

UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
05 JUNE 2002
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES

Board of Trustees

Norman Bangerter, Chair - Salt Lake/Tooele
Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Pamela J. Atkinson - SBOR
Thomas Bingham - Gov. Appt.
John Busch - Uintah Basin
Janet Cannon - SBOE
Don Ipson - Dixie (excused early)
Charlie Johnson - Regents
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
A. Earl McCain - SBOE
Wayne Woodward - Southeast

Regional ATC Presidents

Mike Bouwhuis - Davis
Bo Hall - Salt Lake/Tooele
Richard Jones - Uintah Basin
Richard Maughan - Bridgerland
Rich VanAusdal - Dixie
Brent Wallis - Ogden-Weber
Don Reid - Southwest
Carl Holmes - Central (arrived late)

Institutional Representation

Gregory G. Fitch

Commissioner's Office

Gary Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education and Special Projects
Linda Fife, Director of Academic Programs
Brad Mortensen, Director of Business and Finance

Media Present

Deseret News

Others Present

Jared Haines - VP, Mountainland ATC
Calvin Hunt - VP, Southeast ATC
K. Chad Campbell - VP, Finance, BATC
Marv Johnson - SBOE
Mary Shumway - SBOE
Debbie Headden - Fiscal Analyst
Boyd Garriott - Fiscal Analyst
Race Davies - Governor's Office

Excused Absent

Carl Albrecht - Central
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland
William Prows - Davis
Don Roberts - Southwest
Miles Nelson - President, Southeast ATC

MINUTES OF MEETING
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM
05 JUNE 2002

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held on 05 June 2002 in the Utah State Board of Regents Board Room.

Call To Order

Chair Bangerter called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. and the Secretary was in attendance. A quorum was present.

Approval of the Agenda

Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the agenda of the 05 June 2002 Board meeting. Being none, motion was made by D. Holmes and seconded by P. Atkinson to approve as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from 01 May 2002 Board Meeting

Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 01 May 2002 Board meeting (Tab W). Being none, motion was made by D. Holmes and seconded by M. Madsen to approve as presented. Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Capital Development Projects (Tab X)

President Fitch presented "A Guide To The Capital Facilities/Property Approval Process" sheet and the memorandum from Ken Nye, "Capital Development Request Process and Schedule." He explained that these reflect the required time lines and approval process for the capital development projects, which will be presented during this meeting. He reminded the Board that the goal is to prioritize the requests under HB 1003, based on specific criteria, and this needs to be taken into consideration while listening to each presentation. This list will then be submitted to the State Building Board for funding consideration.

1. Uintah Basin ATC – Presentation by Richard Jones, UBATC President

President Jones introduced this presentation by explaining that this project has been progressing for five years, strengthening partnerships in the process. "Each year we are getting closer to an agreement that will satisfy the Uintah School District in a comprehensive high school setting where all of their students are served in one high school, and gives us an opportunity that if we get a campus adjacent to them, that we can give service to the entire Uintah Basin secondary students."

President Jones further explained that the planning documents had been forwarded to DFCM and that unanimous approval had been received from all required Boards regarding this plan – USU Advisory Board, Uintah School District Board, and UBATC Board of Trustees – satisfying the agreement that this be a joint process required by statute, as being a UCAT Regional facility. President Jones then reviewed the specific information as presented in the UBATC "Capital

Development Project State Funded Request Need Statement FY04.”

J. Busch: (supporting the importance of a high prioritization for this project), explained, “. . . we don't have the programs or offerings available. If these facilities become available, we would be up around 500-600 students we could serve. We currently have space in the high school, but as they need space, they will need to take back the space. We've done that with double wide trailers.”

A. E. McCain: “. . . last year money was allocated for this program, what is the status of that?”

R. Jones: Responded that UBATC was allocated a 0% interest loan but that there is difficulty in servicing the loan and paying it back. “It is all loan and no grant so we have elected to keep that out of the project and at the same time decrease the project by 2.5 million . . .”

A. E. McCain: “Any possibility of grant money. . . ?”

R. Jones – “. . . don't have much grant money available – there is plenty of loan money – we will continue to ask for grant money. Our plan now is not to use the 0% interest loan because we have no way to service that loan over a 30 year period.”

C. Johnson: “The problem is where are we going to spend our money? Is there a need? How do we compare all of this with all of the needs? How do we sort this out?”

N. Bangarter: “The issue for us is that we have to set a priority and then somebody else gets to sort it out. All the requests have to go through this Board and then to the Building Board and then to the legislators and Governor.”

C. Johnson: “Are we setting priorities between these three?”

G. Fitch: “. . . intention is to rank these 1-2-3, because of the due date of June 18 with the Building Board, this Board is charged under the law with prioritization requests for the State Building Board.”

N. Bangarter: “What other requests have we had?”

G. Fitch: “. . . at the time that this was done, when the Building Board notified us of the June 18 deadline, I notified all the Presidents of the requirements and circumstances, including the process that would be involved in setting priorities. Of all the Presidents, these three institutions responded.”

P. Atkinson: “This is a very strong proposal but I think that the one weakness is . . . if it's funded the ramifications for business and industry, it's not clearly spelled out. And the ramifications are many. I think that this needs to be added to this report before it goes to the Building Board.”

R. Jones: “I would plan to modify and strengthen our alternatives if we don't get the project . . .”

D. Ipson: “. . . what the alternatives would be . . . the negatives . . . the program setback if we don't do this . . . are we sure that there are no other alternatives?”

R. Jones: “We have had a lot of years to examine alternatives . . . of course one is to keep the portable trailers there . . . which is expensive.”

Chair Bangerter excused (10:40 a.m.) – Meeting turned over to Vice Chair Holmes.

2. Bridgerland ATC – Presentation by Richard Maughan, BATC President

President Maughan began his presentation of BATC's capital development project by introducing a powerpoint slide show and handout “Capital Development Project Fiscal Year 2004,” which was previously presented to the SBOE and State Building Board. The handout provided additional supportive documentation to be used in conjunction with the BATC “Capital Development Project State Funded Request Need Statement FY04”, for Board prioritization.

President Maughan reviewed the history of the BATC campus, and the established relationships in the Bear River region, serving 4 school districts and specifically 10 high schools, while maintaining a close relationship with USU. He explained that the future building evolution for BATC would consist of phases, and that this BATC Capital Development Project request would consist of the Advanced Technology Building Phase I. President Maughan further explained that this project had previously been “. . . approved by all players in the Bear River region, BOE, DFCM, and is on the 5 year capital list.”

P. Atkinson: “With all of these companies that are growing and moving to your area . . . what is their contribution?”

R. Maughan: “The greatest contribution of business and industry in our area is in the form of scholarship money and equipment . . . We have individuals from business and industry involved in our colleges in an advisory capacity. All of our programs have a full advisory council and they are active and involved.”

D. Holmes: “Are you turning away students now?”

R. Maughan: “Yes we are.”

M. Madsen: “We have a waiting list on most of our programs . . . anywhere from 4 to 6 months.”

3. Davis ATC – Presentation by Mike Bouwhuis, DATC President

President Bouwhuis introduced this presentation by giving a brief history of DATC building construction, in phases from 1983. He then explained the “Davis Applied Technology College Capital Development Request FY04” and provided history of this project. President Bouwhuis further explained that because of the DATC growth, the college had been using the back shops of Davis High School, but that the high school is currently being demolished and so space is now lost

for DATC. “We’ve been pushed by the demand from industry for growth and also by the fact that we have done what the law has suggested – we have gone to the school districts and used their vacated space and now when that space goes away we have a real problem . . . feel that we have met the intent of the law which says that we are supposed to look for all facilities possible before we ask for another one. Obviously when you lose the facilities that you have borrowed you have to start looking to the future.”

Chair Bangerter returns (11:27 a.m.) – Resumed position as Chair.

J. Cannon: “What’s happening with Davis High School . . . what’s their future and how big will they be? . . . is there any possibility of them allotting you space in the future?”

M. Bouwhuis: “. . . discussed openly with Davis High School what programs they should be offering and what programs we should be offering and we came to the conclusion that construction and auto seem to be the ones that we should join together . . . They plan on using our facility more . . . so in that planning process they see us as the technical arm of their high school more than they have before.”

President Fitch: Explained that this will be a difficult decision that the Board will have to live with, particularly in these economic times. “Based on the presentations you’ve heard, there is a need across the system, just as there is in higher education and the school districts, but there are certain requirements that I outlined and I’ll go over them briefly with you from 1003 that might help you in your decision making. One of the key ones that you’ll be confronted with at this time is that you’ll need to abandon your regional hat and look at yourself as a UCAT board member; UCAT is a system that supplies and supports the whole state. There are needs everywhere. So as you approach this you’ll want to look at the specific items that you are required to consider as you listen to the presentations and read the material, and make your decision to vote, because we’ll be asking for a vote on it, simply to identify a 1-2-3 priority basis.”

President Fitch further explained, “But as you think about this I would like you, particularly those of you not directly attached to a particular institution, those of you with the school board recognizing the needs of your local school district, those of you associated with higher education and the relationship there and the partnerships required, and when Mr. Bingham starts to look at population bases and the needs of your manufacturers. Some of the things that you need to consider that are specific to the law that you need to identify in making this determination is have they maintained existing facilities in an appropriate manner? . . . to avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities in a particular area? All facilities in the area, those with applicable higher education facilities and school district facilities and potentially any business and industry facilities have to be maximized. Are there cooperative agreements attached to it? One of the key things that I have found working with the Building Board, the first question that I get is ‘Are there partners involved?’ Is there a college involved, and even the law identifies that, if there is a college close by, are they working with you? And the second, are you involved with the school district? . . . Is there a need in the area? Is there not only a specific need at the school district but is there a need overall in the region that is being

provided for and what is the impact on the state economy as we look at it? Are there projections for jobs and the type of housing that will be provided for certain specific programs. Has the college itself looked at the plans, have they considered the operations and maintenance costs, the additional costs associated with faculty, staffing and equipment, particularly in light of these economic times?"

Bangerter: “. . . the question is, do we expand as a protection or do we maintain as a protection? There isn't a proposal here to cut back anybody. I think there is a concern across the system that with 10 ATCs now, where we had less than that a few years ago, that the money will remain the same and that it will dilute and that's the challenge. I think that we should maintain, but should we allow them to grow at the expense of growth in other areas?"

President Fitch: “The law is very specific about what criteria you might look at, but I think we have to look at 1003 all together and our responsibility as UCAT. One of the key components is to provide an employable workforce to business and industry. As we look at each project, we see that in there. But there's also a comment in there dealing with economic development, an economic stimulus. In the Bridgerland and Davis areas, because of the interest and desire to become another Park City, you have an opportunity there from a forced application. You're going to see the funds and dollars drawn to that particular area. You have a downturn from the Uintah Basin area because of some of the problems and issues there, so in what best way can we balance that support and need for economic stimulus in providing a workforce that eventually will be in a position to say that now we have been discovered and be able to do something. So as you make these decisions, you need to look at the big picture across the state and its application in trying to meet those needs.”

D. Ipson excused (approximately 12:00 noon) and did not return.

D. Holmes: MOVED to vote by written ballot, ranking the three capital development project requests as 1-2-3, with 1 (first priority) getting 1 point, 2 (second priority) getting 2 points, 3 (third priority) getting 3 points, with the lowest combined score receiving the Board's first priority ranking. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen and carried.

Written ballot was taken, and then collected and tallied by G. Fitch and D. Holmes.

President Fitch: “. . . to list in priority 1-2-3, with 1 being the lowest number and being the priority. Mr. Holmes assisted and we identified the three institutions, 1-2-3 . . . for a total of 10 votes in each category. The vote: UBATC – 7-#1 votes, 1-#2 vote, 2-#3 votes; DATC – 0-#1 votes, 7-#2 votes, 3-#3 votes; BATC – 3-#1 votes, 2-#2 votes, 5-#3 votes. Uintah Basin would be #1, Bridgerland #2, Davis #3, based on the number of votes in the #1 category.

D. Ipson: MOVED to accept the results of the ballot as the recommendation for the Capital Development Project prioritization. The motion was seconded by J. Busch and carried.

B. Budget (Tab Y)

President Fitch: Presented the UCAT “Possible Impact of Additional FY 2002-2003 Budget Reductions” sheet dated 5/30/02. He explained that this information reflected the impact for each UCAT ATC and in the areas of Custom Fit, Development, Equipment and Administration, if a proposed 4.75% or 9.00% reduction occurs.

President Fitch also introduced the following information (Attachment A) to the Board, which he felt would be necessary to take into consideration in understanding the budget response with regard to issues, short term and long term implications, and a simple tuition analysis (Attachment A).

Issues

Shortfall

Expenditures in Excess of Revenue

Other Requirements: Medicaid, Corrections, Social Services

“Have all created demands on the state for support, in addition to the needs by Higher Education, UCAT, and the public school system.”

Echo Boom (entering)

“These individuals are beginning to enter our school system and so will confront higher education.”

“Another effect is upgrades – business and industry is asking for increases and upgrades in training in some of the areas and as manufacturing and business and industry needs change, our response has to meet that particular area. So we have a huge growth potential in the next several years.”

September 11 Weakened Economy

“We have 2 issues going on – we have the shortfalls and costs issues, but also the demand issues. In business, . . . it’s great to have the demand, but how do I develop my company in such a way to meet those demands?”

War on Terrorism

“ . . . will draw more and more on revenue and resources . . . ”

“If you take these issues and combine them together, you’re confronted with the budget response that we have right now.”

Short Term

“What you have seen and what we are working with are short term responses. This Board has an obligation to look at that because you cannot ignore the short term response in the hope that there will be adjustments . . . ”

Freeze: Hiring, Travel, etc.

“To cut back without jeopardizing students. Because two of the key areas that we have to work with as a college and serving our state are students and faculty. We have to protect these two categories. As we address the freeze, we are going to address that as more than just the short term down the line.”

Defer Internal Training

“UCAT is based on the idea of providing and developing a workforce for business and industry in this state. That also means that the workforce is our faculty. We have to continue to upgrade and provide them skills and additional training on new equipment as it moves along.”

RIF/Early Retirement

Reduce/Eliminate Programs/Services

“ . . . impacts both the faculty and students that we are trying to serve and ultimately the employers that we provide a workforce.”

Reduce Expenditures

Defer Maintenance and Services

Defer Equipment Purchases

Marketing

“ . . . a lot of people don't recognize UCAT. . . our profile has not been established in the state. Marketing is a concern as we look at the short term because one of the first things that you do is start cutting down on advertising and other things to get the message out.”

Long Term

Mission: Accountability

“We will be looking at mission and the idea of accountability within the roles of long term stability of UCAT and some of the ongoing operations . . . if we are going to move forward . . . we are going to have to demonstrate that we can be held accountable.”

Role: Performance

“ . . . we are going to have to perform and be able to meet their particular needs and be held accountable for that performance. But what is our role? The law specifically states what our responsibilities are, and we need to look at those not in isolation, but in conjunction with the school districts and other institutions.”

Economic Stimulus (e.g. Custom Fit)

“This is a key area of responsibility dealing with our long term implications that we will need to continue to build on.”

Structure/Organization

“The legislature created ten, but they did not fund ten. What we need to do is look at some type of operation. The smaller operations drain the larger and the question is how do we continue to serve and balance all of them? We are going to have to look realistically long term at the structure and organization of this operation – but who can provide the best services in the most efficient manner? It doesn't necessarily have to be UCAT . . . The school district can do it if their mission and role of responsibility is well established, let them do it. We can't keep duplicating. Let's find the best avenue of approach to services for our students.”

Partners/Shared Services/Staff (Tracks)

“ As we start looking at these shared services you'll have to make determinations about your mission and role overall and then how you fit into this particular structure and who can best

provide it in the most expeditious manner, the most efficient manner and the best cost manner. Short term and long term.”

Funding: Private Sources, Tuition, Grants – State/Federal, Investment

Tuition Analysis

“People think that we need to move our tuition increases up in a significant way to cover it (the shortfall). We moved up 5 cents per hour to 95 cents. First, what we find is that any time you increase tuition, you are going to lose some students. We can increase tuition up from 95 cents, but that will drive out more students as it increases. Also, it complicates the issue because the legislation says that we have to serve adults at a low cost. It doesn’t define low cost. I’m assuming that it’s lower than higher education. Second, we are subject to the influence of the previously identified issues, and the short term responses. As we look at the short term response, we will be closing a program or two (for example). If you close these two programs, students and faculty are impacted. You lose not only the students and their tuition, but you also lose that state portion that’s provided that supports all of the other activities that we are involved in with UCAT . . . and would probably outdistance any gain that you might have had with a tuition increase. You have created not only a problem for yourself addressing short term issues but your long term problem is now that you have cut out programs, reduced faculty, reduced staff, you’ve also cut opportunities for financial development. You can have savings with the lost faculty members but now you’ve put two people out of work that are not productive in the state and have gone somewhere else. So the idea that tuition is going to be the solution to meet all of our needs in a particular area is not going to happen.”

President Fitch presented the WICHE (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education) informational facts for Utah Higher Education (Attachment B), in relation to the budget reduction implications.

- 1) Nationwide, one in four beginning college students in 1969 who took the SAT and/or the ACT had not taken the minimum courses recommended by the National Commission on Excellence in Education – 4 years of English, 3 of social studies, and 2 each of math and science.
- 2) Less than one-half of Utah’s high school graduation requirements are in core subject areas.

“This is a question that we will be confronted with as we start looking at our mission and role and accountability, our structure and our partners, UCAT can’t do it by itself. Our partnership has to be synchronized, has to be balanced, has to work together.”

- 3) Utah will see a 5 percent increase in the number of high school graduates between 2001-02 and 2011-12.
- 4) The proportion of public high school graduates that is Hispanic is projected to increase 1.1 percentage points between 2002 and 2012.

“ . . . current budget situation is putting us in dire straits . . . that’s why the long term effect and short term applications can’t be left in place, they have to be modified and adjusted. What can we look at as far as partnerships? The issue that we will have to deal with is from the school district side – how do we get the students into the certificate programs . . . if we are in a situation where the core portions that are necessary for succeeding in life are below 50% in the core curriculum . . . how best do we respond? A lot of our students, typically in their junior and senior years take the technology type courses. The courses are exploratory and this is a mission responsibility in the public school system. Question – if they are the best provider, do they have their students exit and prepared for the world of work at that level? If they don’t, then we need to look at our mission and roles and the services value added that we provide. There are a lot of questions, but there is no reason that we can’t consider something innovative, entrepreneurial as we look at education. Because our consumers on the other end are doing that . . . business and industry. We are a business and industry. We need to make that same type of adjustment.”

N. Bangerter (referring to the “Possible Impact of Additional FY 2002-2003 Budget Response” sheet), verified with Boyd Garriott that the FY 2002 shortfall had been covered with the rainy day fund and the movement of some of the funding to bonding, and asked what the projection was for the 2003 shortfall on the state level.

B. Garriott: Responded that the shortfall for FY 2003 is projected at over 400 million. He further explained that because the cut that was taken in FY 2002 will carry forward into the FY 2003 budget, and the shortfall between what they did to solve the FY 2002 and the FY 2003 budget was to take another 173 million out.

B. Wallis: “When the Regional Trustees of Ogden-Weber met, we began to take these numbers (4.75 and 9.00% possible budget reduction) and build scenarios to determine what approach to follow. . . If demand is up and you have capacity, you raise prices.” President Wallis further explained that his Regional Board had asked that he request of the UCAT Board to allow Ogden-Weber the opportunity to pull back and do some further studies of tuition increase that might be used to help offset some of the cuts. “Although an increase was approved from 90 to 95 cents, we are asking to go back and hold public hearings and begin to investigate what the Regional Trustees feel would be a comfortable level, where we don’t get into a situation to decrease capacity to meet demand. I’m asking for approval today.”

B. Garriott: “When we made the budget for higher education last year we looked at the pressure on the system. They had another 8600 new students that required a 42 million funding price tag. Our approach . . . looked at generating internal resources, some reallocation and some fund generation through various pricing techniques . . . what we charge nonresident students and graduate students and so forth. Part of the component could be self generation of additional resources as opposed to cuts when you have significant demand for service. That (President Wallis’ request) is a viable option.”

P. Atkinson: Questioned the upper limit that the fees could be raised without having students drop out.

B. Wallis: “That is germane to the whole issue. What is the threshold with which you drive your price to the point that you virtually turn off those in the most need of the training? . . . Talked with five different groups at Ogden-Weber and asked that question and compared the comments . . . they all said don’t go above 1.20 and don’t drive the monthly cost above \$200 a month. So we have a range from 95 cents to 1.20. That’s why I think that it’s important to have public hearings so that we have the opportunity to determine that.”

D. Holmes: MOTION that OWATC be authorized to conduct public hearings to consider raising tuition up to whatever the hearings would permit. The motion was seconded by T. Bingham.

M. Bouwhuis: Question to the motion. “Historically we have all stuck together, if we are going to make a motion, should it not include the capacity for all of us to do that if we so choose?”

C. Johnson: Questioned whether a formal hearing is the best alternative as opposed to the informal exercise of determining where the market is.

President Fitch: Responded “. . . if you move forward on the formal hearing based on the truth requirements associated with tuition changes, you have a legal obligation to meet with the 10 day requirement for notice of publication in the newspaper. When you hold those hearings you are moving forward with a specific number in mind In this case I think that what you’re asking . . . to informally test the market response to this particular change. We are confronted with these issues – marketing – going back and explaining our situation, and what we are thinking about is adjusting our tuition up, which is like second tier, which is what higher education did in the process Now the results of that could be presented without worrying about the legal formality. What you’re doing is a survey in a public hearing. All of you could do that on your own.”

M. Madsen: Felt that the appropriate response would be to do something informally but not during this Board meeting. Expressed concern about announcing to the public that the ATCs would be raising tuition, feeling that it “. . . would be inappropriate at the present time, until we (Board) know fiscally where the numbers are going to fall and what the legislature is going to do. I don’t think that we should put ourselves in a position out front . . . so they (public) can take their shots at us because we are raising (tuition) prices.”

President Fitch: “You can have a survey in your area and find out what’s going on and see how the people respond. We are already at different levels for our tuition because of the type of institution or who we are related to or partnered with.”

MOTION WITHDRAWN.

President Fitch: Responding to M. Madsen's comment, "I appreciate the comment and concern of essentially making ourselves a target by moving ahead too quickly in certain areas . . . The purpose of this budget sheet is to give you parameters to work with . . . because they will change within the next 30 days and with the Special Session . . . so the idea of us moving ahead formally right now, I would be uncomfortable to say that we are definitely going to raise our tuition, because when they are forced to go back and look at numbers, they are going to say that they will be able to generate this amount, so let's try to balance something else . . . it's something that we have to talk about in our process . . . we always seem to be reacting to certain circumstances under our current guidelines. My purpose for this general type of presentation is to have you start looking proactive with the long range implications and strategic planning that tie into this so we don't get caught in this situation again."

N. Bangerter: (Giving an update to the Board of a meeting involving the evaluation of technical programs in the state). "The President (Fitch) and I met with the Governor and Higher Education and public education . . . technical programs across the board, public education, higher education and UCAT. Greg was brought in to help us evaluate that so he will be the lead person. And he'll work closely with the Superintendents and the Commissioner as he moves forward with that. He's already built a model . . ."

President Fitch: ". . . we have now created a matrix (coordinated by Linda Fife and Mary Shumway) . . . which identifies all of our forces . . . so that we can make these types of decisions . . ."

N. Bangerter: "The Governor said we should look at this and decide what can we do without and still meet our mission. We are moving forward . . . it's a study that needs to be made . . . if we all stay objective . . . it's a long tough process and to change any of these systems doesn't come easily."

P. Atkinson: ". . . there comes a point when we are cutting quality if we didn't look at other alternatives . . . it's a tough decision to make cuts in programs to save the quality of a number of other programs . . . quality has got to continue . . . we are all about the quality of education."

President Fitch: "President Wallis would like to ask for permission to utilize the Executive Committee with your Regional Board with regard to that piece of property that has already been approved."

B. Wallis: "This is the deal with the purchase of property adjacent to the campus . . . couple of loose ends that need to be tied up and we couldn't get those done in time for this meeting today . . . I'm asking permission that when that comes in that we would be able to put that in front of the Executive Committee for approval."

C. Johnson: MOVED to allow permission for utilization of the Executive Committee with regard to

the previously approved Ogden-Weber property purchase. The motion was seconded by P. Atkinson. The motion carried.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Public Recognition (Tab Z)

The Board was provided with the following articles:

“UCAT’s Necessity Disputed” (Salt Lake Tribune)

“UCAT marks first year by unveiling new logo” (Deseret News)

President Fitch: Reminded the Board that there is no UCAT Board of Trustees meeting scheduled for July. Also requested that the next meeting be scheduled for August 28, none in September, and then the next one on October 9.

T. Bingham: MOVED to have the next UCAT Board of Trustees meeting on August 28 and then on October 9 as recommended. The motion was seconded by P. Atkinson and carried.

N. Bangerter: Advised the Board that he will not be in attendance for the October 9 meeting.

ADJOURN

Chair Bangerter adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 1:26 p.m.