Sandy thanked all for coming to the meeting. There was no previous business or updates to the minutes of the last meeting.

Alice Hoffert (UND) proposes an increase in Miscellaneous Expenses for the 2001-2002 academic year. Based on the current College Board information regarding the Bureau of Labor Statistics (average of low and moderate consumption standards for non-metropolitan areas in north central United States) and reflecting increases in the Consumer Price Index, it is recommended that $2,700 be used for the miscellaneous expense figure for 2001-2002.

Bob Neas (NDSU) expressed concern about miscellaneous expenses for North Dakota Colleges compared to institutions in neighboring states. Our miscellaneous expense item is higher. Are we concerned about competition?

Dale Gehring (MSU) explained the marketing approach from Minot is to down play miscellaneous expense items. Recruiters discuss with student’s tuition, fees, room and board and books. They do not include miscellaneous expenses when discussing costs.

A concern was expressed that we are misrepresenting the costs of attendance by including miscellaneous costs. Our current award letters are very confusing by including Cost of attendance and EFC.

Jeff Jacobs (BSC) recommended that we ask HECN if the Cost of Attendance and EFC can be left off of the Award letter. Also can we adjust the award letter to allow institutions to edit and change the middle section of the letter. Scott will check into if we can suppress middle section of the letter.

Cost of books….Alice Hoffert (UND) reviewed with us a study from UND. 4000 UND students were eligible to charge up to $400.00 for fall 2000. 74% of the students eligible to charge, charged less then $300.00 for books and supplies. She suggested that based on these statistic that they would continue to use $600.00 as a base book cost. Bob indicated that the average book charges at NDSU was about $350.00 per student. Wapheton and Bismarck both indicated they use different budgets for different programs. When the board office is asked about costs they gives tuition, fees, room and board as cost of education.

Motion by Alice….. $2700.00 miscellaneous budget item for the 2001-2002 academic year and that schools are allowed to make adjustment to round up or down to round out budgets. Diane seconded the motion. The motion was carried with three opposed. (Dale Gehring, Bob Neas and Jeff Jacobs) Bob expressed issue with being able to fund the students. Jeff expressed a need for leeway. Lynn suggested we continue to discuss the miscellaneous costs.

Jeff Jacobs (BSC) – Consortium Agreements and tracking of the students. DSU and BSC came up with a form to track the students. Does the System Wide Consortium agreement only include Distance Ed students or all students? Lynn interpreted that the agreement is not limited to Distance Ed. Paper consortium agreements are still necessary for students not within the University System.

How are we going to track the distance students? For more discussion on tracking Consortium agreements Peggy agreed to set up another conference call.
Sandy Klein (DSU) suggested that a comparison of alternative loans be put together for students in a chart form as seen on the FINAID-L list serve. Dale suggested that Sandy extract the chart and add what applies to ND and send to him for the High School Counselors workshop.

Diversity waivers – are there any concerns from the board office? Peggy shared that at the HERO’s conference Leigh Jeanotte showed concern that some institutions are not doing enough with the diversity waiver for Native American students. He was going to do a study and asked Peggy for the Diversity Waiver Report. Dale asked if the report sent to Leigh could be sent out to our offices. Peggy will send out the full report.

State grants have been reawarded and lists were sent to institutions Tuesday, October 11, 2000. Funds for spring will not be sent out until after January due to the short fall in the program. Concerns were expressed that the students should not be affected by the cash flow shortage. There may be complaints from students for having to wait for the spring disbursement of the state grant.

Distance Education Demonstration Program

Fran Susmann – Department of Education contact person for the monitoring of Distance Education Demonstration Program

Fran summarized the purpose of the checklist and what her role is. We all have our agreements to participate in the demonstration project. The next step is creating a monitoring plan. Fran will review with each institution their monitoring plan. The goal of the checklists is to help the department learn about what works in distance ed. What are reporting impediments to giving financial aid to students. Some of the big issues are attendance and sat progress. The monitoring checklists are fluid documents.

The meeting was then opened for questions:

**What is the use of the checklist after it is complete?** To see if anything unique could be shared with other institutions. If the Department of Ed comes on site it will be used as a review tool. It will be used to review what did the institutions said would happen and compare it with what actually happened. If it is different than change the document. This is not an official document.

Fran will want a copy once complete. Deadline to complete will be December 31, 2000 so that site visits can happen in the spring.

**How will the report be compiled?** The check lists will be compiled and reported on a national level.

**What are some of the issues we see?** (Fran) Collaboration between the institutions is a bigger issue for our consortium than the waivers themselves. Systems are the big impediment in making this work. This Distance of Ed demonstration project may push us to a different system.

**If we are not to have a site visit why are we needing to complete the checklist?** (Fran) All information is important if we are going to see change.

**Will the waivers be available to us after the demo project is complete, in the cases that we develop programs based on these waivers?** (Jeff) Fran can’t say for sure that the waiver will be available. Her interpretation is that if we are successful with the project that the waiver will be available.

Lynn suggested that part of the final report be a summary of where institutions see themselves in the future.

Fran Susman’s phone number: (303)-844-3677 ext. 105
Email address: Fran_Susman@ed.gov

Nationally, schools are in various stages of the project. The majority of the schools have not needed to use the 50% waiver.
The Department of Ed is opening the demonstration project to up to 35 more schools.

**Are any of the institutions working outside the box?** (Lynn) Colorado will be separating direct and indirect cost. Direct costs are disbursed in the beginning. Indirect costs are disbursed 4 times during the semester. BYU using correspondence courses.

Fran will contact us in November to schedule the visit.

Scott suggested we take a look at the RFP for the new system. The email was sent out on September 19, 2000 with the subject: State Wide Admin System RFT.

Jeff motioned to adjourned Dale seconded.

**Bring to Decentralization Training (Bring 11 copies of each)**

Copy of memos that we send to students regarding new Return of Title IV funds to be brought to Decentralized Training.
Copy of supplemental pieces sent out with Award letter.

Respectfully Submitted
Katie Nettell