

UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
7 APRIL 2004
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES

Board of Trustees Present

Norman Bangerter - Salt Lake/Tooele
Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland
Daryl Barrett - SBOR
Dixie Allen - SBOE
John Busch - Uintah Basin
Don Ipson - Dixie
Wayne Woodward - Southeast
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
Janet Cannon - SBOE

UCAT Campus Presidents Present

Rob Brems - Mountainland
Mike Bouwhuis - Davis
Linda Fife - Salt Lake/Tooele
Paul Hacking - Uintah Basin
Richard Maughan - Bridgerland
Rich VanAusdal - Dixie
Brent Wallis - Ogden-Weber
Miles Nelson - Southeast
Don Reid - Southwest

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

Brad Mortensen, Assistant Commissioner for Finance and Facilities
Gary Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education and Extended Programs

Media Present

Salt Lake Tribune
Deseret News

Others Present

Debbie Headden - Fiscal Analyst
Boyd Garriott - Fiscal Analyst
Race Davies - Governor's Office
Mary Shumway – Office of Education
Kendall Willardson – for Carl Albrecht

Excused Absent

Carl Albrecht - Snow College Richfield
Tom Bingham - Governor's Appt.
William Prows - Davis
Don Roberts – Southwest

MINUTES OF MEETING
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM
7 APRIL 2004

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held 7 April 2004 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 7 April 2004 Board meeting. Being none, motion was made by Vice Chair Holmes and seconded by M. Madsen to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from 7 January 2004 Board Meeting

Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 7 January 2004 Board meeting (Tab L). Being none, motion was made by Vice Chair Holmes and seconded by D. Barrett to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

A. SLTATC Freightliner Lease Extension (Tab M)

L. Fife: Presented the information on the Salt Lake/Tooele Campus Freightliner Lease and requested that the Board approve a lease extension for an additional twelve month period.

The Salt Lake/Tooele Campus currently leases 18,112 square feet of shop and office space from Freightliner of Utah. The property is located at 2255 South 5370 West, West Valley City, UT and is known as the West Valley Training Center. The current lease expires on August 4, 2004. The terms of the lease require six months prior notification of the intention to renew the lease for an additional twelve months. The lessor has granted an extension of the six month requirement to allow review and approval by the Salt Lake/Tooele Campus Board of Directors, and by the UCAT Board of Trustees as required by policy. The Salt Lake/Tooele Campus Board of Directors approved this lease extension at its regular meeting on March 18, 2004.

J. Cannon: MOVED to approve the lease extension as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Barrett. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

B. MATC/UCAT and Alpine School District Lease Purchase Agreement (Tab N)

R. Brems: Presented the information on the MATC/UCAT and Alpine School District Lease Purchase Agreement and requested that the Board approve a multiple year lease-purchase of the MATC American Fork facility consistent with intent language adopted by the Legislature, State Building Board determination that the lease purchase option is less costly to the State than the current lease, and approval by the Alpine School District Board of Education.

Currently, MATC leases the property from a private owner. Based on rapid growth and the need to expand into additional space at the site, MATC has approached the Alpine School District about purchasing the facility from the current private owner, making some additional improvements, and then allowing MATC to lease-purchase the property over a 12 1/2-year period. (This is a change from the agenda cover sheet which originally indicated a 14-year period). The private owner has accepted a \$2,600,000 offer from Alpine to purchase the property based on approval of the Alpine Board of Education.

While the UCAT Board of Trustees has statutory authority to allow MATC/UCAT to enter into a multiple-year lease, approval from the Legislature is required in order to allow a lease-purchase of the property. The following language was adopted by the 2004 Utah Legislature in the session recently ended:

UCAT/MATC Lease Purchase

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Mountainland Applied Technology Campus of the Utah College of Applied Technology use existing funds to enter into a lease purchase agreement with Alpine School District for the acquisition of the Pacific Avenue Applied Technology Facility costing up to \$2,900,000. It is further the intent of the Legislature that a lease not be executed until the Building Board has determined that the lease purchase option is less costly to the State than the current lease.

J. Cannon: Inquired as to the intended use for the building.

R. Brems: Stated that this will be a branch facility for automotive, biotechnology, certified nurse assistant, cosmetology, emergency medical technician, information technology and medical assistant programs.

Vice Chair Holmes: MOVED to approve the lease purchase agreement as presented. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

C. MATC Exception Requests (x2) (Tab O)

R. Brems: Presented the information on two exception requests. The first involves a request by MATC for an exception for programs currently being offered through a partnership with Utah Valley State College (UVSC), and requests that the Board approve the hours of MATC-enrolled students in the partnership courses listed below as eligible to be counted in the annual membership hour count of MATC and UCAT.

The programs involved in this partnership include Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Technology, Aviation, Collision Repair Technology, Diesel Mechanics Technology, Fire and Rescue Technology.

UVSC has programs already established in these fields, and has requested assistance from MATC to bolster enrollment. The partnership provides training opportunities for students served by each institution and eliminates potential duplication.

Instructors are employed by UVSC, and instructor costs are prorated with MATC and UVSC each paying a share of the instructor costs based on the percentage of students each has enrolled in the classes.

MATC and UVSC have agreed that hours generated by students enrolling through MATC will be counted by MATC in the UCAT system. Students enrolling through UVSC will be counted by UVSC through the Utah System of Higher Education.

The second exception request involves a request by MATC that the Board approve a tuition rate exception for the MATC Learning Lab based on the following explanation.

The MATC Learning Lab provides training in vocational math, reading and language skills needed for technical programs and employment. The instructor-facilitated computer-based adaptive learning format targets specific student and program needs, and is available on an unscheduled walk-in basis. Clock hours vary significantly depending on the student's documented competency needs.

Prior to FY2003 the Learning Lab was provided as a no-cost remediation resource. With funding changes in 2002, a nominal \$10 monthly tuition was implemented to partially cover lab costs while minimizing impact on students and keeping the highly accessible and flexible structure needed for students requiring math and communications remediation. The tuition was raised in FY2004 after it was determined that the impact of the \$10 fee had been minimal. Imposing the full regular UCAT tuition rate for this program at this time would create an adverse impact on both the program and the students. Most students access the lab fewer than 11 hours per week, and many would cease to enroll with a tuition rate nearly four times higher. Unlimited access for a \$20 monthly tuition provides opportunity and incentive for students to take full advantage of the lab while meeting fiscal needs.

W. Woodward: MOVED to approve the exception requests for MATC as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Holmes. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

D. DATC Warranty Deed Land Exchange (Tab P)

M. Bouwhuis: Presented the information on the DATC Warranty Deed Land Exchange and requested that the Board approve an exchange of property, based on the following, with Davis High School and authorize DATC to execute the Warranty Deed.

Davis School District discovered a 0.2 acre of property near the northern twenty-yard line of the Davis High School football field actually belongs to DATC. This discovery was made when the school district began the demolition of the old high school and the relocation of buildings and parking lots. Approximate value of the property is \$12,000.

The original campus of DATC was purchased from Davis School District, and the piece of property was deeded to DATC instead of being retained by the District. DATC has negotiated the exchange of a portable classroom valued at approximately \$20,000 to rectify the land transfer.

D. Mortimer: MOVED to approve the warranty deed land exchange as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Barrett. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

E. SEATC Exception Requests x2 (Tab Q)

M. Nelson: Presented the information on two exception requests. The first involves a request that the Board approve SEATC to count all of the membership hours from the mining program including those where the instruction is funded by the MSHA Grant. This will assist SEATC in growing the program to a point where SEATC can become a statewide resource for classes associated with mining activities.

The College of Eastern Utah (CEU) has recently discontinued its mining certification courses and transferred the responsibility for the program to the SEATC. SEATC has been teaching some of the courses the past two years and now has the responsibility to provide all of the certification related courses. Although the courses have been transferred to SEATC and CEU is providing facilities to house the program, there is no state funding beyond tuition to support the new program with SEATC.

This exception will allow for future growth funding to be requested through the legislature. Without the ability to count the hours as budget related, growth funding will be limited to tuition generation alone. One of the goals of UCAT's mining technology program is to provide this required training statewide through UCAT's regional campuses. State support of program growth would help move the program statewide.

The second exception involves a request by SEATC that the Board approve an exception for tuition and instructor salary in support of a partnership with CEU's CDL/Trucking/Heavy equipment program.

SEATC has partnered with CEU's CDL/Trucking/Heavy equipment Program for the past 10 years. The partnership has allowed the program to provide additional hours of hands-on training to the students. The hours of instruction have been split between CEU and SEATC to prevent duplicate counting for state funding.

During the SEATC's membership hour audit, it was determined that the current partnership arrangements did not meet the decision tree requirements for tuition and instructor salary. SEATC does not collect tuition on the students who already pay a significant fee to CEU for the program. Also, SEATC is paying an estimated cost of instruction to CEU for the non-credit instruction.

D. Mortimer: MOVED to approve the exception requests for SEATC as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Barrett. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

F. OWATC Exception Request (Attachment A)

B. Wallis: Presented the information for a tuition exception and requested that the Board approve a flat tuition rate of \$49 for apprenticeship math for FY2004 based on the following rationale.

Apprenticeship students enroll for a thirteen week term (six hours a week) and pay tuition in advance for the entire term. The UCAT approved tuition per term for the current year is \$198. Apprenticeship students not meeting entrance requirements in math must take an apprenticeship math course concurrent with their apprenticeship course. Apprenticeship math is a 13-week course that coincides with the apprenticeship term.

Students taking apprenticeship math prior to the beginning of their apprenticeship courses are charged the regular UCAT rate for enrollment in up to 12 hours per week which equates to \$247 for the 13-week course. When students take the course concurrent with apprenticeship coursework, they are charged a flat tuition rate of \$49. This rate was derived by calculating the tuition for a student taking 9 hours a week at the regular UCAT rate for 13 weeks (\$247) then subtracting the flat rate of \$198 for apprenticeship courses. Without this exception, apprenticeship students taking math concurrently would have to pay the \$198 for apprenticeship and then another \$247 for three hours a week math course, totaling \$445.

D. Mortimer: MOVED to approve the exception request for OWATC as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Barrett. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

Chair Bangerter: Expressed appreciation regarding the above action items that relate to partnerships with other institutions. In support of this type of association, Chair Bangerter mentioned the positive progress that is being made between the Salt Lake/Tooele Campus of UCAT and Salt Lake Community College, and the resultant draft agreement that is being moved forward. There have been meetings with the Commissioner and others, and a request has been made that the Commissioner put together a formal proposal on how to handle this situation, and that everyone will have to be patient a little while longer before a hard recommendation is presented. Chair Bangerter stated that the involvement of Commissioner Kendell has been very helpful, and expressed the importance of getting everybody "in the talking position" so that everyone knows what everyone is aware, and that there is a cooperative effort.

President Fitch: Echoed the sentiments of Chair Bangerter. "If you look carefully at those items that you acted upon, it engages not only our sister institutions, it engages the school districts, and . . . private industry and operations. It's an expansion of our role in economic development and it does so without adding additional facilities, so we very much appreciate what the Campus Presidents are doing."

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Legislation (Tab R)

K. Henrie: Explained the attached budget sheets which reflect a synopsis of UCAT funding requests during the last legislative session.

Summary of Appropriations, 2004 General Session. During the last legislative session, UCAT did “relatively well” in terms of what they received in their budget. This sheet reflects the fact that UCAT received a 6.1% (\$2,297,000) increase in base funding which consists of salary increases (1% ongoing COLA), Health (5.49%), Dental (2.7%), State Retirement, Program Increases (UCAT Enrollment Growth of 20%), UCAT Leases (MATC and SEATC), and a one time Salary Bonus. This adjustment increases the total state funds received to \$39,971,900.

Operating Budget Comparisons. This sheet shows a comparison between UCAT’s budget request, Governor Walker’s Recommendation and the Final Legislative Appropriation amount.

2004-05 Tax Fund Appropriations by Institution. The first table presents a comparison of the other nine USHE institutions and SBR Statewide Programs and SBR Administration, and the second presents each of the nine UCAT campuses and UCAT Administration, broken down by 2004-05 adjusted based budget, ongoing increases, one-time increases, total increases, and operating budget amounts. The other nine institutions of Higher Education received a total increase of 3.6%, as compared with UCAT’s total increase of 6.1%.

General Fund and School funds Percentage Distribution by Department. This sheet presents the percentage breakdown of the state total amount by department, for the last ten years. This shows that even though UCAT received a higher percentage than Higher Education this year, the percentage received is a decrease of .1% of the state total (1.1 to 1.0%) from last year.

Legislative Action on Capital Development for 2004-05. UCAT did not receive any State-Funded Capital Improvement Funds for buildings this year. However, UCAT was approved for three Other Funds Projects: DATC Entrepreneurial building, SEATC Blanding building and MATC Lease Purchase.

B. UCAT Tuition (Tab S, Attachments B and C)

G. Fitch: The Business Officers from each of the UCAT campuses have previously participated in the discussion of the UCAT Tuition proposal, as presented (Attachments B and C).

K. Henrie: Each year the UCAT Board of Trustees are asked to review the current UCAT tuition rate. The UCAT campuses make a recommendation, present it to the UCAT Board of Trustees for approval and then forward it to the Board of Regents for their final approval.

A PowerPoint presentation (Attachment B) was presented which reviewed the following components associated with a proposed change in the UCAT Tuition model used on each campus:

Historical Background

Prior to the creation of UCAT, each ATC developed a unique tuition model to meet their needs. The models were based on enrollment patterns and revenue plans that they had developed. It was determined

that these tuition models had tuition rates that were inconsistent for students that were less than full time (more than 30 hours per week).

Historical Hourly Tuition Rate for Full-time Students

Presented the historical hourly tuition rate per hour for a full-time student over the last 10 years, and also the percentage increase that it represents for the same period of time. This also reflects the state and national averages for each particular year, for comparison purposes.

UCAT Tuition Schedules 2002-03

Reflected the inconsistencies in the tuition schedules for the nine UCAT campuses in 2002-03. This was the starting point in the creation of a UCAT Tuition model.

2003 General Session and UCAT Tuition Legislative Intent Language

There are two main points in the intent language (1) uniform tuition rates be established for UCAT programs based on cost of instruction and on market demand, and (2) the recommended tuition rate increase be implemented as soon as possible.

The "Double-Kink" Tuition Model

Based on the legislative intent language, this tuition model was developed and approved by both the UCAT Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents, and implemented 1 July 2003.

Points of Conflict: Linear versus Front Loaded Tuition Models

In an attempt to address the intent language and to create a uniform tuition rate across all the UCAT campuses, this new model proved to be problematic for some of the campuses. Some campuses have indicated that previous student enrollment patterns have been affected which have impacted campus revenue. Based on that, the campuses have requested that the existing tuition rate model be revisited.

After meetings with the Business Officers and Campus Presidents, two tuition models were identified for further consideration, a linear model and a (front loaded) step model. The meetings highlighted concerns regarding both revenue and policy issues. The policy conflict centered around the campuses who favored the linear model which would provide low cost tuition without penalizing the student for taking a minimal number of hours. Those campuses interested in the front loaded step model wanted to create incentives for students to complete their programs as quickly as possible and get into the workforce. The revenue conflict centered on requiring campuses that traditionally were front loaded to become linear which would result in a loss of revenue unless they were to raise their tuition 50% for their full-time students. If those that were traditionally linear would now become front loaded, revenue would decrease because those students going part-time and paying a lower tuition rate could no longer afford to pay the tuition.

2004-05 UCAT Proposed Tuition Model

This model proposed that each campus choose between two tuition schedules based on their needs, linear model or step. The campus would need to commit to the use of one schedule for the entire fiscal year. The two schedules meet at three major points (11, 23 and 30 hours per week), and at these three points, all students in UCAT are paying the same rate per hour.

2004-05 UCAT Tuition Model versus 2003-04 UCAT Tuition Model

An advantage of the proposed model is that most part-time students (less than 30 hours) will receive a tuition decrease.

How UCAT Full-time Tuition Compares to Other USHE Institutions

The comparison assumes a UCAT full-time student taking 900 clock hours per year (30 clock hours per week) versus the traditional 30 semester credit hours (15 for two semesters per year) for the other nine USHE institutions. This comparison shows the current year (2003-04) tuition rates, the next fiscal year (2004-05) tuition rates if UCAT remains at \$1.00 per clock hour, the next fiscal year tuition rates if UCAT raises tuition to \$1.15 per clock hour, and finally, the next fiscal year tuition rates if UCAT goes to a pure linear model (which would raise the clock hour cost to \$1.55).

How UCAT Half-time Tuition Compares to Other USHE Institutions

The comparison assumes a UCAT part-time student taking 450 clock hours per year (15 clock hours per week) versus the traditional 15 semester credit hours for the other nine USHE institutions. Currently, UCAT part-time students pay \$1.67 per clock hour.

2004-05 Tuition Proposal Summary

Requested that the proposed two schedule tuition model be adopted because:

Full-time students will experience a .15 per clock hour tuition increase

Part-time students will experience a tuition decrease to encourage additional enrollment

Negative revenue impact of the model used last year will be minimized

Next Steps

April 7-May 30: Campus tuition hearings

June 2: Campus reports to the UCAT Board of Trustees

June 2: UCAT Board of Trustees approval of the tuition rates

June 3-4: Board of Regents approval of the tuition rates

July 1: Implementation of the new tuition rates

K. Henrie: Referred to Attachment C which reflected the tuition impact of three tuition models:

Current Tuition Model - broken down by cost per week and cost per hour

Schedule 1 Step Tuition Model – broken down by cost per week, cost per hour, change per hour and % change

Schedule 2 Linear Tuition Model – broken down by cost per week, cost per hour, change per hour and % change

D. Barrett: Expressed concern about a campus potentially changing the tuition rate model from one year to the next and the subsequent impact on the student. She asked the Campus Presidents to respond to her concern.

B. Wallis: Ogden-Weber campus has had a front loaded tuition schedule for several years. It was put in place as an incentive to encourage students to get through more quickly and thus cost less. He stated that there will be the same up front expenses incurred, whether the student takes 1 clock hour or 12 clock hours, so they are trying to encourage the student to take more hours which will be more cost effective. The Finance Officers had previously debated the tuition rate issue, recognizing the myriad of differences between the campuses and tried to find a solution based on commonality. This is the consensus, but the big problem is the fiscal impact on each campus, operating on one system and switching to another system. In response specifically to Trustee Barrett's concern, Campus President Wallis stated that he doesn't believe that the campuses will be switching back and forth between the tuition models.

R. Maughan: Bridgerland campus has previously operated on a linear schedule. This type of tuition rate model works better for their students who attend during the afternoon and evening, which will provide a cost consistency for the student. His response to Trustee Barrett's concern is that BATC has used linear tuition schedule in the past and will continue to use that schedule in the future because it makes the most sense for their student body and their budget.

D. Barrett: Asked if the UCAT Presidents' Cabinet support the proposed tuition model.

R. Maughan: "Yes we do, because we have a choice."

G. Fitch: Referred to the Attachment B, "UCAT Tuition Schedules 2002-03" which reflected the inconsistencies in the tuition schedule for the nine UCAT campuses in 2002-03. ". . . We had testified for years that we were low cost . . . If you calculate this scattergram, you can see that BATC was charging .85 per hour and that others were building theirs up as the front load as they thought necessary. That's not to say that one or the other was good or bad, that's just the way it was. When the intent language was forced on us, we had to respond, so last year we created a model that we put all the institutions under and this is where you adjusted the cost to \$1.00 per hour which eventually demonstrated to us that in some areas it would have essentially bankrupted (some campuses, such as DATC) and compounded problems for BATC and the students. We looked at our sister institutions in the USHE . . . the other institutions typically do not charge the same tuition. They charge an additional reasonable application based on hearings with the students and programs. It is what we tried to do to reach a compromise. If we would simply have demanded a straight linear model . . . you may have appeased a BATC and the smaller institutions, but you would have essentially crippled DATC and OWATC. So we went back to all of the business officers and asked how we could approach this and still remain within the purview of open entry/open exit, competency based and still maintain market-to-bear cost elements . . . and still serve the students, and that's the purpose of the truth-in-tuition hearings. These Campus Presidents essentially have two options and those options allow for regional differences and student differences. So what we are asking them to do is to go back, hold their hearings and then come back to this Board with their information from those hearings so that this Board can act on it. Rob (Brems) indicated . . . there is some paperwork out there, whether it is catalogs or other things that talk about tuition increases and the cost of attendance. What we'll have to do because each of those documents should have disclaimers, is come back through our public hearings, through our public process, and through our Board with the media present and announce change. It keeps the integrity of the law, the integrity of the interest in low cost and actually market-to-bear and also gives

tremendous flexibility within the institutions. . . This actually provides us the best of both worlds in operating. If you notice, it intersects (proposed tuition rate model) at three locations, and that's the key because everyone essentially charges the same price for a full-time student. Eventually down the line as we kept adjusting our tuition and cost, and as the state tries to provide us additional funding that we seek, I think that eventually you will see all of that coming together down the line."

D. Mortimer: Asked if there would be as much incentive to make sure that the student completes the program (using the step tuition model) as opposed to the other tuition model where the campus would not receive all of their money unless the student completes. "What is the completion rate of students who complete the step model versus the linear model?"

M. Bouwhuis: Responded that DATC currently follows the step tuition model. "When you look at an analysis of our tuition payers and our enrollment hours, we have very few of the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, there are just not that many students who take that number of hours. That's probably the major difference between our service hours and President Wallis' (OWATC) service hours. Most of those people in the 1 to 10 category are employed individuals in our area and their companies are paying their tuition. For many years the higher tuition at the lower level allowed us the flexibility to start the programs because you could charge this amount of money to pay your costs, you could start a program on a dime and then use general fund money over the long haul to integrate those programs. As far as completion rates, in reality the way that it works for our institution . . . for example, students enroll in our full time day program at 20 to 30 hours per week and within 6 to 8 weeks you walk into that some classroom and they're all out working. So then you go into the night program and you find them there and they are very anxious to finish their program. To get a certificate means more to the student . . . so there's an incentive to the student to finish. We have a fairly high completion rate using both models. They start out at \$1.15 and then come back at night on their employers tab at \$2.00 per hour. So rarely do you have students in the 1 to 5 (hour) category.

B. Wallis: ". . . In talking with students . . . we find that many of them will make comments like 'I can take these additional hours and it will cost me less and as a result I want to do that and move through as quickly as I can.' Over the years we have found that students do take advantage of it. In last year's model we were trying to pull everybody together and that began to change the complexion of it. So now we're at the point where you have the step option or the linear option and make the connection at three points . . . and will be able to get that even closer as we continue to massage it and work it over the years. There is an incentive in here and it's worked for us."

J. Cannon: Requested the breakdown of how many campuses have chosen which tuition model.

K. Henrie: Seven of nine have indicated that they may select the linear model; two of nine have indicated the step tuition model. However, both models will be presented to the students of the campuses, a determination by each campus will then be made, and the results will be documented publicly to the Board during the next meeting.

C. SLTATC/SLCC Update (Tab T)

L. Fife: Responded to a request by President Fitch to prepare a brief report on the status of the Salt Lake/Tooele ATC and Salt Lake Community College issue. A Memorandum of Understanding (“Strategic Alliance document”) between the two institutions has been created and is in the process of review/revision by all involved parties. This document will identify solutions to long-standing issues between the two entities and assist with cooperatively addressing and resolving the service needs in the Salt Lake/Tooele area.

D. General Education for the AAT Degree (Tab U)

L. Fife: Explained that when the AAT degree was first structured, it was done to provide maximum transferability in general education for our students to other institutions, and to maintain a technical focused degree. The general education requirements of the degree were in Communication/English, Mathematics, Human Relations, and an elective related to the technical specialty. Two problems have now been identified: (1) definition of what is considered “related”, and (2) location restricting options on where to take the general education classes (ex: UBATC and USU). As a result, the decision was made in consultation with the Campus Presidents’ Cabinet and the IPCC to expand the “related” requirement to one three-credit hour general education course offered by the other USHE institutions in the areas of physical or life science. This change will broaden the number of courses available to students but retain the technical focus of the degree.

Vice President Fife also relayed that communications in the Campus Presidents’ Cabinet and IPCC meetings have involved discussions relating to UCAT’s focus on technical mission as opposed to the transferability option as dictated in law. Although the law specifies that the AAT degree will be “transferable” the law does not address the challenges that this presents for UCAT and the receiving higher education institutions. Vice President Fife pointed out that technical degrees, like associate of applied science (AAS) degrees, don’t transfer in the same way as associate of science (AS) degrees do. The focus of UCAT’s technical degree is to prepare the student for the workplace; the AAT is not a transfer degree and UCAT is not a transfer institution. There will need to be changes in the law to address these realities and focus on UCAT’s mission.

L. Fife: Responding to a question from Trustee Madsen regarding accreditation requirements and a technical terminal degree versus a transferable degree. “Northwest is not modifying what they are – the Northwest Commission has always had a very clear distinction between technical degrees and transfer degrees at the associate level. COE makes no distinction at all. . . We’ve just constructed a degree that allows for maximum transferability and now we are saying ‘maybe we shouldn’t be so concerned with maximum transferability,’ because what we are really trying to do is get students in the workforce. If they know they want to transfer, a community college is a better option.”

R. Brems: Referring to the Campus Presidents’ Summit at MATC on 5 April 04. “. . . On this transferability issue, the decision on transferability will always be left to the institution that they are trying to transfer to.

So looking back historically from where we've been able to develop good transferability, there's always been more of a local or regional agreement . . . rather than this blanket approach . . . that is much harder to accomplish. . .”

L. Fife: “It really is an articulation matter rather than a transferability issue. . .”

G. Fitch: “. . . Basically if you look at UCAT right now, we have the AAT degree that is essentially established because of the accreditation requirements and in the law. The component of the law says to ‘ensure’ the transfer of this particular degree. What that does is put the obligation on the other institutions who receive that degree, to accept it in total. The question is, ‘Is it really acceptable in total?’ What happened as we created our degree and requested those general education hours as part of our degree component, we start subjecting ourselves to the restrictions and the requirements of the other institutions and the traditional presentation of the degrees and accreditation. They are not going to jeopardize their accreditation simply because the law says that you have to transfer the degree. . . What we are looking at in this discussion is, how can we take certain components of this that are necessary, include that in our technical degree, and use related instruction to meet the Northwest Association requirements? Those components . . . will be part of our training and will not be an obligation for the general education component. The other component is articulation. Weber (State University) and Ogden-Weber (ATC) have articulation agreements . . . They are already working in some particular regions. So why should we subject ourselves to tighter scrutiny . . . when we really don’t need to, if we go back to being what we are supposed to be?”

D. Barrett: “Does that require a law change?”

L. Fife: “Restructuring the degree won’t require a law change. The transferability issue . . . is what needs changing (in the law). To restructure our degree, what the law has said is, if general education is part of our offering, we can’t do it. We rely on other institutions.”

D. Barrett: “We knew the legislation wasn’t perfect and this is a piece that needs to be tweaked without changing the mission. I like the flexibility of what you’re explaining and how it needs to be individual in nature between institutions.”

G. Fitch: “Given the success of our larger institutions in meeting business and industry need and developing the economy in their area, I think that what it does is put us back on track for a specific mission rather than forcing us into a competitive mode. However, for accreditation we have to provide degree status at the college level. This does provide the degree status, but we’re dictating what the degree will be as opposed to trying to accommodate what is the traditional concept of the degree and transfer. What we need to do is ensure that as our students enter the program, that they recognize it for what it (the degree or certificate) is, and the student’s job is to finish the program and get to work. If they want to do something else on their own, they can take components and that’s where these articulation agreements come into play. We are not denying them the options. If someone comes to a UCAT campus, the idea is that I am coming to gain the skills to work. That’s what we are trying to provide and that’s where our strength has been.”

E. Program Process Update (Tab V)

L. Fife: Responded to the Board's request for a monthly update of any concerns or problems related to the UCAT Program Development and Approval Procedures. There had not been any concerns originally expressed when the inquiry was made by Vice President Fife. However, when Vice President Fife attended a recent OWATC Board meeting, she learned that there are some concerns about the process and she wanted to advise the UCAT Board of those concerns.

"The concerns are not really focused on the Board's policies and procedures. . . The problem really is when one institution (UCAT) develops the Certificate of Completion at 900 hours or above, or degrees, all of our faculty across the state come together in a workgroup and develop the curriculum for that degree. . . The issue that was of concern at the Ogden-Weber campus, with their Board, was with Hill AFB and a course to be added to the certificate. In order to add that course to the certificate, because all the faculty were instrumental in developing it, it needs to go back to the faculty group, to add (the course) to the certificate. You do not always have uniformity in the way that faculty feel about adding something to a certificate of completion. This one was resolved and we did add a course. There have been other issues, some feeling that we need more hours in a course or program, but the majority of the committee does not feel that we need to do that, and we don't have consensus in those issues and that really is a dysfunction of trying to standardize a curricular process across the institutions. I don't know what the answer is to that. We've talked about a lot of different things. . . But I do want you to know that there are concerns, and that I don't think any of us really know at this point how to do this better.

D. Barrett: ". . . It seems to me that the basics that they all agree on for a certificate could be the general piece and then if you have an industry that comes and wants something else, that you could say with an 'emphasis in,' and add an emphasis area that meets their specific need but doesn't have to make everyone add that when it's not needed in their area."

L. Fife: "There really are emphases. We have a structure right now that when we initially constructed this, everyone said we need to have these particular things . . . so that individual campuses could pick and choose what they needed. The problem emerged when they want to modify what's already in place and not everyone in the committee agree that it should be modified. One possibility that we talked about . . . is there a way to have a core that all of the faculty committees agree to? That would be our certificate offering. If you want to add an elective and it makes sense for you, could we provide flexibility even though it's a UCAT offering? Does it need to go back to the entire group? It's cumbersome to do that, and I think that there's some value at looking at that."

Chair Bangerter: "I think that you need to keep this thing as flexible as you rationally and reasonably can with the local campuses to respond. The difficulties that you have with committees is that they come from too many different backgrounds. I think that we need to do everything that we can to preserve the initiative, the institutions are out there, so that they are responsive to the new opportunities as they come."

R. Brems: “. . . For years as I worked at the state level, I understood the need for certain things to become commonalities, to have this core . . . But it wasn't until I worked at the regional level that I totally appreciated the need to look at the individual differences between, not only what our workforce looks like in our individual regions, but also the stage which we are finding ourselves in terms of maturity of the institution. We have to have that regional flexibility on these items . . . but there also has to be a common thread of President Fitch and his staff that weaves us all together, and we just have to keep working on the regional flexibility along with a united system.”

Vice Chair Holmes: Felt that the process for the AAT degree works well but expressed concern about the process with regard to certificates. “I don't think that I have or anyone has any problem going through this whole process for the degrees. That should go through the normal degree process. But on certificates . . . It's how long it takes to get the approval because you have to go through this committee and it can take a considerable length of time. The IPCC, because they have nine different members, may decide that we need this and need that, and take six or nine months to get it approved. So, there are two problems: the problem of adding additional information because of the other institutions, and the problem of how long it takes to get it approved. We need to look at both of those.”

Chair Bangerter: “. . . The challenge that you have is that we're always afraid to give people some slack. . . I really would argue for as much flexibility as we can do and then have the accountability come back. When we tie everything too tight, we restrict our people . . . and what we really need to do in education, I think, is unleash the talent that we have here and let them meet the challenges that they face every day. . . I don't like centralized things, but you have to have some of it . . .”

W. Woodward: “I support and agree with that, but let's not forget . . . UCAT has to have some credibility. If you get a machinist certificate from Ogden and then come to Price to work and show me that certificate and don't have the general skills that I expected to come with a certificate of machinery because they were specialized over here (Ogden). . . We need to keep that integrity in tact as the basis of what that certificate would say. But by all means we need to be able to provide the flexibility that if Hill needs an additional course to satisfy their needs, they can add it without a bureaucratic mess to go through.”

G. Fitch: “Some time ago we had a question regarding the business application of the certificates . . . What we are looking at here is trying to develop a core component that would always be there to do what you (Woodward) are talking about. When a machinist comes in, they know how to do these things. . . However, what we are looking for is to expedite things. For example at Hill AFB, there could be a core, but add extra hours in your area to meet specific needs. I can't see where, for example, somebody learning the specialized components here wouldn't be of value to you in Uintah Basin if they have all of the general skills necessary that you are looking for. I think that's where we are heading.”

L. Fife: “There's quite a bit of flexibility in these guidelines to revise them, I just wanted to let you know that there will be some revisions in the language related to the certificate of technical competence, the certificates that we award for one course. We have bad language in terms of the cumbersome nature of doing these.”

F. Personnel Update (Tab W)

G. Fitch: Introduced Kendall Willardson, who is present representing Trustee Albrecht from Snow College, Paul Hacking, the interim Campus President from the Uintah Basin campus and Linda Fife, the interim Campus President from the Salt Lake/Tooele campus. President Fitch also announced that SWATC Campus President Don Reid will be retiring on 30 June 2004.

President Fitch reminded the Board of the process in place for selection of the UCAT campus presidents. "Typically the local campus board of directors, designs or determines if they want to be a screening committee, a selection committee, and then make recommendations to my office, and send forward three names and then they move through the process and hire. . . The interim presidents or anyone serving on an interim basis have the ability to apply."

President Fitch reminded the Board of the process involved in the evaluation of the Campus Presidents. A year ago, the Board agreed that the UCAT Campus Presidents could be evaluated on alternating years, instead of all nine every year. The Campus Presidents who will be evaluated this year are: VanAusdal (Dixie), Nelson (Southeast), Maughan (Bridgerland), and Bouwhuis (Davis).

D. Barrett: Inquired as to the process involved in evaluating the campus presidents.

G. Fitch: "It's rather a lengthy and extended process. When I first arrived, there was no pure process for evaluating . . . they may have been evaluated among their own Boards within their own system, but because of UCAT becoming one, there was no overall, comparable evaluation process that we could follow."

President Fitch explained that he contacts the Chair of the local Board of Directors directly to provide the evaluation materials. The process is coordinated with the campus president, representatives of the Campus Board of Directors and the UCAT President, who serves as the appointing authority. There will be in place at each campus a "Review Team" comprised of the Campus Board of Directors Chair, one other Campus Board member selected by the Campus Board of Directors, and one person selected by the Campus President. This appointee shall be a member of the staff of the campus, a representative of a school or college in the region, or any other person (other than family members) that has knowledge of the Campus President's service.

The Review Team may select any method, as deemed appropriate, to evaluate the Campus President. Materials are used to solicit input from others, e.g. superintendents, business community-at-large, campus staff, and representation from other colleges, regarding the Campus President's performance. There are four sections to the evaluation: (1) System Duties and Responsibilities, (2) Goals, (3) Projects, and (4) Numerical Review. The completed documentation is sent to President Fitch and is used in the review process with the specific Campus President. The goals section is evaluated from the previous evaluation to determine if progress has been made in ascertaining those goals, what can be done to adjust them, if necessary, and move through the process. Then President Fitch submits a letter for renewal.

“The process was done originally because we didn’t have anything. It has expedited (the process) because we use the alternate year process, giving the campus president a year or two to get goals in place and make accomplishments so that they can be truly evaluated on what their intent and purposes are. We do incorporate the elements of the law that says what campus presidents must do and are required to do. We incorporate the goals they project for their own area. It is very specific to what they are doing. They are not evaluated against another president in another area.”

G. Accreditation Update (Tab X)

G. Fitch: “We will be coming back to this Board at your June meeting with a specific plan on how to address the accreditation issues. And by accreditation, I’m using that as just an umbrella concept. The components that we will be looking at, that will be part of this overall plan are:

- Revisit our Mission. As you can see as we talked about our degree options and so forth, what that does is centralize our mission option, establish our focus and direction specific to technical education, and that will be a key component as we seek accreditation as a multicampus unit within, for example, Northwest or COE. The mission statement will be very focused and direct our certificate and the associate of applied technology degree.
- Structure. Are we one college with nine campuses or nine independent campuses? We feel that particular question will be answered with this plan as we move forward. All of the (campus) presidents met with, not only with Commissioner Kendell and myself, but also with two members of UHEAA. Any accreditation discussion is tied directly to financial aid support. What this does is look at our major, primary institutions which will continue to move forward, full board. The smaller institutions will continue to move forward at their own pace, but the key to that is that they will continue to be under the umbrella of UCAT. The primary element will be choice; to remain as they are, to remain as a partner for the smaller institutions that may not have staff or funding to support them, to be a partner with one of the senior institutions. Or, based on the economy, there is the potential that a campus of UCAT will align with one of our traditional institutions.
- Organization. There will probably be requirements and changes in the law. We are looking at the Regents and so forth, and their responsibilities, the Boards, this (UCAT) Board of Trustees, our Boards of Directors, Officers of the campuses, my Central Office and how it will function. The plan will incorporate those organizational recommendations. One thing that I think all the (Campus) Presidents agree to, as we look at it, we would like to remain with Commerce and Revenue committee through the legislature at this particular time. We do not want to shift to the Higher Education committee.
- Accreditation. Those institutions that are capable will continue to move forward, visiting and working with COE. But as you can see, any changes in our mission, any changes in our degree applications may have an impact as we relate to COE. We are moving toward Northwest accreditation which will recognize us as a multicampus/college unit. We’ll have a combination of our smaller and larger institutions, being able to move at their own pace and still remain within the system.
- Financial Aid. We are trying to ensure through our relationship with COE and the candidacy status, so those institutions that are providing financial aid continue to do that during this period of time.

We are on an 18-month crunch time right now to ensure the continuation. If we start looking at our smaller institutions relating to the larger institutions, we have had questions of financial aid and their ability to serve under one federal number or a second id number in those cases, so we'll be looking at all that, trying to ensure the flexibility for our students.

- Process. The question/attitude is, we need to centralize certain things, for example, data, our budget requirements under the law. We do want to maintain elements and integrity of the law that put us in the position we're in to serve business and industry. So we try to be a watchdog and serve those while allowing the institutions to continue to grow on their own. The centralization process would be outlined. They will not be much beyond what the law has already determined at this time, that we've operated under. For example, the budgets would still come to the UCAT Board of Trustees, or whatever this body is defined as, and then move forward as one budget to the legislature through Commerce and Revenue. We would not have four, five, six . . . additional budgets moving on their own independently.

The key to it, and with the Commissioner's assistance, we now have someone willing to step out, take a leadership role in a system wide application, and move this forward."

D. Barrett: "On accreditation, some are moving forward with COE and yet there's the ultimate idea that we will go with Northwest. Is there a conflict there? Can you have some under one accreditation and some under another?"

G. Fitch: "You can seek accreditation; you just need to notify each accrediting body that you're seeking accreditation so they understand what's going on. The COE accreditation, for example, right now with all of us under candidacy status, would allow us to continue for financial aid. The smaller institutions as they look at COE accreditation right not, have dues coming forward very soon, on, July 1, and are not receiving any true benefit from a relationship with COE, even in candidacy status, simply because they're not in a position with personnel or financially, to be able to provide student financial aid. There will be other institutions that are not at the level of the four larger institutions, but because of program accreditation requirements and recognition, have to have candidacy to offer a program, like Pharmacy Tech. But our ultimate goal is to move to Northwest because even though we are not looking at the transfer of the degree, the articulation of any component of our degrees, the recognition of the standards of education, would be comparable to the other nine colleges/universities under Northwest. Plus their (Northwest) flexibility is outstanding. For example, they're the ones that allow "related studies" for a technical degree rather than requiring 12 to 15 general education hours."

H. Strategic Planning Committees' Update (Tab Y)

G. Fitch: Indicated that this agenda item is in place to allow all three UCAT standing committees the opportunity to bring the UCAT Board up to date on committee activities.

Statewide Campus Development and Master Planning Committee
Nothing to report at this time.

Mission Role Accreditation Committee

M. Madsen: The committee is still trying to address the accreditation issue. The overall organization will impact that.

Funding/Services Legislative Support Committee

Nothing to report at this time.

I. Campus Presidents' Cabinet Report (Tab Z)

President Fitch referred to the Campus Presidents' Cabinet Agenda from the most recent meetings on 4 February and 24 March 2004 to present various agenda items.

Item #3 (24 March) UCAT Organizational Structure

"From the Presidents' Cabinet meeting, the Summit that you've heard us talk about, involving Commissioner Kendell and the financial aid people from UHEAA, came from that Presidents' Cabinet meeting. It allowed us to move forward in the areas we have been talking about."

Item #6 (24 March) Assignment of Business Officer for Custom Fit

"I'd like to remind you that this Board gave us the authority to continue to move forward because of your response and stewardship of Custom Fit, to start modifying not only the policies and procedures but also to address the audits in Custom Fit. One of the things that we are doing in moving forward is that we will assign a Business Officer, in this case Andy Archibald from the Ogden-Weber campus. He will be there to assist them with audit issues or concerns that may surface, and also to assist when they look at funding proposals and formulas. Kimberly (Henrie) is also directly engaged in the funding aspect, and Sandi (Grimm) is directly engaged in handling the reporting aspect. Previous to this assignment with Custom Fit, we were getting very little participation from one of the community colleges that provides for Custom Fit training, and an audit brought to the surface some issues and concerns that are public knowledge. However since that time with this realignment, the college is not only participating on a regular basis with us, they have also volunteered staff . . . to do some other things as far as the Custom Fit Council is concerned. They have made excellent recommendations in serving areas, and one of the components of our agreement is the idea that SLTATC and SLCC will be working and sharing Custom Fit applications, and meeting business and industry needs. It's exciting to see some of the old barriers dropped. I think that you will be quite pleased with the final report in September/October on what Custom Fit is doing at this particular time. Quite frankly, we asked for \$500,000 more for Custom Fit and did not get that through the legislature. I can only speak for Salt Lake/Tooele (campus) right now, but they have used the \$52,000 that was available to them in transfer and they have \$180,000 worth of formal training requests by companies for additional matching training and we can't meet their needs. And it's the same across the board at every one of our institutions that provide Custom Fit. It's a tremendous opportunity in this state for economic development, probably one of the strongest components of the UCAT system."

Item #8 (24 March) Higher Education versus Other

"I think, and the consensus is, that we still want to continue to work with Commerce and Revenue."

Item #9 (24 March) Compensation/Salary Increases

“This is a peculiar one this year. Our concern is that after three years, we are looking at a one percent increase across the board, and then a one percent bonus component that would be provided to full-time employees, but in fact it’s less than that because of the lack of funding and support for all of the dental, all of the health, and some of the other requirements that we are confronted with. So we appreciate from the legislature their efforts in this area given the restrictive economy, but unfortunately it still impacts our employees overall.”

ADJOURN

Vice Chair Holmes: MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen. Motion was unanimously approved and carried.

Chair Bangerter adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 12:10 p.m.

The next UCAT Board of Trustees meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 2 at 10:00 a.m.