Members Present: Alice Hoffert, Pat Miller, Peggy Wipf, Katie Nettel, Lynn Aaberg, Scott Mahar, Diane Christiansen, Charlene Schuchard, Dale Gehring, Bob Neas, Sandy Klein and Betty Kuss Schumacher

Guests: Julie Kubisiak & Clark Wold

Alice called the meeting to order and proceeded with housekeeping issues. She then asked Clark Wold for a short introduction.

#1 One Stop Guarantee

Dale gave a brief explanation of the agenda item with emphasize on quality service to students.

Peggy stated that the System Office was evaluating the support from SLND for system support. The issue goes back to when Dave Soliah worked at HECN and system program problems. Concern was expressed by the System Office regarding budget constraints and staffing support from the bank. Peggy did not feel that it was directly related to the One-Stop-Guarantee Proposal.

Bob mentioned that about eight years ago when the bank first purposed system programming support, the group raised the issue would this eventually come with strings attached. It appears based on the current proposal that this has now come to pass?

Dale stated that it is important to consider the fact that in the future we will be looking at a new computer system and that at the time support from a state agency will be very important cost wise.

Alice looked at historical data that shows getting funding support from the state is always tight. Will the bank be able to give the support as needed for changes?

Julie expressed concern that she was not advised that Clark would be present and under the circumstances feels uncomfortable to proceed at this point.

Clark apologized and stated that was not his intent by being present and did not want to make the situation uncomfortable. He excused himself and said he would be available by phone if needed.

Julie then went into a brief history of loans and how the One-Stop-Guarantee Proposal came about.

Discussion followed and a number of issues were raised. One point brought out is that we currently have a well-oiled process why should we change?

Betty asked what happens if a loan application is submitted and the bank does not have an agreement with the lender, what happens? Will the application then be returned to the school? Will it sit somewhere for a while? Or will the Guarantor immediately forward the application to the proper Guarantor?

It is important to remember that competition always makes things better and has been a driving force in making SLND top-of-the-line. If we proceed with this proposal will we be moving backward? Again service to the student is “top priority”.

Scott pointed out that we could be doing Common-Line if we want to key in information twice.

Alice asked if we could get clarification on whether or not we will be able to continue to process loans with other Guarantor’s as we have too date or will this go away if we go to One-Stop which would then mean many manual applications.
Julie indicated that as long as the system recognizes other agency software and the agencies work with HECN to make this possible, this should not change.

Alice indicated that the group needs to take some type of action.

Peggy stated we need to list the pros, cons and benefits to students. Peggy recommends a sub-group needs to be created to put things together. Sandy said she would like to see Scott included giving his position regarding programming.

Alice indicated this may need to be done by the Design Committee. Dale will call a meeting of the Design Committee.

#2 Cost of attendance Books/Supplies - Lynn

Lynn checked with some of the schools and was given some estimates on book costs within a semester. Science books tend to increase 10% each year.

JTPA pays for all the book costs but Voc Rehab pays only what the college COA allows.

At this time $300 per semester is still in the ballpark but this is an issue that does warrant consideration in the future.

Alice stated that the internet is playing an important part in driving down the costs.

Lynn made a motion that books/supplies should remain at $600 (base amount) for another year. Diane seconded the motion. Motion carried.

#3 Distance Education - Lynn

Lynn, Scott and Jim Schaeffer attended a meeting in Denver where a number of concerns came up. The Clearing House is not set up for multiple school enrollment. Cost of attendance was a hot item. ND was used in the discussion a number of times as an example and we will be watched closely.

An institutional contact has been set up for each school across the state. Each school will be submitting data (due by Dec. 6) listing programs in the Program Participation Agreement and listing the waivers that can be used.

According to Scott, Registrar’s Offices will be running reports tonight to return to Jim Schaeffer to gather some of the data.

Three main items of concern: We need to be able to deal with on a consistent level (Satprog, cost of attendance, policies). The Dept. will be monitoring each individual school and the entire university system. Memorandum of understanding or monitoring checklist needs to be followed.

The Participation Agreements have yet to be signed. Each institutional contact is responsible for submitting a completed PPA to Jim Schaeffer. NDUS was granted all waivers available which can be found in the PPA. It is expected that the waivers will not be fully implemented until fall.

Because of the waiver of a Correspondence course definition, these courses will be considered a “class” and will be treated the same as a regular course for Distance Education students.

“Goals” is another important item to review.

The group is extremely appreciative to Lynn for the hours of work and dedication to this project.

#4 Access to Information
Scott discussed a way of rectifying differences in accessing information from different institutions. He mentioned an old policy that stated the University Office would not be allowed to access data. Both he and the Chancellor feel it is time to take a look at changing. It was asked that HECN be allowed to be considered as the 12th school and be allowed to access data as needed from the different institutions.

#5 Refund/Repayment – Betty

As of July 1 we are suppose to have a new policy. It is being worked on.

#6 Packaging Native American students – Bob

NDSU packages Native American students along with all other students based on the same parameters. Bob inquired if the other schools follow the same practice or if these students are treated differently? The response from the other institutions indicated that no preferential treatment is given. Bob has been receiving pressure from an Educational Specialist on a reservation that Native American students should be given priority for SEOG. BIA funds are reported only at the time it received. Self-reported tribal funding should not be counted as a resource until official notification from Tribal Specialist is received.

#7 Community Service (FWS) tutoring requirement for 2000-2001 – Sandy

Sandy asked for information from those schools that have a working program in place in order to prepare for meeting the requirement.

#8 ACCESS Project and financial aid – Betty

ACCESS is only a clearing house for courses it has no relation to financial aid.

#9 Scott

The Department of Education is looking for 30 computer science majors to work at setting up ACCESS. Scott feels this is a wonderful opportunity for students.

Scott also explained that Y2K has been performed with the Dept. of Education and that we came through with flying colors. All college presidents should be getting a letter to this effect from the Dept. of Ed.

Respectfully submitted:

Betty Kuss Schumacher