UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
01 MAY 2002
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES

<u>Board of Trustees</u>
Norman Bangerter, Chair - Salt Lake/Tooele
Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Carl R. Albrecht - Central
Thomas Bingham - Gov. Appt.
John Busch - Uintah Basin
Janet Cannon - SBOE
Don Ipson - Dixie
Charlie Johnson - Regents
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainlands
William Prows - Davis
Don Roberts - Southwest
Wayne Woodward - Southeast

<u>Regional ATC Presidents</u>
Mike Bouwhuis - Davis
Bo Hall - Salt Lake/Tooele
Carl Holmes - Central
Richard Jones - Uintah Basin
Richard Maughan - Bridgerland
Miles Nelson - Southeast
Rich VanAusdal - Dixie
Brent Wallis - Ogden-Weber
Don Reid - Southwest

<u>Institutional Representation</u>
Gregory G. Fitch

<u>Commissioner's Office</u>
Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner
Gary Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education and Special Projects
Linda Fife, Director of Academic Programs
Brad Mortensen, Director of Business and Finance

<u>Media Present</u>
*Deseret News*
*Ogden Standard Examiner*

<u>Others Present</u>
Senator Scott Jenkins
Jared Haines - VP, Mountainlands ATC
Dr. Marv Johnson - SBOE
Collette Mercier - VP of Instructional Service, Ogden-Weber ATC
Debbie Headden - Fiscal Analyst
Jay Greaves - VP of Instruction, Davis ATC
Kelle Stephens - Custom Fit
Dana Slaughter - Custom Fit
Jackson Ferguson - HFS Architects
Barry Smith - HFS Architects
Greg Scherer

<u>Excused Absent</u>
Pamela Atkinson - Regents
Earl McCain - SBOE
Royanne Boyer - Mountainlands ATC

MINUTES OF MEETING
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM
01 MAY 2002

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held on 01 May 2002 in the Utah State Board of Regents Board Room.

<u>Call To Order</u>
Chair Bangerter called the meeting to order at 11:06 a.m. and the Secretary was in attendance. A quorum was present.

<u>Approval of the Agenda</u>
Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the agenda of the 01 May 2002 Board meeting. Being none, motion was made and approved as presented.

<u>Approval of Minutes from 06 March 2002 Board Meeting</u>
Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 06 March 2002 Board meeting. Don Ipson requested that the minutes be amended from "Don Ipson - Southeast" to "Don Ipson - Dixie." The motion was seconded and the minutes stand approved as corrected.

## ACTION ITEMS

## A. UCAT Budget

## 1. Review and Ratification of FY02 - FY03

President Fitch presented the "FY02 Budget" memorandum and accompanying support materials (Exhibit II.A.1., which include support materials designated as A, B and C). President Fitch explained that this exhibit is a recommendation provided originally to the UCAT Executive Committee, as per their request, regarding carry-over funds under the control of the UCAT Board. These are funds which the Board had previously acknowledged and approved during the legislative activities for FY02 and FY03, and the request to the Board today is to ratify this recommendation.

Support material "A" (Distribution of Centrally Administered Funds, to date):
President Fitch explained that this support material highlights the original budget appropriation, the two subsequent reductions, the distribution amounts in the categories of Development, Equipment, and Custom Fit to each UCAT Regional College, the "Available Funds" and the "Potential Uses of Available Funds." The Available Funds amount consists of $509,991 in Development and $235,899 in Custom Fit, for a total Available Funds of $745,890. This is the amount that the UCAT Board had previously approved and now has the flexibility to redistribute.
Support material "B" (Final Allocation of Centrally Administered Funds):
President Fitch explained that this support material reflects the FY01- 02 budget cuts to each UCAT institution, in both dollars and as a percentage of the total. The "Proportionate Distribution" column indicates the amount of the available funds that would be proportionately reapplied to each UCAT institution, using the same method and percentages as the reduction.

_____

_____

W. Woodward:  "When you made these cuts, we looked at them as a percentage of what each institution had the previous year and now we are looking at restoring them as a percentage of the cut as opposed to looking at them the same way that we made the cuts.  It's different."

B. Mortensen:  Agreed to run the numbers both ways and bring them back to the Board.

D. Holmes:  Questioned the discrepancy in the total Available Funds indicated in support material A (Exhibit II.A.1., page 3 of 5), which reflects $745,000, and support material B (Exhibit II.A.1., page 4 of 5) reflecting a $600,000 Amount to Distribute total.

G. Fitch:  Explained that the $600,000 amount did not reflect the total of $745,890 because at the time this information was gathered, which was originally for the Executive Committee, it was unclear what DCED would be doing with those funds.  So, that portion of their funds were held back in case they would need to be returned.  However, since that time it has been determined that those funds will not be returned so the actual total amount of Available Funds to be reapplied to the UCAT institutions is $745,000.

W. Woodward:  Requested a recommendation from President Fitch.

G. Fitch:  Referred to page 2 of Exhibit II.A.1. and reviewed the four specific suggestions indicated for utilizing these funds on a one-time basis:
(1) Invoice from Davis MIS for State MIS Support.
(2) System proposal to upgrade VSR4 at 7 of the UCAT institutions.
(3) Transfer an additional $33,153 to Dixie ATC to be used in conjunction with the development allocation of $41,847, totaling $75,000.
(4) Balance of the remaining funds to be distributed proportionately (based on percentage of reduction) to each UCAT institution.

D. Ipson:  "...during this 60-day period, as we move money away from Custom Fit because of the contract issue, what negative effect does this have on their ability to function from now until the end of the fiscal year?"

G. Fitch:  Responded by posing the question of how much could be done, during the 2 months remaining in FY02, in Custom Fit training and services, as opposed to what could be done to assist student services with the purchase of a software upgrade which would address current MIS issues. " . . . I think that the people who can best determine that would be the Presidents."

G. Fitch:  " . . . need to weigh the issue, one way or the other, because in both circumstances, one of our roles and responsibilities is to serve Custom Fit and business and industry, and the other is to serve our students . . . ."

_____

A discussion then ensued regarding the utilization of Custom Fit as a component of the reductions, and support for the MIS package.

B. Wallis:  " . . . The questions being posed is either Custom Fit or the student service package.  I leave that up to the discretion of the President."

Support material "C" (Final Appropriations, Tax Funds Only):
President Fitch explained that this information highlights the appropriation percentage change from the base for each UCAT institution, and presents the question, "Do we have an ongoing student services package for seven institutions in some of those areas and address it in FY02 or do we look for a balance and a continued extension of our Custom Fit?  That's a question that the Board needs to decide."

T. Bingham:  "What is your student services package?"

R. Jones:  ". . . VSR4 package that tracks all of our membership hours so that we can record them all systematically and uniformly.  There are some upgrades needed for that particular program and we have been trying to figure ways to accomplish that so that we can continue to get our data to present to the President on our performance."

D. Holmes:  " . . . should we upgrade or consider a new system?"

R. Jones:  " . . . upgrade the existing system.  To keep us going until we get the money from the Legislature to do a new MIS system approach."

G. Fitch:  " . . . the money for the new MIS system was lost to budget cuts.  So now we are looking at what exists in those seven institutions to operate strategic functions in FY02 and 03.  A MIS Survey has been conducted.  What we need now is a committee with Presidents and IT people to sit down and say which is the best way to go."

B. Wallis:  "The question posed to me regarding the Custom Fit . . . . We will always have that need for funding.  But in this case, President Fitch has taken one-time funds and put it toward the application such as the advancement of the VSR4.  We are very supportive of having this added addition to the VSR4, for the various reasons that Mr. Holmes has mentioned of the difficulties that we have.  Our interest is to get the application put into place to buy us some time until we can . . . determine what our long-term requirements will be."

T. Bingham:  Expressed concern with the " . . . continued trend of robbing our Custom Fit dollars.  The concern is our economy and this goes to help immediately to get these employers the type of training that they need to make sure they can spring back from largely a manufacturing recession in the last year and a half.  Despite the value of upgrading the system . . . .  I am really uncomfortable with that."

_____

Brad Mortensen:  Presented and explained the "Final Allocation of Centrally Administered Funds" sheet, (Attachment G) as earlier requested by the Board, which compared the dollar difference of "Restoring 47.3 percent of the FY01 - 02 Cut" and the "Proportionate Distribution" amounts for each UCAT institution.  "If you figure that the $600,000 is 47 percent of the 1.268 million that was cut from the institutions and if you're going to apply just the $600,000 back to the institutions then you can restore essentially 47 percent of what was cut and redistribute the money that way.  It's not exactly the same as the original method that was on the spreadsheet.  But, it's less than 50 dollars change, plus or minus at each institution.  So the numbers are pretty comparable."

C. Johnson:  MOVED to approve the recommendation on the allocation of funds as presented.  The motion was seconded by D. Ipson.

C. Johnson:  SUBSTITUTE motion made:  MOVED to approve support materials A and B of Exhibit II.A.1.  The substitute motion was seconded by D. Ipson and carried.  (12 aye, 1 nay - Bingham, 2 absent).

C. Johnson:  MOVED to approve support material C of Exhibit II.A.1.  The motion was seconded by D. Ipson and carried.

## 2.  Review Capital Improvement Request and Process

President Fitch presented the "DFCM Capital Improvement Recommendations" memorandum (Exhibit II.A.2.) which lists DFCM's FY 2003 Capital Improvement funding recommendation for each of the qualifying UCAT institutions.  "There is a process and procedure that is followed in the state.  Norm Tarbox visited each site and assisting in making a determination of projects.  Four institutions are listed because only those four qualify at this particular time."  Request the Board's approval.

J. Busch:  MOVED that the DFCM Capital Improvement Recommendations be approved as presented.  The motion was seconded by M. Madsen and carried.

## B.   Campus Master Plans

## 1.  Discussion

G. Fitch:  "One of Higher Education's responsibilities is to create a campus master plan for the Board of Regents. . . . We do have the authority in our own governance to create our master plan concepts and the direction of the master plan following basic initiative requirements on the campus. This Board needs to work with the Planning and Policy Committee to create a policy and requirements of a master plan that would be part of UCAT, not just a hybrid of all the others that we've looked at. But also a means to identify the growth and development of each campus as you each make your decisions.  Business and industry needs to know what's going on with all ten campuses.  This would give you some insight to the projection of the future and planning necessary

_____

to cover the operation of the campus.  This would give us a centralized bank of information to work with for our campuses and to approve expansion requests."

**2.  Southwest ATC**

Changed later in the agenda to accommodate an Executive Session provided for under law, to discuss possible land acquisition.  Postpone Executive Session until the end of the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting (see page 9).

**3.  Davis ATC**

M. Bouwhuis:  Gave a brief history of the composition of the Davis ATC campus.  "When we built the last phase of our campus, DFCM asked us to develop a new master plan . . . they wanted to get to the point where there was a new master plan that fit applied technology education, because we are different."

President Bouwhuis introduced Jackson Ferguson, from AFS Architects to present the Davis ATC Master Plan.

J. Ferguson:  Explained the importance of the institution's mission statement to the designers in the creation of the master plan.  This master plan design is very flexible and will easily allow for updates to the plan, as dictated by changes, such as aging buildings, connections between buildings, exterior space, transportation, growth, etc.  This is considered a ". . . living plan . . . " which will grow and change as dictated by campus need.

N. Bangerter:  Clarified that approval is needed, not for a particular building at this time, but for the master plan outline for the Davis ATC.

T. Bingham:  MOVED that the master plan outline for the Davis ATC be approved.  The motion was seconded and carried.

**C.  Logo Selection for UCAT**

G. Fitch:  Explained that the UCAT ran a logo contest on the ten ATC campuses.  "If we are going to represent UCAT to a student client base, the student should be directly involved in helping to make the decision."  Specific elements were required to be incorporated into the logo design: UCAT and/or Utah College of Applied Technology, Established 2001, Business/Industry, 10 Applied Technology Colleges, State of Utah, Open-entry/open-exit, Competency based.
Although there were approximately 15 entries, only six (Attachments A - F) of the submissions qualified for consideration based on the required elements.  President Fitch then introduced each of the six qualifying entries and discussed each one, identifying key components and the importance of the final logo selection for public recognition.

_____

G. Fitch: Emphasized the importance of making the logo decision at this meeting. This logo will be used in conjunction with the new web site UCATS.ORG, which will eventually " . . . contain the minutes from our Board meeting, the development and legislation associated with it, and any other activities and history of UCAT." There will also be a selection for information on the institutions. An individual will be able to click on "institutions" and the logo and name for each college will appear. From there a student can click on a specific college and get information on admissions, etc. associated with that particular UCAT college."

D. Ipson: MOVED to approve logo exhibit D. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen.

John Busch: SUBSTITUTE motion made: MOVED to approve logo attachment E instead of logo attachment D. Motion died lack of second.

D. Ipson: Requested to AMEND the original motion. MOVED to vote between logo attachments D and E. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen. Vote: 9 votes for D; 4 votes for E. Logo attachment D wins Board approval.

**D.   Discuss the competency based Associate of Applied Technology degree**
**Seek approval of the following:**
**1) Computer Aided Drafting and Design (CADD)**
**2) Medical Assisting**
**3) Information Technology**
**for the Associate of Applied Technology degree**

C. Albrecht: Introduced three handouts (Attachments H - J) from the Curriculum Committee. The Committee is submitting to the Board a recommendation that Computer-Aided Drafting and Design (CADD), Information Technology and Medical Assisting be approved by this Board as UCAT's first three Associate (AAT) degrees, pending further approval in July from the State Board of Regents. These were chosen because of the existence of national standards in these areas, " . . . they are the most viable and less contentious." The next areas that the Curriculum Committee will be considering for AAT degrees will be welding, machining, apprenticeship programs, business information systems, dental assisting, diesel and electronics.

G. Wixom: Referred to the first two handouts, "Update from the UCAT Instructional Planning and Curriculum Committee (Attachment H)" and the "UCAT Glossary of Terms (Attachment I)", indicating that these are for informational purposes, explain the structure of the AAT degree, and provide the specifics for the three degrees being recommended today. The "Update" handout will be " . . . sent to local boards to give people an idea of what the committee is doing and how they are operating." The "Glossary of Terms" handout will " . . . help to define the terms that are used in relationship to degrees."

Dr. Wixom explained that the third handout (Attachment J) is the recommendation from the Committee to the UCAT Board of Trustees. This handout also includes the basic structure of the

_____

degree and an information sheet for each of the three degrees reflected in the recommendation.

Dr. Wixom also explained that on the overall structure sheet, the comparison between the AAT degree and the AAS degree is for informational purposes only.  The language "credit equivalent" is used only as a means to compare the number of credit hours normally associated with a traditional degree structure, to the unique UCAT focus of competency-based hours.  The AAS degree ranges from 63 to 69 credits.  The competency- based AAT degree will require between 1890 and 2070 hours, with an equivalency of 30 hours to 1 semester credit.  The AAT degrees will have two components: General Education, which will be comprised of 90 hours of composition, 90 - 120 hours of math, 90 hours of human relations and 90 hours of distribution electives; and Technical Specialty, which will require 1500 membership hours.

C. Albrecht:  MOVED to approve the three AAT degree programs presented, as recommended by the Curriculum Committee.  The motion was seconded by D. Ipson and carried.


**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

**A.  MIS Survey**

G. Fitch:  Briefly explained that " . . . the MIS Survey outlines all of the activities and circumstances that we deal with within our system, for each one of our institutions.  We'll use this information to determine which way to go.  We have the information so that we can take action."

**B.  Custom Fit**

G. Fitch:  Explained that there is a Custom Fit Council that has been operating for 4 - 5 years.  The UCAT Regional Presidents had previously requested the creation and documentation of Custom Fit procedures and definitions.  Two Custom Fit representatives, Kelle Stephens and Dana Slaughter were in attendance to present Exhibit III.B., the "Utah State Custom Fit Training Procedures" draft.

K. Stephens:  Gave a brief history of the Custom Fit funding process and introduced the current formula funding process that has three parts: base for stability, set of productivity measurements, and a strategic adjustment fund.  "We need to meet the needs of our region where those needs are. It needs to balance out and be fair to everyone."

B. Wallis:  "The real need is to get more money into the Custom Fit process . . . over the last few years we've spent too much time trying to rearrange it amongst ourselves and not really direct our attention to what the real need is which is the need by these companies for trained people.  They have worked it to death to try to figure out what's fair for everyone . . . it's our task now to try to get more money into the process."

**C.   Discuss the need for common measurements that can be used, with variations, to**

_____

**develop and analyze procedures**

D. Mortimer:  Expressed concern about finding common measurements to use in comparing the UCAT institutions.

G. Fitch:  Explained that the UCAT Budget/Facilities Committee ". . . needs to be spearheading creating the draft, identifying those components."  " . . . on how to compare these institutions, the only way to do that comparison right now is to collect the appropriate data."  President Fitch further explained that over the last several months, several pieces of documentation have been created which would assist in the identification of those components.  For example, the Institutional Survey which provided a complete overview of all of the UCAT institutions to date, number of students, facilities, etc., the MIS Survey, the Capital Projects review, the Master Plan design which will apply to all of the UCAT institutions and give an overview of not only where the institutions are but what direction they plan to go, and most recently, the Custom Fit application.  "So now we can start looking at all the institutions on an even plane so that we can compare . . . distinguish the similarities, the differences, . . . Mr. Busch's committee can determine how to fund those.  The information is there, maybe not as clearly defined as you want it."

G. Fitch:  Presented a "Planning Document" draft (Attachment K) which was previously sent to the Regional Presidents.  Explains that this document " . . . gives a basic overview on the first couple of pages, . . . the Planning Committee is going to specifically look at strategic planning, identifying goals, objectives, and key components of all our institutions in the areas of funding and finance, facilities, institutional coordination and effectiveness, instruction and curriculum, shareholder partnerships and student services.  The following areas actually break down by goals, some of the components that the Planning Committee is looking at.  And finally on the last page is a format that can be easily designed for strategic planning to create a living document that is ongoing, that will do exactly what you are asking for, to start looking at differences, comparisons and application on a system wide basis rather than institutional."

## D.   Update on Technology Services (nominating) Committee

This is being referred to the Presidents' Cabinet to create an IT Committee.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Vice Chair Holmes requested a roll call vote to adjourn to Executive Session.
Vote: 12 yea, 0 nay, 3 absent (Bangerter, Atkinson, McCain).
Motion carried to adjourn to Executive Session at 2:03 p.m.

Board reconvened at 2:24 p.m.

**ADJOURN**

_____

Vice Chair Holmes adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 2:26 p.m.