UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
6 AUGUST 2003
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES

Board of Trustees Present
Norman Bangerter - Salt Lake/Tooele
Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland
John Busch - Uintah Basin
William Prows - Davis
Daryl Barrett - SBOR
Don Ipson - Dixie
Wayne Woodward - Southeast
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
Janet Cannon - SBOE
Don Roberts - Southwest
Dixie Allen - SBOE
Charlie Johnson - SBOR

UCAT Campus Presidents Present
Rob Brems - Mountainland
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
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

Office of the Commissioner
Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner
Brad Mortensen, Assistant Commissioner of Business and Finance
Kimberly Henrie, Budget Analyst
Gary Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education and Special Projects

Media Present
Deseret News

Others Present
Debbie Headden, Fiscal Analyst
Boyd Garriott, Fiscal Analyst
William Evans, Assistant Attorney General
Chad Campbell, BATC
Paul Hacking, UBATC
Ken Nye, DFCM
Senator Beverly Evans
Representative Loraine Pace

Excused Absent
Tom Bingham - Governor's Appt.
Carl Albrecht - Snow College Richfield

MINUTES OF MEETING
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM
6 AUGUST 2003

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held 6 August 2003 in the Utah State Board of Regents' Board Room.

Call To Order
Chair Bangerter called the meeting to order at 10:16 a.m. and the Secretary was in attendance. A quorum was present.

Swearing In of New Board Members
Assistant Attorney General William Evans swore in the two newest members of the UCAT Board of Trustees: Dixie Allen, representing the State Board of Education and Daryl Barrett, representing the State Board of Regents.

Approval of the Agenda
Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the agenda of the 6 August 2003 Board meeting. Being none, motion was made by D. Holmes and seconded by D. Ipson to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from 7 May 2003 Board Meeting
Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 7 May 2003 Board meeting (Tab M). Being none, motion was made by D. Ipson and seconded by D. Holmes to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Waiver of Schedule Change Fee (Tab N)

President Fitch referred to Tab N, the agenda cover sheet for this agenda item. There is one correction under the Background section, line 4. Need to modify ". . . waive the $5 schedule change fee for students two times per year . . . to ". . . two times per month" because of the open-entry, open-exit format of UCAT. The campuses will provide oversight and assess the fee.

J. Cannon: MOVED to approve the provision for a two-time per month waiver of the $5 fee for student-initiated schedule changes. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

B. Capital Projects Review (Tab O)

President Fitch referred to Tab O, the "UCAT Capital Improvement Funding History, FY 99 to FY 04" sheet.

_____

G. Fitch: "As you are aware, UCAT has to ensure that they are partnering with other institutions or agencies in the development of any facilities. What you have before you is the identification of our four institutions that own property which are supported by state revenue funds. With that is a formula that provides for support of that property . . . If you look at the last column at the top, 'Total Share $775,000', based on our square footage and the multiplier, that is the amount normally received by our institutions on an annual basis, under improvement. If you look at the six-year history in the chart, it identifies how much each of those four institutions has received. . . The total at bottom, Ogden-Weber has received over the past six years about $4 million dollars, BATC $3 million, DATC $1.6 million and Uintah Basin $1.4 million. Below that is the 'x share', the multiplier, indicates Ogden-Weber 3.1 times what they normally would have received under the formula. I highlight this because as we look at our facilities and development of new facilities, we will have more institutions come on line as you approve or recognize these new facilities. With that idea in mind, we have to look at this number because DFCM is also looking at this number and the services, as they consider and rank as a committee, the Building Board, the facilities that we send forward. Basically, if you have received a lot of money to maintain your facilities, they may consider that a variable as they look at the development of new facilities on your campus. We also have other items that they may start considering: population, student enrollments, programs and service needs in those areas . . . and also the rural versus urban component. So there are a number of variables that the Building Board will be looking at as they try to make determinations on priorities, which is being prompted by very limited funds and the way that they can respond to us and our particular needs. However, as we approach this and each institution gives you information on their project, you will be required as a Board to prioritize those projects. I remind you that last year we only had three projects in the fold and the way they were identified was Uintah Basin was first, Bridgerland was second, and Davis was third. This time you'll be looking at six presentations, they vary in scope, design and need. . ."

CAMPUS PRESENTATIONS

Bridgerland Campus – Presentation by Richard Maughan, BATC Campus President (Attachment A)
Campus President Maughan presented an alternative to the project originally approved and prioritized last year as #2 by the UCAT Board of Trustees. The original project would have a cost of $7.75 million and the alternative project, presented today, would have a cost of $3.5 million.

C. Johnson: Questioned any potential "downside" of the proposed location.

R. Maughan: "The only downside that we can find at the present time is food services."

W. Prows: Questioned the feasibility of potentially leasing the building.

R. Maughan: Acknowledged that a lease is an option, but may not be the best alternative.

D. Barrett: "What type of retrofitting would meet your need?"

R. Maughan: "The only retrofit that would be requested in the future would be if we were to restructure some of the labs and classrooms with some temporary walls."

_____

Davis Campus – Presentation by Mike Bouwhuis, DATC Campus President

D. Roberts: Questioned how many students the facility would house.

M. Bouwhuis: "It is about 85,000 square feet . . . it will hold all of our diesel students, all of our computer technology students, all of our drafting students, it will be upwards of 800 to 1000 students."

D. Roberts: "How far in the future will this accommodate you?"

M. Bouwhuis: "If it is like our Health Technology building, it took one year to fill it. I would think that these occupations fill a little slower, so my feeling is maybe a year and a half to two years. But then we are projecting today and if the building were built in 2007, we may have to fill it immediately."

Mountainland Campus – Presentation by Rob Brems, MATC Campus President (Attachment B)

D. Holmes: "If you do this, would you still have to be associated with Utah Valley State College?"

R. Brems: "We believe that as the future rolls on that we will have continued negotiations about the Orem campus, the 58,000 square foot building that we occupy. We don't see ourselves as being able to move out of there because of the populations of Orem and Provo that we serve, so that campus will probably need to continue to exist or some alternative to that. But this one (proposal presented) would take a lot of pressure off of the northern Utah county area, where we currently just have the leased facilities . . . In Springville, we think that we will need some additional space like we've discussed, and the same thing over in Heber . . ."

D. Mortimer: "One thing that is concerning me a lot is the new president at UVSC . . . he is very open about his concern for space for them; they are the fastest growing college in the State. It's a real concern because now all of a sudden the urgency is fact and that we could be asked to leave in the next two to five years . . . and we have no permanent facility at all and here we are growing so rapidly at 15 percent a year."

Ogden-Weber Campus – Presentation by Brent Wallis, OWATC Campus President

D. Barrett: "What kind of support do you get from the health care industry in terms of partnering and donations . . .?"

B. Wallis: "Can't measure it. It is very, very good. Most of these programs require some type of a co-op or onsite experience for the students before you can even start programs. So those partnerships have to be developed with the IHCs . . . operating in our area."

D. Barrett: "And money from them . . .?"

_____

B. Wallis: "Oh yes. Our x-ray machines and so forth provided by donations, equipment, technical support, those things are going on all the time. I feel very comfortable. By proximity, Ogden-Weber to Weber State, Weber State having a very large role in the health occupations area required that we come along a little slower in the development of health programs. As Weber has felt the need to expand . . . those entry level programs, they have partnered with us to get these programs going. . ."

Salt Lake/Tooele Campus – Presentation by Bo Hall, SLTATC Campus President (Attachment C)

Uintah Basin Campus – Presentation by Richard Jones, UBATC Campus President (Attachment D)

J. Busch: "The only thing that I would like to add to that is that most of the campuses complain about having portable trailers. For us, portable trailers are our campus and that's one of our biggest concerns."

G. Fitch: ". . . The Building Board is meeting right now . . . They will be holding open two slots . . . so whatever you vote on, the first two items will be moved forward to the Building Board. . . I've also had the opportunity to talk to the Chairman of the Building Board and others . . . and they've indicated that in looking at all of our projects, they recognize the importance and the growth and so they'll be looking at the five-year plan to try to incorporate some of these other requests that we have in our priority order, in their five-year plan. As you seek to do this, your responsibility will be to prioritize the recommendation that will be going to the Building Board. One thing that I would like to say . . . Southeast has an equal need in their particular area in meeting requirements for a facility. Their project has been blended with CEU, and there are conversations going on with CEU dealing with the razing of one building and possibly adjusting another building through the development fund application. That is why you don't see that one here, otherwise that would be a key project that would be part of this competition. We are looking at it from a different approach so it will probably be on the CEU agenda as they move forward. . . and that would be an element that we would be looking at next year to ensure that if it doesn't go through with CEU, that that institution be placed on there and be considered."

Brad Mortensen provided an explanation of the ballots and the balloting process to be used to prioritize the presented recommendations.

D. Barrett: "Summarize for me those that are new this year, those that have been prioritized . . ."

G. Fitch: "Last year Uintah Basin was number one, Bridgerland was number two, and that was on the original project of $7.75 million with the new facility. What they've presented now is an alternative to that facility . . . The third one was Davis . . . at that time they were in desperate straits, as they are now, because the high school is coming down and the training that was going on there was necessary. Those were the only three projects that we had to move forward. The Uintah Basin one did go to the Building Board and the other two were essentially placed on the priority list."

W. Prows: "How many buildings have we had approved in the last three years? What is the total amount of money that the State has for building . . ."

_____

B. Mortensen: "They have close to 60 million in cash that they use each year with 40 or so million of that reserved for capital improvements . . ."

W. Prows: "Is there a better way of doing this? Can we lump some of these things together and consider a percentage of the total? Present some alternatives that can be considered . . . I guess the issue is that we are in dire straits here. So if we vote against one we hurt the whole program. We're functioning as one and maybe we shouldn't divide and conquer . . . maybe we should just ask for a percentage and then come back to this Board and figure out how to use it . . . The question is, what options do we have?"

G. Fitch: (clarifying BATC's request) ". . . now it's clear that you would like the $3.5 million dollar project substituted on the ballot for Bridgerland. The other point, our very first year of operation this Board decided in it's infancy that we would send forward our request as one because we were one college. DFCM immediately rejected that and said 'No, you will prioritize, just as they do with the Utah System of Higher Education.' What we are up against as far as the dollars that are available, is the renovation of the capitol and the dollars that are projected there, the University of Utah library, and I believe and the USU library project. So there are huge projects out there even though they approach it from a different track, there are still only 'x' number of dollars available."

D. Barrett: "This ballot makes me very nervous. Do you always vote in private? This is a public meeting. . ."

N. Bangerter: "Should we not vote these publicly?"

President Fitch explained that the ballots were to be used so that the Trustees could individually prioritize the projects and then vote accordingly.

N. Bangerter: "I personally favor voting publicly. . ."

D. Mortimer: "What are the last three or four buildings or capital projects that have been in front of this group? Which ones are the most recent?"

B. Wallis: "The most recent is Bridgerland and then Davis . . ."

C. Johnson: "I would like to say something about Bridgerland . . . we shouldn't be choosing the financing method, that will be up to the Legislature and others . . . What we are here to do is to prioritize . . . So I don't think that we should say that this should be a lease instead of a purchase . . . all we are doing is prioritizing . . . this is an opportunity, and let's look at it as an opportunity. The financing mechanism is in someone else's hands, so I think that we need to be careful. I don't want to vote for two different things and I don't want to penalize this particular project by thinking that it will be picked up in a lease so let's not prioritize it."

D. Holmes: "But it makes a difference if we are talking about $7.75 million or $3.5 million . . ."

_____

J. Busch: "But I think that what we are doing here today is for the Building Board and that classification, not to present to the Legislature on what they should do."

N. Bangerter: "I think that ultimately they have to go before that (Building) Board but I think they have different voting with a lease purchase with that Board . . . I think they would look at a lease purchase differently than an outright lease."

N. Bangerter: "In reality we would hope that the Building Board would give credence to our priority list when they send their list to the Legislature. Would they do that Senator Evans?"

Senator Evans: "I think the decision made by the Building Board is that they will give the top two prioritization at the October meeting . . ."

J. Busch: ". . . are they going to look at a building project or a lease purchase the same . . .?"

K. Nye: "A lease purchase or a capital purchase is the same thing. You're still coming and asking for an obligation for a new building . . ."

D. Barrett: "So if we drop that to $3.5 (million), we're dropping the amount, why can't we add a third priority? What is this automatic top two?"

G. Fitch: "The top two are the slots provided by the Building Board and their decision is that they look across the State. They will allow two of our projects to be presented at their October meeting for consideration and then they make their recommendation to the Legislature. They limit us to the two. What we do have in the six is that the other four projects could potentially move to the five-year list for consideration and move up as you reprioritize on an annual basis."

K. Nye: ". . . recommend based on need."

D. Ipson: MOVED that the vote on the Capital Projects prioritization be made publicly. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen. Motion was approved (12 Yea, 1 Nay), and carried.

J. Busch: MOVED to keep the prioritization list the same as approved last year (1-Uintah Basin, 2-Bridgerland, 3-Davis). The motion was seconded by D. Barrett. (Motion Substituted)

D. Mortimer: SUBSTITUTE MOTION to proceed to vote the prioritization of each of the six presented projects. Motion was seconded by W. Woodward.

Chair Bangerter requested a Roll Call of the Vote: (7 Yea, 6 Nay, 2 Absent)
        Yea: Cannon, Woodward, Roberts, Johnson, Mortimer, Prows, Holmes
        Nay: Busch, Allen, Madsen, Ipson, Barrett, Bangerter
        Absent: Albrecht, Bingham
Substitute Motion Carried.

_____

The Board voted publicly and approved the following prioritization:

#1   UBATC
#2   BATC
#3   DATC
#4   MATC
#5   SLTATC
#6   OWATC

Break for lunch (12:55 – 1:15)

C. UCAT Board Meeting Dates (Tab P)

D. Holmes: MOVED to approve the UCAT Board of Trustees' meeting dates for 2004 as presented. The motion was seconded by J. Busch. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

D. Strategic Planning (Tab Q)

N. Bangerter: "You've been given a strategic planning book. We recommend that you take the time between now and the next meeting to review this and then we'll have a fuller discussion."

President Fitch referred everyone to their Strategic Planning book and explained how the book has been organized. The first page of each of the nine sections lists a "Goal Area" and several "Objectives." Subsequent pages for each section present each of the objectives individually and the associated "Strategies", "Responsibilities", "Funding/Resource (Fiscal Impact)", "Schedule", "Finish/Followup", "Reference Cite" and "Referred To" areas.

G. Fitch: "What we've done is to design a plan that takes you from those nine goals that you have, identified objectives in each of those areas, and then strategies on how to accomplish each one of those objectives.   What we are asking is that you take this home with you, read through them. This is your working document. Work very closely with your Presidents because as you add objectives or meet objectives, you can add or change to this document. From this basic skeleton we'll be able to flesh out the strategic plan within a period of time that will identify our particular needs for the future."

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Financial Aid Position Paper (Tab R)

L. Fife: "We've gone over our processes and tried to pull together a common financial aid model for UCAT. Four of the campuses have offered financial aid in the past but we now need to standardize a model for the institution. The federal government basically has two operating standards for financial aid; one is a credit hour environment and the other is a clock hour environment. We have traditionally said that we are clock hour but what we really are is competency based. Clock hour regulations emphasize the student sitting in the seat and the regulations require that the student sit in the seat for a set period of time. We are able to

_____

operate under the clock hour guidelines but it really is not what we need or want to do with our students. During an Executive Committee meeting, via teleconference call about a month ago, we asked for help from the Board in initiating a process to try to get the regulations changed. This paper is the result of a meeting with a financial aid representative. It gives you the background of our legislation, the background of the regulations and some solutions that we think would work better for us. It would require regulatory change in the law. One thing that I would like to add, this was developed before we had a meeting with the Washington D.C. representative from the Department of Education last week. As a result of that meeting, she said it is very unlikely that you would get this kind of change initiated at the federal level. One of the things that they are concerned about is proprietary schools which these regulations govern, and opening the door for problems. She suggested that we apply for recognition as an experimental site. And if we were able to do that we would be able to do what is proposed in the paper in a protected environment so that we would actually have time to deliver financial aid in the way that we need to, develop the model and demonstrate to the federal government and the State that this is a model that really does work, for the taxpayers, for the State and for the students."

B. Review of Background Check Survey (Tab S)

G. Fitch: "This is a consolidation of information to remind the Board that we had a question from Mountainland in regards to hiring process and background checks and criminal background checks for faculty and staff. You asked that we come back with general information, and what this does is provide you a nine college overview based on responses from the Presidents."

N. Bangerter: "I think that is something that we'll need to develop a policy on in the future. In lieu of that I think you would be served as good notice that if you're not doing it, you ought to do it in some form or another."

D. Holmes: "Is there a proposal that we adopt a UCAT policy sometime in the near future?"

G. Fitch: "That would be part of our policy development and also in our Strategic Planning. What you've done to this point is allow Mountainland to continue with their process. What we are trying to avoid is a central policy that would be a detriment to other institutions. But, the policy can be general and still meet the requirements for background checks."

C. UCAT Committees and Assignments (Tab T)

President Fitch indicated that this list of UCAT Committees and Assignments has already been approved, but requires one correction. Former Trustee Pamela Atkinson, listed on the Statewide Campus Development and Master Planning Committee, will be replaced by Trustee Daryl Barrett.

D. UCAT Central Administration Organizational Chart (Tab U)

_____

President Fitch reviewed the presented UCAT Central Administration Organizational Chart. He also introduced the new UCAT Budget Analyst, Kimberly Henrie, to the Board.

D. Roberts: ". . . to be so bottom heavy and top light, it amazes me that we can function efficiently. I think that there needs to be more emphasis from this Board to get the staff available."

E. Governor's Summit (Tab V)

G. Fitch: "The Governor is planning Summits across the State; you have a listing of the dates and times in your packet. Also, just for the Presidents information and also the two school board members and the two Regents' members, you have a signup sheet. The Governor's office would like you to indicate which one you are planning to attend, if you can attend, and then fax that over to them. One thing I would like to highlight, with the Governor's Summit letter, they wrote a letter directly to me asking specifically that UCAT be represented at every one of these Summits with at least four or five people. They are very interested in this because it has to do with the State Board's concern about competency education. As UCAT provides this we need to be a partner and support the State Board of Education."

D. Roberts: "Wouldn't it be nice if a high school graduate could graduate with emphasis in ATE? . . . I think that we have a great opportunity from the ATC point of view, where its competency based, wouldn't it be nice if the high school graduate graduates with an Associates degree, in one of the degrees that we offer?"

N. Bangerter: "One of the things in the subject that you are raising, as the new plan came out from the committee that the Governor formed, the emphasis seemed to be heavy on additional academic requirements in some areas. I've asked the question that I really don't know the answer to it, whether there is a two-track system for high school graduation, which I would like to see. One with an emphasis on technical training and one with an emphasis with going on to college. I don't know if there's any discussion on that in the State Board or others."

D. Allen: ". . . There is not any decision to do that, to separate that out, but there has been some discussion."

J. Cannon: "There needs to be an increased focus on counseling for students so that they are aware of the opportunities that are available and what career possibilities they have."

N. Bangerter: "If there is some way that we could get them directed toward real qualifications for jobs at the conclusion of high school that would be a big savings on the system."

J. Cannon: "I would just like to make this body aware that in association with these Summit meetings, individual State Board members are contacting districts, and we will be having meetings tailored specifically to State and public input."

D. Holmes: "Janet, what is the overall purpose of these meetings?"

_____

J. Cannon: "Our Governor is very interested in competency. And the State Board has proposed that we take graduation requirements for our students and start requiring that these students prove that they are competent in several core areas . . ."

D. Holmes: "So are there going to be two kinds of high school diplomas? One says you're competent and the other, if you're not competent, you still graduate?"

J. Cannon: "There's going to be some issues, particularly for lower performing students. There is an option of a Certificate of Completion versus the high school diploma. Also, if someone is having problems becoming competent in the core areas, they would have the opportunity to retake some of these classes so that by the time they graduate they would have had enough time that they can become competent in these areas."

N. Bangerter: "I don't like the idea of two different . . .if they graduate from high school I think the kid who's going technical should get the same certificate as the kid who's going on to college. Their transcript will determine their eligibility and their proficiencies. I don't mind having tough requirements, but if they meet the requirements, they all should all get the same certificate. One of the problems that we have in our society is there's a tendency that those who work with their hands . . . don't enjoy the status of others. And I think that we need to do everything that we can to elevate the business that we are in, because it's a real challenge in our society."

F. Confirmation of Purchase and Transfer of Land (Tab W)

G. Fitch: "The Board had originally approved for Mountainland to buy a piece of property from the Nebo School District. You required in your motion that we have a letter back ensuring that legally we were in a good position. . . The question that came up is that this was purchased originally as part of their Bond issue . . ."

G. UCAT Program Development/Approval Procedure and Faculty Workground/Standing Committee Guidelines (Tab X and Attachment E)

L. Fife: "You've seen these documents before at the last Board meeting. There are two documents, but I'd like you to focus your attention on the first one. The first one is the Program Development and Approval Procedure guidelines for UCAT. They were developed in order to provide some guidelines for faculty as they develop curriculum for UCAT. I brought this to the Board, at the last meeting, for your information so that you would know what we are doing, as well as for your input, with the intention of taking this document to the Board of Regents for their information. . . At the last Board meeting, there was a very good suggestion made, number 3, (in the document) probably the most significant thing that I've changed in the document. There is a requirement right now that the UCAT campuses that are not approved originally when we bring a degree or certificate of completion forward, come back subsequently to the Board of Regents for approval if they are ready to offer it. We established some guidelines for campuses to do that and the language that we built into that process, language that stated we would get letters of support from

_____

the other educational entities in the region. The point was made, why are we asking for letters of support, we should be asking for position statements. They might not necessarily support what we are doing but we need to know what their position is and what their rationale is for their position before we proceed as an institution with that offering. That is the most significant change in the document, that language has been revised. The others are more housekeeping issues. I would like to say that I don't know if the Board would want to be involved in the approval of procedural documents for the institution, because every time we make a change we would need to come back and have that approved. We are finding that this is an extremely dynamic process – we are changing it all the time. I would like to have your support in terms of your comfort level with the document, recognizing that we would like to take it to the Regents for their information."

D. Holmes: "It seems to me that these are very important documents for UCAT and it would be my thinking that we really should discuss them and formally adopt them rather than just acquiesce. So I would ask that you bring them back at our next meeting for approval."

N. Bangerter: "Does anyone object to that being an agenda item? I should report that Doug and I met with the Commissioner of Higher Education and half the Board of Regents this morning . . . and one of the things that was primarily discussed was this idea of curriculum development and are they putting too many rules on us? Doug made the point that their rules are for academic higher education and may not apply to us. Now they do have a mechanism where they can do what they call a fast track, and the President (Fitch) reported that he had met with all of the (Campus) Presidents last Wednesday and you had said that you had not had any problems in that area. I think the Board of Regents is interested in giving us as much latitude as they can conceivably give us and don't want to interfere. So if you run into roadblocks, they promised to sit with us and work through those. The main thing that I would like to say is, go do it. If you have a good idea, get it moving, give it a try and ask for permission while you're going. . . I think that the Board of Regents is on board with us, I don't think they're going to give us any problems in that area. But if they do, don't be quiet, let us know if you think they're in our way."

G. Fitch: ". . . for internal procedural activities that we follow, I would like to ask the Board, rather than make a formal motion on it, where we would have to wait until the next Board meeting or an Executive Committee meeting to change even a word or two, that if we can bring them back to you periodically as they need changes or adjustments, that we bring them back as information items. Because if you do something and vote on it, we're stuck with it until you change it down the line. So I'm looking for a compromise where we can administratively function within our procedures, make the adjustments, and then come back to you with them. We would bring you all of the procedures, like you see here, and then incorporate the changes that you recommended. If you start making them actual public votes, then we can't do anything until you vote on them again."

D. Holmes: "But we've never voted on these."

G. Fitch: "That's why I'm asking for clarification. Are you asking that these be brought forward to be voted on?"

_____

D. Holmes: "Yes."

D. Mortimer: "I think that we should vote on the official piece to get it started. And then when you need to make changes, you go ahead and make them and start using them, and then at the next Board meeting, just bring them up and say here's what we've done, is everyone in agreement, so that it doesn't stop you."

G. Fitch: "I'm concerned about the Board voting on something and then I go along and make decisions to tell people to do things and you may come to a vote on what we're doing and say no. So for a period of time we've had students doing something or we've been reporting differently, so that's why I'm asking that it be the same process but it be for information. That you look at it and recommend changes rather than make a formal approval. I want to be able to make those adjustments internally as we operate in our procedures and still come back to you with those changes. But if you vote on it, it's like law for me. I don't feel that I can violate it. It doesn't shortchange what you're getting."

D. Holmes: "But at this point, we have not had an opportunity to look through this thing and the Board consider it, discuss it and approve it or disapprove it."

N. Bangerter: "Why don't you look at it and if you have recommendations, one of the ways that you can handle that is as a part of the policy could be a mechanism where things could move forward for approval. I think you can write your policy to do what you want to do. I don't want to see done is that you have a good idea and it takes you forever . . . I want you to be able to move, prudently. The Presidents have constant contact with President Fitch and he bounces things off of me regularly . . . we try to keep in the box. But we've got to be out of the box a little sometimes, but we have to do it right and make sure that we are covered."

D. Holmes: MOVED that this agenda item be put as an action item on the agenda for the next UCAT Board of Trustees meeting (1 October). The motion was seconded by J. Cannon. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

H. Executive Committee Report (Tab Y)

G. Fitch: "The Executive Committee met and you've already had several of the items already presented. Normally you would do ratifications or move the items forward based on the Executive Committee's decision. . . Item #4, Board Memberships, at the time we were trying to confirm all of the memberships, renominations and replacements on the Board, which addresses what we have right now. Item #5, Elections of the UCAT Chair and Vice Chair, that election will be held in October and we wanted you to be aware that you have the authority to appoint and have an election for your UCAT Chair and Vice Chair, and that would occur as a ballot item in October. This Board can decide how to approach this and then please inform me and I would be happy to set it up however you like. Item #6, Financial Aid, that was the strategy and position paper. We really began that because Governor Bangerter asked, what do you want? And that's why Vice President Fife put that together and gave us the information."

_____

I.   Campus Presidents' Cabinet Report (Tab Z)
President Fitch referred to the Campus Presidents' Cabinet Agenda from the most recent meeting on 30
July 2003 to present various agenda items.

Item #2 HIPPA Compliance
"The Campus Presidents are aware on their campus that we have certain regulations and requirements
where we take information and deal with health services on the campuses. It has to do with risk
management and liability, and the Presidents are positioning their campuses to comply. We have to report
to the Attorney General what we are doing in those areas."

Item #9 COE Cost
"We had a meeting attended by about 40 representatives from the nine campuses. COE was here and
made a presentation on the self-study requirement for accreditation. After listening to them, the Presidents
and I sat down and wrote a letter asking for clarification on certain issues. One is the general education
requirement that they outlined. They indicated that they would work with us on the general education
requirement. We want the majority of our programs to be technical programs and in this particular case,
they said that they agreed. Now that we are in candidacy status, they have come back and said that there
is a possibility that we would need to have 15 hours of general ed, rather than the 12 that we've
incorporated and approved in our degree application. So we are still negotiating that point. My position is
that we will not advance to 15. It's not a requirement of the Northwest Association for the students that we
serve; it is a requirement of COE which aligns itself in the Southeast region. But our students typically don't
end up in the Southeast. The second component that we are dealing with is some of the procedures,
processes and requirements of their onsite visit. They submitted an estimate of what it would cost to bring
teams here and it was approximately $78,000. That's a bit much. We are asking for a cost accounting on
all travels. We are going back and forth on that. We are trying to hold them to what Utah would require as
a per diem, rather than simply on their own. And the reason that we are asking some of these questions is
because of some of their statements with regard to gratuities and recognition of people that are working for
them and the gifts that would be given, we don't agree with a lot of those activities . . .. We are still in
candidacy status, the last component that is key to that candidacy, and quite frankly the reason that we are
into it, is because it is insurance for our student financial aid. We will be applying for candidacy status, we
hope, mid year (2004) with Northwest Association. If that happens, we will be in a position where we'll be
able to negotiate better with the duo or we can just go with Northwest."

Item #10 Campus Compact
"This is a service component where our students do service in the community. This state will be the first
state with UCAT joining as the tenth institution, and the only state in the United States that has 100 percent
membership."

Item #12 Policy Restrictions
"I went to the Presidents and asked them specifically if they were having trouble with any Regents' policies
that are stopping them from having programs in a timely manner. The answer was no. We have other
issues dealing with certifying bodies and so forth, like at Salt Lake/Tooele . . . but that's not Regents'
policies dictating that. We were only looking at Regents' policy. So we worked through that and this

_____

morning (Joint meeting of UCAT and Regents' Executive Committees) the Regents' simply said they are willing to listen to anything that you want and help you move forward; tell us what you need."

Item #14 Nursing Reentry
"We will be meeting with the University of Utah staff. A large discussion and statewide initiative has gone on dealing with nursing and medical services generally. One of the things that was obvious from the very beginning, UCAT wasn't a player, but yet we do CNA and LPN, and RN with the associate degree through some of our partner institutions. With that idea in mind, we are in no position with the National League for Nursing to grant the Registered Nurse Recognition and Certification based on licensure. However, there's no reason since we provide technical training that nurses who are already licensed and registered, but have been out of employment, can't come back to us to get an upgrade in technical training, use of equipment, supplies, materials, etc. that our students right now are routinely engaged in. One of the things that we heard is that nurses returning to employment were intimidated by the environment, because it has changed so much since they left; and the second thing was the new technology. There is no licensing or certification requirement involved in that so UCAT, hopefully, will now be a player addressing that. The figure that we got from the State Nursing Board was that there were 4,000 people who are Registered Nurses and not working, so we are going to try to go out and let them know that we can help."

Item #15 Headcount Quarterly Review
"This is simply a centralized data processing component. We're going to start looking at headcount on a quarterly review. What we've done now is gone back and cleansed all of our information on our MIS system that the Commissioner is providing support for. Cleansing means the elimination of duplicated headcount, crossovers, etc. So we're getting to a point were we can actually get a clear understanding of what our numbers are, both in our normal membership hours and headcount, and also Custom Fit. So what we're going to be asking is for the centralization of quarterly reports so we can make sure that we match up and follow through and know where we're at."

Item #17 Standardization: HR Systems, Financial Records System, Student Information System/Classroom Management
"This follows up on the headcount quarterly review, as a standardization. There are some components, if we are to remain one college not nine stand alone colleges that would be part of a system, such as accreditation, student financial aid and so forth, that will be centralized. Also that may be some of our HR systems, financial records, student information systems and classroom management. We already have restrictions on us due to the legislation, for example, before Bridgerland can buy a completely new classroom systems program to review their students; they have to check with USU. Much like MATC now, MATC works with UVSC, and UVSC is saying that MATC's requests are going beyond their capability and that MATC needs to start doing something on their own. What's sad is that our nine institutions, because of the maturity levels, have everything from the very sophisticated system that they operate to an almost pencil-paper application with the same requirements. As financial aid approaches us, the reporting requirements for competency skills, hours and so forth, will be far more dramatic. We are going to try to find a way to centralize this information and if an MIS system is there, we're going to do that. We will be putting forward one nonvendor application to try to get funds from the legislature based on our needs. The Banner system will be in use by the majority of the colleges and universities. Presently, those UCAT

_____

campuses supported by other colleges, e.g. MATC/UVSC, may have to adapt. However, UCAT's reporting requirements are very different, so we will continue to examine our needs with the possibility that another product and a self-contained UCAT MIS will be our direction."

ADJOURN

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

Chair Bangerter adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 2:04 p.m.