

UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY  
5 NOVEMBER 2003  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING  
MINUTES

Board of Trustees Present

Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber  
Daryl Barrett - SBOR  
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland  
John Busch - Uintah Basin  
Dixie Allen - SBOE  
Tom Bingham - Governor's Appt.  
Don Ipson - Dixie  
Wayne Woodward - Southeast  
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland  
Janet Cannon - SBOE  
Don Roberts - Southwest  
Charlie Johnson - SBOR  
Carl Albrecht - Snow College Richfield

UCAT Campus Presidents Present

Rob Brems - Mountainland  
Mike Bouwhuis - Davis  
Bo Hall - Salt Lake/Tooele  
Shane Larsen - Uintah Basin  
Richard Maughan - Bridgerland  
Rich VanAusdal - Dixie  
Brent Wallis - Ogden-Weber  
Miles Nelson - Southeast

Institutional Representation

Gregory G. Fitch, President  
Linda Fife, Vice President for Instruction and Student Services  
Sandra A. Grimm, Assistant to the President  
Kimberly Henrie, Budget Analyst

Office of the Commissioner

Commissioner Foxley  
Brad Mortensen, Assistant Commissioner of Business and Finance

Media Present

Others Present

Debbie Headden - Fiscal Analyst  
Boyd Garriott - Fiscal Analyst  
Race Davies - Governor's Office  
Mary Shumway - SBOE  
Greg Sanders - SWATC  
Calvin Hunt - SEATC

Excused Absent

Norman Bangerter - Salt Lake/Tooele  
William Prows - Davis  
Don Reid - Southwest

MINUTES OF MEETING  
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM  
5 NOVEMBER 2003

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held 5 November 2003 in the Utah State Board of Regents' Board Room.

Call To Order

Vice Chair Holmes called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. and the Secretary was in attendance. A quorum was present.

Approval of the Agenda

Vice Chair Holmes asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the agenda of the 5 November 2003 Board meeting. Being none, motion was made by J. Cannon and seconded by C. Albrecht to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from 1 October 2003 Board Meeting

Vice Chair Holmes asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 1 October 2003 Board meeting (Tab P). Being none, motion was made by D. Allen and seconded by D. Ipson to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Budget** (Tab Q, Attachment A)

K. Henrie: Presented the budget request information (Tab Q/Attachment A) and requested Board approval to move the request forward to the Legislature and Governor's office. The component parts are as follows:

Driving Needs/Priorities of the 2004-05 Operating Budget Request

Identified needs and priorities in response to legislative intent language (H.B. 1, Item 4).

UCAT Funding Formula – 2004-2005 Operating Budget Request, Funding Distribution Summary (Table 3)

During the 2002 general session, it was requested that UCAT (Board of Trustees) develop a budget request based on a funding formula. This is a summary of the funding distribution, based on three components: Membership Hour Growth (869,355 hours - \$4,208,600 in Net Tax Funds), Base Membership Hour Support (includes a 3% funding compensation increase for all state appropriated employees - \$899,300 in Net Tax Funds), and Core Support – UCAT Core Issues (\$1,972,500 in Net Tax Funds). The Core Support – UCAT Core Issues component, if funded, will be brought back to the UCAT Board of Trustees for a determination of distribution across the campuses. The total request is \$7,705,400 (\$7,080,400 in Net Tax Funds and \$625,000 in Tuition Offset).

UCAT Funding Formula – 2004-2005 Operating Budget Request, Financing Summary (Table 4a)

Presented a more detailed look at the summary information presented in Table 3. This table reflected the "2002-2003 Actual", and the "2004-2005 Requested Adjustments" information.

UCAT Funding Formula – 2004-2005 Operating Budget Request, Funding Distribution Detail by Campus and Category (Table 4b)

The three funding formula categories are presented in more detail and are broken down by campus.

UCAT Operating Budget Request Summary (Tax Funds Only), Ongoing Restoration of Budget Reductions (Table 1)

Presented a breakdown of the budget request by Ongoing Funding Formula (\$7,080,400), Ongoing Base Adjustments (\$5,890,700), Ongoing UCAT Initiatives (\$1,100,000), and One-Time Increases (\$4,240,000).

Ongoing Base Adjustments: Administrative Costs (Central Office, Mountainland, Southeast, and Dixie ATC), Facilities: Operation and Maintenance and Leases, Other Standard Mandated Costs (Fuel and Power Increases and ADA), Health and Dental Premiums, State Retirement Rate Increases, and Salary Equity.

Ongoing UCAT Initiatives: UCAT Information Management System and Custom Fit Training.

One-Time Increases: UCAT Information Management System (hardware), and Applied Technology Education Equipment (to help campuses purchase equipment that needs to be replaced and is not covered in their ongoing general budget).

UCAT Operating Budget Request Summary (Tax Funds Only), Ongoing Restoration of Budget Reductions (Table 2)

Presented a more detailed breakdown, by campus, of the information presented in Table 1.

K. Henrie: “We are asking you to approve this budget, so we can forward it to the legislature and the Governor’s office, and allow us the opportunity to make technical changes where needed.”

W. Woodward: Inquired as to what was meant by “technical changes.”

K. Henrie: Explained that there were some campuses that had not yet provided the “actual” cost information, and acknowledged that those campus numbers will change “slightly.”

D. Holmes: Asked if the MIS system had been identified yet.

G. Fitch: Responded that a decision has not yet been made and that UCAT is seeking a “vendor neutral” proposal.

G. Fitch: Offered to construct a letter, similar to the letter which accompanied last year’s budget request, which presents, not only the UCAT annual budget needs and the UCAT Board of Trustees advocacy and commitment to economic development, but also convey an understanding of the current economic situation in the state of Utah.

M. Madsen: MOVED to approve the UCAT budget request, as presented, and to forward that budget request to the Governor and legislature accompanied by a letter, signed by Chair Bangerter, indicating UCAT's understanding of the current economic situation, as well as UCAT's continuing advocacy and commitment to economic development. The motion was seconded by J. Busch.

Discussion:

D. Mortimer: Asked what total percent increase the request represents?

K. Henrie: Responded that the request represents a 34% increase, from \$37.7 million to almost \$50 million.

C. Johnson: Inquired as to the "pre-cut" number.

B. Mortensen: "It was about 42 (million) in state tax funds before cuts."

G. Fitch: "Just to give you an idea, the request that we've made for Central Administration, based on our needs with 3.4 people, if we were to get all of the funding we requested, we would be back at 2001 startup level for Central Administration. . . The \$75,000 that we (Central Administration) had transferred to Dixie to keep them operational is exactly (\$75,212) where we are over expenditures for Central Administration so we are using one-time money in a lot of areas simply to plug holes as we move along. So even though this is a rather significant increase, based on our growth . . . over the past two years (the legislative analysts study indicated that our growth is at 8.66% over those two years), I think that we are right in the ballpark, even though with the economy the way it is, it looks like a rather significant jump."

Motion unanimously approved and carried.

President Fitch introduced the newest UCAT Uintah Basin Campus President, Shane Larsen.

### **B. Campus Development Funds** (Tab R, Attachment B)

K. Henrie: Presented the campus improvement projects prioritization information presented in Tab R/Attachment B. Previously asked the campuses that have capital improvement projects to rank the priorities, and also requested DFCM and the Building Board to provide direction regarding their intentions. They have asked the UCAT Board to prioritize the UCAT projects and move those forward to the Building Board. "This list was taken to the Campus Presidents last week (during UCAT Campus Presidents' Cabinet meeting on October 29), they have reviewed it and agree with the priorities, and we are now asking for your approval."

C. Johnson: Asked if the Building Board has already prioritized the projects.

K. Henrie: Responded that the prioritization has begun but has not been completed.

G. Fitch: Referred to Attachment B, and the priority numbers listed to the left next to groups of various projects. "You'll notice the small one, two, three, to the left with multiple projects . . . The Building Board has asked that we prioritize each one of these individual projects, but, many of them are already ongoing, so how do you say that this one is more important than the other? So in meeting with the (campus) presidents, we looked at these and determined the primary projects. The dollar amount falls within the formula that we would normally be provided . . . and the dollars should be available, based on formula, to cover all of them as one."

D. Barrett: "Is the Building Board going to accept this strategy? Have we had any dialog?"

G. Fitch: "The dialog that we have had in the past two years has been back and forth. They don't want to be the ones to make the determination on what we do, that is what this Board will do. In this particular case, all they've asked us to do is prioritize our projects. Projects that they are already engaged in. So all we've done is go back and determine how we distinguish these. . . We assume that they are going to accept this. If not, the simple adjustment . . . would be to take the four projects currently reflected under UCAT priority 1 and break them down into priorities 1, 2, 3, and 4. But what we've found with the dollar formula is that we can cover all of them."

M. Madsen: MOVED that the UCAT Capital Improvements priority list be approved as presented and forwarded to the State Building Board. The motion was seconded by C. Albrecht. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

### **C. DATC Building Recommendation** (Tab S)

M. Bouwhuis: Explained that as part of a previously approved (by the UCAT Board of Trustees) master plan for the DATC campus, there was a building that DATC had been seeking funding for during the last five years. The campus had been seeking private funding for the building's operational maintenance and construction costs. The funding had been obtained one month earlier from a foundation who, in principle, wanted to participate in the project. Campus President Bouwhuis then received tentative approval from the Building Board of this project since it was to be funded with non-state funds. "It would consist of several bays that could be converted to any kind of business that would occupy that facility. We are looking for student entrepreneurs or entrepreneurs in the community who have projects in their garage or basements, and they haven't perfected the prototype. . . The individual companies that would rent these facilities would pay a small rent. Faculty and students would be participants in the development of the prototype. . . We also talked about the possibility of those companies paying part of the profits for a period of time, one to two percent back to the institution . . . if for some reason the building was not being leased, I have about 15 faculty . . . who could use it as classrooms. So, the space will never go vacant because the types of classes that we would put in there are one time classes, customized training classes. . . As far as the cost of the building, DFCM requires that we put a worksheet together . . . \$125 per square foot for the building. You add another \$58 for soft costs, to include design work, furnishings . . . The final cost would be \$183.50 per square foot, which amounts to a project of \$1,835,000 for a 10,000 square foot building."

D. Barrett: Requested an explanation of the process for these types of unfunded projects. "It goes to the Building Board before it's funded?"

M. Bouwhuis: Explained that it normally goes to the Building Board before it is truly funded. Sometimes, as in this case, and also sometimes with other institutions in Higher Education, a project is presented first although the funding is not currently in place, but is anticipated it will be. The sequence of this particular approval process exists so that a project won't have to wait until the next legislative session to be approved; it is taken to the Building Board in October for tentative approval. Once the funding is in place, the institution has the approval to move ahead with the project.

C. Johnson: MOVED to approve the DATC building recommendation, as presented. The motion was seconded by T. Bingham. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

#### **D. SLTATC Lease Extension** (Tab T)

B. Hall: Referred to Tab T, and Campus President Hall explained the details of the SLTATC lease extension. "It is with our main facility in Salt Lake, which is the former Libby Edwards School within the Granite School District. We initially had a 3-year lease on that and talked with Granite about extending that because we had put in some joint improvements to the facility. We wanted to make sure that we had a long window so that we could benefit from those improvements. So the request is to extend the existing lease, which is due to expire June 30, 2004, to 2006. Same terms for the next two years that we've been under when we initiated the lease."

T. Bingham: MOVED to approve the extension of the above presented lease for SLTATC. The motion was seconded by C. Albrecht. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

#### **E. SEATC Nonfunded Budget Request** (Attachment C)

M. Nelson: Explained that he is also requesting Board approval for a nonfunded project. Campus President Nelson is attempting to improve facilities and consolidate operations, which is very spread out through his region. He refers to this project request as "all things great and small"; a great project to the SEATC, but to most it's small. He is proposing to construct a 2500 square foot facility adjacent to the San Juan High School. The project cost will be \$200,000, with half of the money coming internally through funds generated over the last four years in the building trades program, and the other half will come from a CIB grant that is currently being worked on (not in place yet). The cost per square foot will be "low", using their construction trades program to do most of the labor on the project. DFCM has accepted the proposal, but request approval from the UCAT Board of Trustees before forwarding it to the Building Board and then the legislature.

C. Hunt: SEATC Vice President Calvin Hunt presented Attachment C and provided more detail about the proposed project.

M. Nelson: "Part of the concern at DFCM was to make sure that we had met the statutory requirement that there is no other space available to operate out of in the area. We have letters included as backup (Attachment C) from a college president (Ryan Thomas, CEU) and school district superintendent (Douglas Wright, San Juan School District), indicating that there is no space available to operate beyond what we are using now. The college president from CEU is assisting us with the CIB efforts, to help us to move the project forward."

C. Johnson: "You are using \$100,000 of funds that have been accumulated by the building trades students. Why are we using it for this and not something else?"

M. Nelson: "We have talked about some other possible uses, and we are in a situation that it is very difficult to start a program with what's basically one-time money to us. We can't utilize it for program use except for equipment upgrade. We have no other resource for a facility. Without a facility, you can't function. It's our number one priority. We're in a substandard facility right now."

W. Woodward: MOVED to approve the SEATC proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Allen. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

### **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **A. State Board of Education (SBOE) Report** (Tab U)

Mary Shumway, State Director, Applied Technology Education, Utah State Office of Education, presented the "Meeting the Needs of Utah's Secondary Students in Applied Technology Education" report, as is required by law and was originally presented to the Legislative Education Interim Committee and Governor Leavitt.

"In the report we basically focus on four different areas: an overview of the district program, an overview of the college and university partnerships, what's going on with UCAT, and some information on Snow College. In putting together the report, we looked at school district data, UCAT data; we too are required by law to send out a survey requesting information from the forty school districts. We also asked each region to give us some information on partnerships and some profiles that are going on in each of the regions."

J. Cannon: Expressed the importance for the UCAT Board of Trustees to have this information to assist in understanding the "big picture" of applied technology education in the State of Utah. Also expressed the importance of both groups (USOE and UCAT) to work together to do the best for the students.

D. Mortimer: "Your competency based component is really good. Janet, a few months ago you mentioned that the State Board (of Education) was doing a study on competency based. Were they studying the model that is going on here?"

J. Cannon: "Yes. We had a meeting last week and use the words "performance plus", that is our competency based proposal that we are looking at. We are undertaking a task force to help define competency. They are looking at possibly having a diploma that indicates the competency that the student has shown . . ."

T. Bingham: Encouraged Trustee Cannon to include some of the individuals in the UCAT system in her task force. "I hate to be harsh but performance plus is not a competency based education program; it's end of course, end of testing, that is not competency based. These folks (UCAT) know how to do it, and I encourage you to include some of those who have been doing it for a long time."

J. Cannon: "I will make that suggestion."

M. Bouwhuis: "I noticed that there were a couple school districts that either indicated that they did not have slots on an ATC Board or were unsatisfied. . ."

M. Shumway: "Mainly our question was, do you feel like the interests of the school districts are being met on the local regional boards. And looking at some of the comments, I'm not sure that the districts really understood that question. . . . their Board members sit on your Boards . . . one of the things that we've encouraged is more dialog, more communication between our ATE Directors and the individuals who sit on your boards to open up some of that communication. But there were a couple that felt their interests were not being met, and I'm not sure what that means and we probably need to drill a little farther and maybe ask that in a little different way. But for the most part, most districts feel that the UCAT Boards represent their interests."

B. Wallis: "I didn't feel too good about seeing the school districts' reaction to the AAT degree. That's a pretty significant number particularly when they said that felt that it had no value. Is that because, what they are really interested in is credit? Or is it the degree?"

M. Shumway: "I think the secondary directors are concerned with the transferability of this degree. It's not like some associates degrees. . . I think that the credit issue is another issue. If the student takes the transcript that has competencies on it and takes it (to a college other than UVSC or WSU or an out-of-state school), what is it that they are going to do with a transcript with competencies? It is suppose to be an associates degree. I think those are some questions that we are all asking. My recommendation is that we continue to get the word out to them . . . perhaps its miscommunication, misperception . . . there's a lot of nervousness out there . . . we hope that we don't counsel a kid the wrong way."

R. Brems: "One of the things that I can see, you talk a lot about your skill certification program . . . and we know about the competency based aspects of that program. As the AAT degree was brought forward to the legislature, as a competency based degree, which is really to the benefit of all the applied technology education family. And I know that you spoke of working toward better articulation of the skill certificate program that you have and the competency based program of UCAT, I would just urge you and Linda (Fife) and President Fitch, and the rest of us have a stake in this too, to do more work in terms of helping everyone understand the competency based aspects of both programs and then articulate one with the



other. And I would predict that would increase the acceptance and understanding of the AAT degree that seems to be misunderstood.”

M. Shumway: “I think that most understand the skill certificates and students coming out with some kind of competency certificate. But with the (AAT) degree . . . some think . . . it is equal to any other. Our parents are thinking, yes my kid is going to college and this degree is equal to some of the other degrees . . . But when you start moving out of a competency certificate mode to a degree mode, it gets people uncomfortable. The solution is to continue the communication, continue the articulation and then working through the BAT degree and making sure that it’s real. It’s on paper but there are a lot of folks questioning, why have a student go to Weber State and they were turned down and they can’t go on to a computer science degree, like they wanted . . . there’s a lot of rumor mill out there. And we are well aware of that and that’s why I bring it here. I didn’t talk about this to the legislature.”

D. Holmes: “From your understanding, you mentioned that when someone transfers an AAT degree out of state that we don’t know what’s going to happen. What about in state?”

M. Shumway: “Weber State and UVSC were to develop the BAT degree and it should transfer on. . . One of the rumor mills was, a student from DATC got a degree and then went up to Weber State. They didn’t want the BAT degree, they wanted computer science degree. . . I think that it’s clear that you can go to Weber State and UVSC . . . I think that they need to know that there are only two places you can go to move on . . .”

D. Roberts: “I’m concerned about if the colleges recognize our degree, are we recognizing the secondary, ATE certificates in giving these students credit?”

M. Shumway: “We are working on that, but with the 40 certificates that UCAT has, for example in drafting, we have four different certificates that could articulate into that one. We are hoping that all 130 of our certificates will hook into the UCAT program (40 certificates and 3 degrees).”

R. Maughan: “I think that one thing that we have to remember is the receiving institution must have a program for a degree to receive these AATs into. Utah State University, their associate degrees are going down dramatically. They have no programs to accept our associates into. . . Our choice now becomes Weber State for the BAT and BAS. So it has to go both ways, universities and colleges must have programs to receive these students into, and if they are not there, then select another college or transfer their general eds to that institution and then move into a different path. We find them very willing to accept their gen eds, in most cases . . . so the transferability is there but they must have a corollary at that institution to transfer into or it’s a wallpaper degree. And that’s why we have to look around and see where else and with proper counseling our students need to know, this is great, but you must be aware that if you go up on the hill, the transferability aspect is not as great . . . So I think that it goes both ways and I think that we need to be cautious and that we don’t accuse our sister counterparts of confusing those degrees.”

D. Holmes (Question directed to Trustee Bingham): “Regarding the transferability of the AAT degree; disregarding the transferability, do you have a sense of what the business industry, the manufacturers, feel about the degree irregardless of whether it can be transferred or not?”

T. Bingham: “I think that they are favorable, but I haven’t had a lot of discussion with them. Some of them are requiring and wanting more of an emphasis than just some of the certificates . . . But there isn’t any resistance . . .”

D. Holmes: (Pertaining to question on survey) “The two school districts who are not satisfied with their representation on the ATC Boards, have you talked to or identified two of those Boards that people are dissatisfied . . .”

M. Shumway: “No. I didn’t pay attention to who marked what on that particular question. . . One of the things that we’ve thought about is maybe we need some type of orientation program for our school board members who sit on that board. And maybe we need to take it into our hands and give them more background about what’s going on. . . And I don’t know if all of them are that well versed and that’s as much our responsibility to work with those two or three districts that say there is little involvement . . .”

D. Holmes: “I would think that the ATC Board concerned would be interested to know their people are not very happy, so I would encourage you to find out who they were and then get with the ATC Board.”

R. Maughan: “One thing that we have found, is if our school district board members have time on the district agenda to report back to that school district on what has happened at the ATC, that Board member has more ownership and more of a vested interest . . .”

D. Mortimer: Inquired as to the possibility of having one combined survey and report (UCAT and USOE) to present to the legislature.

G. Fitch: Expressed that he would not be in opposition to that, however, the legislation is specific in requiring two separate reports, one from UCAT and one from USOE. “What was interesting to us is that we ran our survey, incorporating all of the comments, and Mary (Shumway) ran hers through the State Board of Education and essentially reaffirmed what we found. So we had two independent sources doing that. The legislative analysts (Debbie Headden) also did a similar review, so there were actually three independent bodies analyzing the problem and coming up with the same result. I found it good that we had a checks and balance.”

M. Shumway: “We worked really carefully to make sure the data was the same. . . I would like to run an independent survey through this year and look at some rural issues. Debbie’s (Headden) report is looking at maybe a different funding formula for very rural schools, and what a wonderful concept that may be. But we need to look at more data and maybe work together to get some data and give us better positioning with the legislature to get more money for UCAT.”

President Fitch asked Fiscal Analyst Debbie Headden to present an overview of her report.

D. Headden: "Basically, based on legislative intent language, the legislative fiscal analysts in conjunction with the Governor's office and the UCAT Board of Trustees and the State Board of Education and Higher Education . . . we all worked together on this and set it up as Operation ACE and looked at access, cost and efficiency.

The cost component was not ready at this point, that will be done in the next year. UCAT is fairly new and are trying to come together as a system, and we are waiting on more concrete and appropriate documentation from them so that we can match them up with the cost of higher ed and public ed.

In access, what we saw was similar to what Greg (Fitch) and Mary (Shumway) have reported. For the most part, all students in secondary ed have access at least to the minimum ATE programs. However, in certain regions they have limited access or no access to the upper level courses. . . I am requesting that the legislature look at a funding model similar to a model used in public ed to help UCAT serve those students and meet those needs.

Under efficiency, we looked at duplication . . . overlapping of services. For the most part, I did not see a lot of duplication simply because of the budget constraints and most regions are working together. Under duplication, there were a couple areas of concern; it was mainly between UCAT and Higher Education where they were doing the same certificates, or an AAT degree and an AAS degree. I am saying 'may appear' to be duplicates because some regions sent me back information, because everything went out on the matrix, I took Linda Fife's matrix and added public ed and more higher ed (USHE). Some regions sent me back detailed information of what's going on for example, in Rob's (Brems - MATC) shop they had a duplication issue but what was happening was that Utah Valley (State College) was doing adults and Rob was doing secondary or like Southwest, they were doing prisoners and SUU was doing the adults so they were doing different populations. The nursing, Weber State and Davis (ATC) both offer the same nursing program, but it's because of demand, so we have some of those situations. But some just checked yes and no, and I can't determine what that means. So we're sending it back to the regions, I'm meeting with the ATE directors next week and we're going to send them back to the regions to get more detailed information relating to that so that we can take it to the legislature again in January and say this is our findings.

The next component that we talked about is articulation and we've talked a lot about that. Basically, there is some articulation in the works between UCAT and public ed. I know that Linda (Fife) and Mary (Shumway) have been working and are doing some great things to make sure that those students can move through and the system can be seamless. Also we have concurrent enrollment and the tech prep that we know already articulate. The areas that I'm most concerned with in articulation are the second certificates and AAT degrees in UCAT. Can that student who receives a Certificate of Competency in UCAT move on to the higher ed institution, their sister institution, and do they have to start over or will they evaluate and give them some credits for those competencies. So there is work going on with that. But it's more of an academia and they just don't know what to do with competency based education. So they are trying to work through that. But I think it's going to take more time than the other end; I think that public ed understands competency based better than USHE institutions. So there will need to do some work there. So I've made a recommendation that perhaps we need to come together in communicating better at the

front end of the process so that the students aren't negatively impacted because that's who are clients are. We want to insure that the students can move through the system as seamlessly as possible and our hope is that either the student can go into the workforce or on to the next level of education as smoothly as possible.

The third area, partnerships, I want the legislature to understand that there is a lot of good work going on between the systems. And as I meet with the different regions . . . a lot of partnerships going on, for the most part. The areas that are successful are because of their strong partnerships and their communication with one another. And they understand that they need to pull their resources together. . . And I tried to end on a positive note. A lot of good things are going on throughout the state for ATE. And that we do have three entities that are providing applied technology education and they each have a different measure."

#### **B. Capital Development Project Ranking** (Tab V)

G. Fitch: "I sent you after the Building Board's meeting, the placement of UCAT priority projects dealing with the Vernal Basin and BATC. This sheet (Tab V) is the actual sheet that was used and you can see that we fit in at 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> overall. The chance of us getting any type of funding, we'll just have to wait and see. . . But we will still need all of you and part of our strategic planning effort will be able to move these forward. Interestingly enough, except for one Weber State project, UCAT went ahead of all other higher education projects on this listing."

#### **C. Program Process Update** (Tab W)

L. Fife: "This is an item in response to your request last meeting to have an update on whether we have had any problems or concerns associated with the program development process. I sent an inquiry to the Instructional Vice Presidents on the campuses and also the Campus Presidents and received no responses back with any concerns. We will continue to keep you updated as you requested. And I also wanted to let you know that UCAT put its first certificate through the fast track process. It had a very quick turnaround and it's approved on the consent calendar for the Board of Regents."

#### **D. Update on SLTATC/SLCC Negotiations** (Tab X)

G. Fitch: "We're dealing with a significant history of problems and issues in that area of service. Ironically, when we talk about how USU complements BATC and how UVSC and MATC complement each other, we are not having the same effect in the Salt Lake area. What we've done, we've met several times and had several conversations, and the Commissioner has sat in on several of the meetings almost as an arbitrator as we've worked through these particular items. Oftentimes what happens is, an offer is made, a counteroffer is given, an offer is made, a counteroffer is given; right now it's basically at an impasse. . . We are looking at key components of it and have visited with Mr. Bingham because he is very concerned with Custom Fit and continuing to offer services in the Salt Lake area under Custom Fit. Just to give you an idea regarding Custom Fit, for example in the Ogden-Weber area, since July 1, has served approximately 40 businesses. In the Dixie area, they have served approximately 24-26 businesses. In the Salt Lake

area, they have issued 3 contracts of service to manufacturers and have then withdrawn those contracts. So there is little movement here. Part of that is not because they have deliberately not provided services. They are going through a number of significant changes internally at Salt Lake Community College. So we are trying to work with them and accommodate them as best we can. Under those circumstances, we are moving very slowly in that area. There was an intent or purpose behind the idea of trying to come forward with something before the legislature took action on the idea. And part of what we'll do, part of our strategic planning component, is look for alternative sources. . . Bo (Hall – SLTATC) has been very good about helping and providing information to this office . . . I've met with portions of the Salt Lake/Tooele ATC Board at different times, to get their feedback on these negotiations as we move forward. As they continue to progress, we'll keep you informed on what goes on."

#### **E. Campus Presidents' Cabinet Report** (Tab Y)

President Fitch referred to the Campus Presidents' Cabinet Agenda from the most recent meeting on 29 October 2003 to present various agenda items.

#### **Item #2 COE**

"As Presidents we sat down and considered COE because our real concern was that COE has not responded in the manner that we had anticipated they would respond based on their comments to us at a number of meetings. Our concern is that we do not want to become 'like someone.' We want COE to recognize us as we are as we move forward, and we will try to work with them and be as flexible as possible. However at this time, just so you know, we have committed four emails, as recently as this morning, two full letters, and phone calls to COE and have not received a response back from them on a number of key issues including, recognition of our certificates, to the general education requirements, and some other things that I have reported to you ongoing. The Presidents have indicated that we are going to consolidate and come together with a response to COE in how they are going to identify our institution. We're almost stepping back to the point of 'what are you, one college or nine colleges?'

**D. Mortimer:** "We got a copy of the response from your office sent to COE and I was a little concerned about it. It seemed like it was almost adversarial . . . my concern is that, are we doing what we can to try to meet in the middle? I understand the legislation . . . but it seems that they are a viable alternative and the letter sounded as if we were pushing them away instead of saying, here is where we are and here is where you are, now how can we get together?"

**G. Fitch:** "It's a double edge sword that we are dealing with at this time. For example, COE in their letter to us indicated that they would not change any of the requirements, for general education, that we had talked about. When in fact their presentation to us indicated that they would be willing to work with us in that area. Which means that we would have to go from 12 hours of general education requirement to 15 to meet their requirement because they are being looked at by DOE. We are in a situation right now where this Board has indicated we have concerns on the creation of our degrees; do we want to add more general education requirements? The one area that we negotiated and looked at, they suggested that we take our IT (computer) course and make it a general ed requirement. I would bet that there are nine presidents sitting

around this table who would not like to see their computer courses become general ed, to be offered by Weber State or USU. So we've almost reached an impasse in that area. We have tried to be as direct as we can with COE because we were told certain things verbally that we are responding to and the concerns that we sent them and I flew to Memphis personally to present that information, and we had a good exchange at that time. And that's when they wrote back and said, no we are not going to change on any of them."

D. Mortimer: "Can we invite someone from there to come to a Board meeting?"

G. Fitch: "We sure can. In fact, as recently as this morning, we sent them an email saying, we had hoped that you would respond to our correspondence and phone calls so that we could come back to the Board with some basis. I know that a lot of the institutions are frustrated, our 40 certificates, we are holding those because COE hasn't reacted to them and they've had time."

B. Wallis: "And that's creating us a real problem. We've held off for 6 weeks on the publication of our catalog. We need to represent to the students and when we represent it in that catalog; we have to have some substantiation to it."

R. Maughan: "The problem that we are finding with COE is what they agreed to in this room with regard to flexibility and being able to work within our structure and operation."

D. Holmes: "One thing to consider, if we don't have the viable alternative of COE and we go back to Northwest, then we have no negotiating power with them. I'm a little concerned about what Northwest is going to say that we have to do to satisfy the Northwest requirements. I would like us to keep COE as a viable alternative if only for the purpose of a counterweight against Northwest."

B. Wallis: "The problems that we are faced with and the reasons that we've jumped to the alternative of COE is for federal financial aid approval. I'm wondering if we should look at some other alternative, such as the Regents taking on the role of the State Office of Education used to take as a way of giving us some backup in this regard. I thought that COE was going to be flexible, they espoused a certain line to us in all of the discussions, and then as we got into it, the practice has been quite different. . . The worry that I have is that we make sure that we don't put our students in jeopardy, in terms of financial aid."

G. Fitch: "They (COE) just sent responses back to our questions and concerns (just received by VP Fife), but they have not answered our question on the certificate yet. So my feeling is that we need to publish our documents and continue to move ahead."

R. Brems: Asked President Fitch to respond to Campus President Wallis' suggestion of the Regents as an alternative.

G. Fitch: "We have already had some conversations with some members of the Regents staff and the Commissioners office with regards to the Regents becoming the recognized body. What it would do is very similar to what the State Board of Education was before, the accrediting body for the State. The Regents

would then become the accrediting body internally. That is one consideration. The second thing is that we are still working with the people out of Boise for Northwest, the concept of the specialty schools, where they were looking at combining some and creating a third track toward accreditation. They put that off for a year, but we haven't abandoned that . . . We probably have four or five irons in the fire with regard to accreditation."

### Item #3 Structure of UCAT

"One of things that we are challenged with is our structure and organization that the Presidents and I have been visiting with back and forth and at the appropriate time bring it forward to you. But one of the key issues that is facing COE and will be facing Northwest is stepping back and saying, are you one college or nine colleges? COE insists that they will accredit each campus as a college and that works well for their accreditation. However, accreditation by COE in this State for one of the campuses means absolutely nothing because of the law. These campuses cannot offer the AAT degree or the certificates of 900 hours or above without Regents approval. Under the law, you have one college, not nine colleges. To recognize them as independent colleges under the present law would violate that law because there would be no funding. Then the question will come up, how are they funded if they are operating outside the law? So we have a number of issues dealing with structure and operations. I think that, quite frankly, we can handle it, if we work together."

D. Holmes: "How much more time do we have with financial aid under the auspices of COE?"

G. Fitch: "As long as we remain in candidacy status with them (COE), we would have the financial aid application. We actually have three years before we have to go into the on-site visit and reach accreditation. They have also indicated that we get 6 month grace period. . . The difference will be, what will happen if COE finally decides that because of the way UCAT is structured under the law, they won't be able to help UCAT at all and then they withdraw the candidacy."

D. Mortimer: "I can see a little of their concern in that a degree is being offered at Bridgerland, may not be able to be offered because of course offerings, let's say at Southeast. Yet, in our college we have the ability to offer that degree. So I'm not so sure that it is in fact violating the law if they accredited that specific campus that offers that degree."

G. Fitch: "They don't accredit to offer the degree. They accredit the institution. It's the Board of Regents who approves the degree and the offering. So there's a distinct difference. What you have is not them recognizing a campus for degree status, what you have is then is identifying a campus of one college as a stand alone college. And that's what the legislature is specifically opposed to, as I read the legislation."

B. Hall: "Let's also parallel what the Department of Education is saying with financial aid."

G. Fitch: "The interesting thing is, USU is granted the opportunity to provide degree 'A' and they can provide it under the Board of Regents. That doesn't mean that they have to provide it at all of their outreach centers. But they are still one university, one college. That's the key difference between the two. They want to recognize us as nine colleges rather than one college with nine campuses. So I would agree

with you. If they simply would grant UCAT the authority to give the degree, then BATC could do it and Southeast wouldn't have to unless they were prepared to."

D. Mortimer: Requested copies of all the correspondence between UCAT and COE.

G. Fitch: Agreed.

Item #4 Annual Report Distribution

President Fitch thanked Bridgerland campus for printing the UCAT Annual Report.

Item #7 Tuition Waivers for Non-Utah Residents

"President Bouwhuis had a question on tuition waivers for non-Utah residents directly related to our philosophy and operation. We received a letter from the Attorney General's office that has directed us in this particular area."

Item #8 Decision Tree – Matrix #3 Distance Technology

"This had to do with an audit request to see if we were being treated differently, more stringently, than the other institutions of Higher Education and essentially have made adjustments in those areas so we'll be able to work through our decision tree."

Item #9 UHEAA Scholarships

"I am very pleased about this. Last year we received about approximately \$1,000 for each of our institutions from UHEAA as part of our scholarship program. They were so pleased with the response of our presidents and the selection of those recipients, how they documented the information. They have essentially doubled that money for this year for scholarships for us. So I applaud the presidents and their effort and selection in that area."

**F. Strategic Planning** (Tab Z, Attachment D)

G. Fitch: Referred to Tab Z and Attachment D. "I would offer the Board two options on this. . . One, given the hour I would like to make a general presentation on strategic planning on a couple pages to get you thinking along that line and then allow your facilitator contact you, or if you would like, break into individual groups at this time and start working on some of these once we have the overview."

D. Ipson: Suggested that the facilitators contact the committee members.

G. Fitch: "I would to quickly go over some things. In your sheets you have a strategic planning assignments, to give you an overview. We listed the three standing committees (Tab Z), and the goals listed on that sheet are the goals directly related to the three ring binder 'Strategic Plan Document.' Those are the titles and headings, not by one, two or three, they are not numbered that way, that just put them in order. As you look to your major document, you'll see all of the elements dealing with the goals, objectives, the strategic components, etc. and how it applies. Those will be committed to each of the committees and



you can see that each of you has a different set of goals that you'll be working with. Then you have in some areas an 'A', those are extra assignments that you may want to turn into goals. . . Then you have on the right side of the sheet, the facilitators. . . Those are the ones that will be contacting you regarding setting up a conference call or so forth. I would ask that you turn to the second page of that document. Here's basically a general assignment for all of you to do. . ."

R. Brems: Announced that the Funding/Services, Legislative Support Committee will be meeting at MATC on November 24.

T. Bingham: Inquired of President Fitch as to the plan of action in having lobbyists for UCAT approach the legislature.

G. Fitch: Acknowledged that he had previously promised that a "hoard of lobbyists" (indicating the UCAT Board) would approach the legislature. . . And has since had one recommendation, from Mr. Bingham who has sent the name of an individual that President Fitch has talked with in regards to lobbying for UCAT. He believes that needs to be a conversation with the UCAT Executive Committee, to determine how they want to do it. "Quite frankly, with Central Administration, if I don't have you (UCAT Board of Trustees) available and the have the Presidents available at certain times, we aren't going to make a good showing. And we won't get a lot of things pushed through. . . Comments have been made to me that UCAT should be under the Higher Education system, obviously, but also going through the Higher Education Legislative Committee. My position, and if you look at our Annual Report based on what we've approved here, we remain with Commerce and Revenue. If that (issue) does surface, I've got to have some of you folks in key positions, being able to work with legislators, more than just myself or a few of the Presidents, to get that word out that we are very happy where we are at."

T. Bingham: "If you don't have one common voice, it's very confusing to legislators. They don't know what position you really have because each one of us will spin it a little differently. So I encourage you to take a look at how we do that. It's my experience that with the legislature you have to be present to win. Unless you plan on spending 45 days up there doing nothing but that, you need someone to be your eyes and ears."

G. Fitch: "I agree with that. Last year, for example, the Presidents allowed me to represent UCAT and it worked well to certain points. But with their reputations, interests, skills in regional areas, and their contacts, it was good to be able to call on the Presidents. And the Presidents responded immediately. But it was not the 45 days that you are talking about, and I think that we are in a position right now where we need to start looking at coordinating that effort and being available. . . I would hope the Executive Committee and our discussions will address that issue."

T. Bingham: "These folks here, with the reputations and contacts are invaluable, but it needs to be a coordinated effort."

D. Holmes: Reminded everyone that the next meeting is Wednesday, January 7, 2004.

**ADJOURN**

D. Holmes: MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by D. Ipson. Motion was unanimously approved and carried.

Vice Chair Holmes adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 2:25 p.m.