

**The Bitterroot College Program of The University of Montana**  
**UNAPPROVED Meeting Minutes: Monday, October 26, 2009**

The Steering Committee of the Bitterroot College Program of The University of Montana met on Monday, October 26, 2009 from 2 – 3:40p at the Carriage House Annex in Hamilton. The meeting was chaired by UM Academic Vice President and Provost Royce Engstrom. In alphabetical order, attendees included: Tim Bronk, Victoria Clark, Royce Engstrom, Carlotta Grandstaff, Mary Moe, Deb Morris, Rick O'Brien, John Robinson, Bobbie Roos, and Lynn Stocking.

Excused were Sharon Alexander, Katelyn Andersen, Anita Driscoll, Chuck Jensen, Kimberley Mills, Dixie Stark, and Patricia Wilson.

Members of the public in attendance included: Frank Laurence, Jim Olson, and Janet Woodburn.

Taking meeting minutes was Bruce Weide.

Provost Engstrom opened the meeting by introducing new Steering Committee members Deb Morris, Anita Driscoll, and Kimberley Mills. Of the new members, only Deb Morris was present. Following the introductions, the committee approved the meeting minutes from October 1, 2009.

Next on the agenda was Interim Director Victoria Clark's report. Clark's report began with an overview presentation of the scope of work before the committee and a timeline for completing the committee's tasks—all of which were summarized in a handout entitled "Bitterroot College Program Steering Committee Scope of Work Timeline - Project Map." Clark explained how over the course of the current academic year the strategy was to begin with Educational Planning then move to Organizational Planning and, finally, end with the production of a Master Plan document providing a comprehensive proposal for the delivery of sustainable and responsive adult and higher education services in Ravalli County. Clark's presentation also included a discussion of ongoing Operations, meaning that while on one hand the committee was charged with a significant planning task, it was also charged with providing guidance and oversight of the UM's ongoing effort to provide local higher education services via the UM's Bitterroot College Program.

With respect to Educational Planning, Carlotta Grandstaff asked about the data analysis, wondering if there was enough substantive data to examine and whether such an analysis had already been done during the community college effort. Clark replied that demographic and existing Montana University System (MUS) student data did exist, and that while previous analysis had been conducted, it was important at this point to start with a "clean slate" and "crunch the numbers" anew. Provost Engstrom noted that it was critical to formulate the data questions first before "crunching the numbers." Mary Moe affirmed Provost Engstrom's point, and Clark noted that "it was important to have a direction."

Next in the Interim Director's Report was Clark's discussion of Operational issues (which she noted she had initially termed Implementation issues, but now was switching to the term Operational, as this was more in line with Project Management terminology). In Clark's summary of Operational issues, she mentioned finalizing the Spring 2010 BCP course list, noting that she was just waiting on final budget numbers to see if the number of courses offered could be upped from 10 to 14. Clark also mentioned that she was working on getting out an BCP Adjunct Faculty Pool Advertisement, as instructors had not been identified for the BCP Spring 2010 offerings as of yet. Clark noted that adjunct faculty pay would

be \$775 per credit hour for those living south of Lolo and \$1000 per credit hour for those living north of Lolo (the extra compensation being for further travel).

At this point the discussion turned to how the BCP Spring 2010 courses had been selected and what other types of courses might be needed. Mary Moe and Tim Bronk expressed an interest in understanding the process of course selection. Clark noted that she and Lynn Stocking had looked at what current Ravalli County COT students were majoring in and what courses would then fit with those majors. Health care majors topped the list, with General Studies next; consequently the BCP Spring 2010 course list reflected those requirements in those majors. John Robinson pointed out that there seemed to be a local need for education courses (for teachers to remain certified). Frank Laurence suggested a local interest in business law courses and also wondered how many of the current BCP students had taken courses with the Hamilton Higher Education Center (HHEC). Clark responded that exact numbers were not known, but that several current students had spoken to her about their past experiences with the HHEC. Clark then made the general comment that “we wish we could satisfy everyone’s needs now but we don’t have the infrastructure nor the analysis. This time around we offered courses with the most cross over and in health services. We can’t do everything yet but we’re working towards that end.”

Clark’s report then addressed the topic of non-credit programming with respect to computer courses like Word and Excel for which she had been getting a number of requests for as of late. Bobbie Roos asked if public organizations and private employers what been surveyed as to their non-credit training needs. Tim Bronk expressed his concern that an expansion into non-credit programming would hurt local schools and take away from existing offerings. He voiced the need for collaboration.

The final piece of Clark’s report to the Committee mentioned that the new BCP website was scheduled to be launched by the end of the month, that she was working with UM-COT Recruiter Nicole Brandt to develop a new student orientation which would be launched in December, that the BCP Business Office was set to move to its new location at the Ravalli Entrepreneurship Center after Thanksgiving, that Clark would be attending a PEP Talk training in Butte in mid November (Career Planning training), and that Provost Engstrom, Mary Moe, and Clark would be updating the Regents about the BCP effort at the Regent’s meeting in Bozeman in late November. Clark ended her report with her goals for November: complete new student orientation development, initiate advertising for new student orientation, and begin the community conversations component of the Educational Planning Phase.

Provost Engstrom then asked for questions or comments for Clark. Tim Bronk suggested that the high schools be targeted for student recruitment. Janet Woodburn asked about a marketing plan. Clark responded that high school recruitment was on her list, and that marketing needed to be developed. Frank Laurence remarked that the BCP Spring 2010 course list showed Introduction to Psychology to be a three credit course, while he thought it was a four credit course. Clark noted that this was a typo, and that it would be fixed.

With no more questions or comments for Clark, Provost Engstrom then moved to unfinished Business. Provost Engstrom asked for nominations for the Chair and Vice Chair positions. Tim Bronk noted that the committee was then not following its original protocol. Provost Engstrom noted that the committee had already decided at its last meeting to change this piece of the protocol. Lynn Stocking then nominated Sharon Alexander for the Vice Chair position. Rick O’Brien nominated John Robinson for the Chair position. Mary Moe moved to close the nominations and accept the nominations by acclamation.

All voted in favor of the nominations. John Robinson was elected Chair and Sharon Alexander (absent) was elected Vice Chair.

Provost Engstrom then asked the new Chair if he wanted to conduct the remainder of the meeting. Chair Robinson declined, and Provost Engstrom continued as Acting Chair for the rest of the meeting.

Provost Engstrom then moved to the next unfinished item—revisiting options for online Steering Committee discussions. Clark related that she had communicated with UM Legal Counsel David Afronosky about the legality of UM employees using UM e-mail addresses in conjunction with work-related social networking sites. Afronosky had responded that there was no legal issue with using UM e-mail addresses, however, he was concerned about the potential for privacy and open meeting violations (no personnel issues could be discussed and no decisions could be made online). Tim Bronk, Carlotta Grandstaff, and Bobbie Roos all wondered about who could “chat” on the forum versus who could view the “chats.” Clark replied that if the Ning social networking tool was used, that only Steering Committee members would actually be able to log-in and chat on the forum, however, any internet user would be able to view the “chats.” Clark explained that she believed the tool would “promote in-depth discussion” especially during the organizational planning phase of the committee’s work. Clark said no decision was needed today, but that she could put examples of Ning forums which were currently in use by UM groups up on the BCP website for the committee to take a look at and get a feel for what she had in mind. Clark also stated that this was an opportunity to try something new, and see whether or not it worked, and that future groups might benefit from the committee’s “experiment” with this tool. Tim Bronk was skeptical, but said he was willing to try it. Carlotta Grandstaff said that she was interested in using the online forum tool. Provost Engstrom noted that some members would be more involved than others, but that ultimately he was willing to try it. John Robinson noted that it would provide a way for members to learn who was interested in what aspect of the discussion, and that those who were interested in specific aspects could then communicate freely. Jim Olson provided the final comments on the topic stating that open meeting violations would need to be watched carefully and that a disclaimer would be needed stating that the committee would be taking no action during the online discussions. Olson did, however, strongly support the use of the online forum tool, stating that, “when you’re dealing with thoughtful, technical matters this works very well.”

Provost Engstrom then moved to New Business. Clark opened the discussion, providing her ideas for guiding questions in the committee’s Educational Planning phase:

- What offerings/programs are needed locally?
- What levels of enrollment can be expected short-term and long-term in which types of offerings/programs?
- What types of educational pathways need to be in place to serve our population?
- What types of delivery methods (multiple sites, course times/days, ITV) will maximize enrollments?
- What types of services, facilities, and information technology are important to serve our population?

Clark then explained that regarding the data analysis portion of the Educational Planning Phase she had been talking with Dan Rosenberg of Maas Companies, Inc., noting that Maas develops master plans for higher education institutions, particularly community college districts, in California. Clark stated that as her discussions with Rosenberg had become more involved, that there might be an opportunity to

actually hire Maas to “crunch” some of the needed numbers/data. Clark noted that she would keep the committee up to date on any developments on this front. Provost Engstrom stated that the proper UM channels would need to be followed before any work contract could be agreed to.

Clark then turned to the idea of creating a Committee Conversations Subcommittee to develop a plan for eliciting community input on Educational Planning. Clark asked the committee to authorized such a subcommittee, which would have 4 to 7 members and would meet several times over three or four weeks to develop a “community listening” plan. Clark hoped that not only would several Steering Committee members step forward to be on the subcommittee, but that also Patti Furniss of the Bitterroot Job Service and Julie Forster of the Ravalli County Economic Development Authority (RCEDA) would be interested in joining. Rick O’Brien wondered if this hadn’t already been done with the community college effort’s World Café sessions. Clark explained that while the World Café had provided baseline data, now more detailed programming information was needed—e.g., exactly which health care programs did the community want, etc. Mary Moe said she thought Patti and Julie were important to be on board, but that also Larry Swanson at the UM would be important. Provost Engstrom asked about the timeline for the actually conversations. Clark responded that the majority would probably be scheduled for January. Provost Engstrom then suggested the name Task Force rather than Subcommittee, for a Task Force designation had an end goal while a Subcommittee designation was generally for something on-going. Clark then asked if a vote was need to form the Task Force. The committee then agreed by consensus to allow Clark to form the Task Force. Carlotta Grandstaff, Deb Morris, and Lynn Stocking all expressed interest on being on the Task Force. Jim Olson concluded the Community Conversations discussion, commenting that when his company had done the assessment work for the Ravalli Entrepreneurship Center proposal that it had been critical to “go to the targets” with a standard set questions, rather than expect the stakeholders to come to you with ideas.

Provost Engstrom then closed the Educational Planning conversations and asked for Public Comment. Jim Olson spoke up in favor of the hiring of the new Interim Director.

Provost Engstrom then moved to adjourn the meeting, and all agreed. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Weide (with Victoria Clark summarizing)