their home institution, and e-learning staff put them into the courses.
  - These students were never put into Banner.
  - Montana Tech received the head counts, fte, and tuition.
- Mick-Looking at the spreadsheet handout, fte’s appeared to be counted in the enrolling college, tuition was captured by the teaching college, and mandatory fees were retained by the enrolling campus.
- Dena said that for the student, this was a seamless process: funds were collected by the enrolling campus and transferred to the teaching campus.
- Marlene-at Montana Tech, collaboration on courses occurred in 2011:
  - Communication had to occur with health informatics course.
  - Marlene completed a template, got it approved, students were agreed on, and the money was transferred.
- Tyler said when the enrolling campus counts the student, that student is enrolled in Banner.
  - How does this look on a large scale, among institutions with multiple campuses?
  - Logistics concern: data sharing becomes difficult, will have to be entered manually.
- Mick-The fee schedule used comes from the tuition charged by the teaching college.
  - Need to address the enrolling campus’s ability to capture the enrollment effort costs.
  - Tuition is all General Fund revenue.
- Dena thought the Board of Regents policy includes an item regarding collaboration.
- Matt-3-4 teaching colleges and 13 enrolling colleges; the tribals are not on Banner; learning management also has to be entered manually; files that maintained confidentiality of students
- Mick asked about the envisioned estimate of students.
- Brad replied the projection is 200-300 students will take advantage of this part of the grant and remain engaged across all three years.

- Financial aid: students lose their “flat spot” in financial aid if enrolled in more than one campus.
- Manual entry with good templates can work technically.
**Next Steps**

- John asked whether we should expand our conversation.
- Susan suggested E-learning and instruction designers may be further ahead in their thinking regarding course delivery.
- Matt suggested keeping this as simple as possible:
  - Pilot it to see if manual entry is scalable;
  - or
  - have the tuition conversation with other groups that we need to identify.
- Jerri-Have a draft model agreement to show to others and then collect ideas on workability as a reaction (i.e., do not totally open up the conversation).
- Have this ready for the August 1st conversation.
- Susan said this model is a good idea, send it to learning management people.