

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

Board of Trustees Present

Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Charlie Johnson - SBOR
John Busch - Uintah Basin
William Prows - Davis
Carl Albrecht - Central
Don Ipson - Dixie
Dixie Allen - SBOE
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
Janet Cannon - SBOE
Wayne Woodward - Southeast
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland

Regional ATC Presidents Present

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
Rob Brems - Mountainland

Institutional Representation

Gregory G. Fitch, President
Sandra A. Kronenberg, Secretary to the President

Office of the Commissioner

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner
Gary Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education and Special Projects
Linda Fife, Assistant Commissioner of Programs
Brad Mortensen, Assistant Commissioner of Business and Finance

Media Present

Deseret News

Others Present

Collette Mercier - Ogden-Weber ATC
Mary Shumway - SBOE
Noel Bailey - Central ATC
Keith Nielsen - Uintah Basin ATC
Jim Shea - Bridgerland ATC
Paul Hacking - Uintah Basin ATC

Excused Absent

Pamela Atkinson - SBOR
Carl Holmes - Central ATC
Don Roberts - Southwest
Norman Bangerter - Salt Lake/Tooele
Thomas Bingham - Gov. Appt

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

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

Call To Order

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

Approval of the Agenda

Vice Chair Holmes asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the agenda of the 5 March 2003 Board meeting. Motion was made to amend the agenda by removing information/discussion item III.F. "UCAT Board of Trustees Services and Activities", which was originally scheduled to be presented by Chair Bangerter. MOTION was made by C. Albrecht and seconded by J. Cannon to approve as amended. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from 8 January 2003 Board Meeting

Vice Chair Holmes asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 8 January 2003 Board meeting (Tab Q). Being none, motion was made by C. Johnson and seconded by W. Woodward to approve as presented. Motion carried.

Vice Chair Holmes welcomed the newest member of the UCAT Board of Trustees, Dixie Allen. Dixie will be one of the two UCAT Board trustees representing the Board of Education.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Ratification of Executive Committee Budget Recommendation (Tab R)

This agenda item was originally included as an action item after the UCAT Executive Committee met on 17 February to consider a budget recommendation in response to the projected FY 04 2% reductions. The Executive Committee had voted unanimously to move this recommendation forward (Tab R). However, after that time and prior to this 5 March UCAT Board of Trustees meeting, the budget situation had again changed, making this recommendation unnecessary.

B. Budget FY 04 (Attachment A [1-4])

President Fitch introduced Brad Mortensen to discuss Attachment A (1-4).

Utah College of Applied Technology Summary of Appropriations – Preliminary (Attachment A1)

This summary page reflected the base budget amount of \$38.3 million after the July Special Session. It also showed the adjustments from the December Special Session of an additional one-time 5% cut (\$182,400), as well as all the other reductions that had been implemented, bringing the total budget to \$38.1 million for this fiscal year.

For the next fiscal year that begins on July 1, there will be an ongoing 1.9% reduction of \$728,500 (from the December Special Session), and increases in health, dental and state retirement totaling \$543,100, and some program increases of \$979,800, creating an overall increase of \$794,400, which is a 2.1% increase above the base budget for the current fiscal year. This amount is still below the original budget amount that UCAT had when it was first created.

Allocation of \$1 Million Incremental Change to Subcommittee Recommendations (Attachment A2)

Reflected the details of the programming add-backs provided by the Legislature (from Attachment A1). This sheet reflected both how the \$1 million was allocated, and the Hot Spot list that was developed and adopted by the Commerce and Revenue Subcommittee. Approximately 20% of the Hot Spots were funded through the \$1 million allocation.

Discussion then temporarily reverted to the HB 161 transfer issue:

G. Fitch: "This is the shift of supervision and funding from CATC in Richfield to Snow College. The funds of \$1.4 million will be shifted to Snow College for technical education, so that they can continue to provide those services in the area. . . Under Growth in the Hot Spot list, the amount of \$98,800 for CATC reflects their growth. However, in the transition through previous decisions of the legislative analysts, those funds were not shifted to Central (CATC). . . It appears that Central is being denied some funds (\$18,000) . . . What we are hoping they will do is what we've suggested, look at the bill (HB 161) and allow us within the \$1 million to make our adjustment for UCAT. What that means is that the rest of the institutions, in the growth component, will be reduced marginally . . ."

D. Mortimer: ". . . that was already taking into consideration, that Central would be out and that it really would be for who was left. If Central would get some, that would come through Snow College, wouldn't it?"

G. Fitch: "I would agree with that except this is based on growth that was earned while they were CATC. My perception is that, based on their history, they have earned those funds and should have those funds as part of their overall budget."

B. Mortensen: "This transfer of funds from Central ATC to Snow College South really isn't reflected here . . . that bill (HB 161) hasn't passed yet, and we just became aware at 7 o'clock this morning, so that hasn't been built in . . ."

Fiscal Impact of State Tax Fund Budget Reductions, FY 2001-02 through FY 2003-04 (Attachment A3)

B. Mortensen: Column (a) reflected the ongoing base budget for UCAT when it was founded, \$40.4 million for FY 2001-02. Later in that year (column b), budget cuts of almost \$1.7 million (4.16%) were incurred and in this year, FY 2002-03 (column c), the budget is down 6.18% in net tax funds. For the fiscal year that begins on July 1, FY 2003-04, the position is improved so that net tax funds are down only 3.16%. Column (d) reflects the impact on the individual institutions. "There are some percentage increases for most of the institutions, and the cause is the allocation of the Development fund from the central office into the base budget of each institution, so it now shows up in the base budget of each institution, but it really is not new money for them, because they were getting allocations from the central office. So the base budgets for each institution has improved but it really does not provide any more funding for them and that's why you see the 100% decrease of Development money and it's offset by the increases in the institutional monies, with an overall decrease of 3.16 percent. If you add in the 80% of the growth that wasn't able to be funded through the \$1 million add-back, the budgets are still down about 11 percent . . ."

Utah College of Applied Technology 2003-04 Appropriations Summary (Attachment A4)

B. Mortensen: "This sheet is for the campus presidents to take back to their business officers. This gives a detailed account of all the changes that have occurred during this legislative session."

G. Fitch: Requested that if a motion is made to accept these figures (Attachment A) and the distribution of the \$1 million, that an adjustment be made to include CATC with part of that allocation, if it is not done by the legislature before the end of the legislative session.

D. Ipson: MOVED to accept the figures as presented in Attachment A, to include an allocation amount for CATC if not incorporated by the legislature. The motion seconded by M. Madsen. Motion was unanimously approved and carried.

C. Mission Statement (Tab S/Attachment B)

G. Fitch: "As a reminder, this mission statement had previously been approved by this Board (6 March 02). We were using it as a blueprint to direct us in our activities. It was really an attempt to try to interpret the law and see what we could do to meet the requirements. The reason it's back to you now in draft form, is because the Board of Regents is looking at the mission statements of all the institutions within the ten college system. They wanted us to ensure that this Board is still in agreement with this mission statement before it is submitted to them for consideration. Also part of this overall mission statement is the consolidation of information dealing with the 'type' of institution, which includes all the institutions of Higher Education."

Discussion Draft 1-21-03 R312, Institutional Categories, Accompanying Criteria, and Institutional Missions and Roles (Attachment B)

G. Fitch: "This lists types of institutions within our system, and page 9 shows 'R313-8. Technical Colleges: Type V.' The Regents are looking at creating an additional type of institution to ensure that we have and maintain our own identity as technical colleges. It incorporates components of our mission statement, our

programs, our accreditation, our faculty, educational preparation, etc. This is in line with all of the other institutions that we serve with.”

B. Hall: Expressed that one of his board members is concerned with some verbiage contained with the Mission Statement (Tab S). Specifically, R311-5.10.1 Institutional Mission Statement – Utah College of Applied Technology provides through its regional colleges, market-driven applied technology education programs which meet the demand for technically skilled workers in Utah businesses. Requested that the word “businesses” be replaced with “employers.”

J. Busch: Suggested that the word “industries” replace “businesses.”

B. Hall: Indicated that “employers” is referenced in subsequent paragraphs and should be used to maintain consistency.

Commissioner Foxley: Pointed out that if “businesses” is replaced by “employers” that the preposition “in” will need to be replaced by “for.”

D. Ipson: MOVED to change sentence R311-5.10.1 Institutional Mission Statement to read “Utah College of Applied Technology provides, through its regional colleges, market-driven applied technology education programs which meet the demand for technically skilled workers for Utah employers.” The motion was seconded by C. Johnson. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

G. Fitch: Requested that the Board specifically approve the Mission Statement in total (Tab S) and the Type V Institution (Attachment B), so that it can be modified and taken to the Board of Regents.

J. Busch: MOVED to approve the Mission Statement, as corrected (Tab S) and the Type V Institution category (Attachment B) as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Ipson. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. COE Update (Tab T)

G. Fitch: “The Council on Occupational Education (COE) has been in contact with us on an ongoing basis. As you know, we have submitted our requirements for meeting candidacy with COE. They have reviewed that and received approval from their board, and are now negotiating specific elements with us. We are very concerned about some issues that have been highlighted at this time such as, programs and program hours, providing student financial aid and its related elements, and some of the program requirements within the Associate of Applied Technology degree. As we get those ironed out you will be notified. Each of our institutions in the near future should be receiving a letter from COE indicating that they have met candidacy requirements, and UCAT will be notified officially that the college has been approved for candidacy status. At that particular point in time it won’t be automatic that you receive the letter and will be able to offer student financial aid because it will be far more difficult for some of the campuses that do not

already have financial aid. I believe that we currently have four campuses that offer financial aid and the others will have to adjust. We have a student financial aid officers group that is meeting regularly and will be traveling to Denver to ensure that we meet compliance requirements for offering financial aid. All this is hinged upon receipt of these letters. . . We will also be looking at meeting candidacy requirements for the Northwest Association in 2004. Anything that we are doing for COE right now will have a mutual application within the Northwest Association.”

M. Madsen: Inquired about an approximate timeline for the accreditation process.

G. Fitch: “The accreditation process can take anywhere from one year to 18 months or more. You have to do a complete self study, submit that material and then another on-site visit by that particular group. So accreditation may be 18 to 24 months down the road for COE at this particular time, but the candidacy status should be very soon.”

D. Holmes: “As I understand, candidacy status is what grants us the right to receive financial aid.”

G. Fitch: “After candidacy, you have three years in which to meet the requirements to become an accredited institution. They can then grant an extension of one year, and at that point they will reevaluate you to see if you are viable.”

B. Legislation (Tabs U – W)

G. Fitch: Presented Attachment C, which highlighted a discussion from the 26 February UCAT Presidents’ Cabinet meeting regarding the status changes of HB 161 and HB 232 as the bills went through the revision/legislative process. “Remember when we were talking about opening the UCAT bill for consideration of changes, Mr. Mortimer had pointed out that once the bill is opened up, its fair game for everybody. I just wanted to give you a brief rundown on the legislation and what has occurred.”

President Fitch referred to HB 161, which he indicated had gone through four significant changes and incorporated three full substitution motions (see Tab U). “I just wanted to highlight that this has gone through some rather significant changes from what we intended, and why it has brought us to the focal point of looking at the \$18,000 (CATC proposed allocation portion of \$1 million add-back). With this transfer there have been certain commitments by legislators, by UCAT, by myself, to ensure that we monitor and support the local school districts and ensure that services are provided to technical education. But you can see from what our original intent was, it had several changes.”

President Fitch then referred to the overview of changes incorporated by various groups to HB 232 (Attachment C). Specifically, the changes that occurred when the Commissioner’s office made revisions after the UCAT Trustees had made changes. “To give you an overview of where some of the problems occurred and where Trustees of this Board had legitimate concerns, after the UCAT Trustees revision of HB 232, this revision then went to the Commissioner’s office, who has the responsibility to align the changes made to Regents policy because the Regents have about 60 to 70% control over what we do. That caused some issues because it wasn’t the exact bill approved by this Board to go to the legislators.

From the Commissioner's office, the bill moved through the governor's and legislative analysts' offices and changes were also made there. . . Then the State Board of Education testified at two of the presentations in regard to additional changes. As it went through, Representative Bigelow working with legislative staff and his people, also made several changes. The one change that was made that was most critical and that I am most disappointed in is with the scholarships. That was knocked out. They were concerned that there wouldn't be funds available for scholarships, so why put it in the law if there were no funds available? In this case there was approximately \$250,000 available for these scholarships and they have been utilized totally by the other institutions. But given the responsibility that the UCAT has to create and work with the State Board of Education to create a high school diploma and also an associate degree, our kids should have been included."

R. Brems: "Are you speaking of the New Century scholarship? Is that fully funded . . . ?"

G. Fitch: "It is my understanding from Representative Bigelow, they were used to full capacity, they were not fully funded. . . I wanted us to be part of that because our kids deserve the same playing field."

President Fitch continued, "There were changes on the House floor, and then changes in the Senate, and then back to the House for concurrence. Essentially what I'm pointing out is that there were 7 or 8 additional changes from what we (UCAT Board) did. I wanted to give you this information before we got into the specifics of the Bill."

B.1. H.B. 161 (Tab U)

G. Fitch: "This does provide for the transfer of CATC supervision and funding to Snow College. It will be Snow College Richfield. But some of the key components for this UCAT Board, and your responsibilities in dealing with technical education, would be on page 3 (line 86) of the 3rd Substitute Cherry Bill (HB 161, Tab U), '(k) provide expertise and monitor applied technology education . . .' Basically, along with a reporting sequence that will be required, is that Snow College will have to provide this Board an overview of their activities at Snow College providing support for technology education. In that we will ask for requirements dealing with expenditure of dollars, the number of students served, etc., and then that report will be rolled into our report that is due in October. So we still have the oversight responsibility monitoring through your administrative officer working with Snow College. . . That report is due by Snow College in September and we will be working directly with them. . . Snow College Richfield will be responsible for the same duties and responsibilities as CATC. Mr. Albrecht, or some member of that particular Advisory Board for Snow College (they are not Board of Directors under HB 161), will have a seat on the UCAT Board as a voting member at all times. Essentially, the same dollars, the same regions have services, the same activities and responsibilities under the law will be there. What Representative Johnson testified to in many cases is that it is the desire of the community to move in this particular direction. Unfortunately with recent circumstances in Richfield dealing with the financial picture, there were shifts that needed to be done under the recommendation of the State Auditor's Office, which combined all of those services, and this bill supports that activity. Our hope in this, and we have received public representation from President Benson and Rick White, is that those areas, particularly the Juab area and up through Delta and also North Sanpete County, have not received the types of services that they have been looking for and with the

salary savings there will be a reallocation of technical college money that will allow them to place personnel in that area. That has been committed to publicly, and part of our responsibility will be to monitor that and ensure that service is there. One key component this Board has under this particular bill is tuition because they are still obligated as Snow College Richfield to provide open-entry, open-exit competency-based education, and also technical support services for the high schools in the area so they still fall under our tuition component. No cost for the high school students that they serve and the 95 cents, or the tuition components that this Board will be setting at different times along with the Board of Regents. And that's basically what HB 161 does overall."

D. Mortimer: Expressed concern regarding two issues: (1) perception that we no longer have a statewide system, and (2) in his communications with legislators, a legislator expressed the opinion that the campuses should all be dispersed and back under the colleges. "The door got cracked a little, and it concerns me. . . I think that we are going to have to be very careful, to make sure that we understand what it is that we are, what we are to do, why it's unique. . ."

G. Fitch: "If I may add to that, just so you know, during testimony between House Ed, the Senate, and the Education Committee generally, I was asked those exact questions, 'Is this a domino effect'? My concern too is the technical program. I agree with you. We have a good operation right now and let's keep it going with the technical support. . . However, in this particular case, the UCAT Board did not sit down and create this legislation, this was truly legislatively created, based on the State Auditor's recommendation that the services and consolidation be there. We were trying to salvage at least the protection of services for that area through the legislation. . . There is no question in my mind that in this State, given the present economic picture and the circumstances confronting our senior institutions, even the concept of changing admission standards, etc. that we are going to have a rather significant population that will need technical education. Look at our increases in services even based on our cuts in funding. We need to be able to address business and industry employer needs in this state, in the best way possible."

C. Albrecht: "You make a good point. This was a very special situation down there and there was a lot of reasons why this happened. Our local ATC Board met and made a list of 8 items, and 7 were included in this bill. . . It was a difficult process but the door is open and I think that this Board does need to watch that in the future because this is an important part of education and the economy in the state."

B.2. H.B. 232 (Tab V/Attachment C)

G. Fitch: Referenced Tab V, the 1st Substitution (Buff) of HB 232 and also Attachment D, which replaces page 7/8 and 15/16 of the 1st Substitution copy.

"On page 7 (lines 209a – 209d) you'll note "(b) Students have the flexibility to begin or end study at any time, progress through course material at their own pace . . ." What the legislators were looking at was trying to ensure some way that UCAT would remain UCAT, competency-based, open-entry, open-exit, by clearly defining the language. The only problem that we are going to have with this, and it will be up to each of the institutions to monitor, as we move forward with financial aid, are restrictions on financial aid with regard to how long you can remain in college and draw financial aid. It could be interpreted to look at

begin or end study at any time, and it may have implications, so we'll have to monitor through our financial aid counselors on campus to ensure that we don't put a student at risk.

On page 8 (lines 221a – 221b), if you recall, I was in my job as President of UCAT before all of you (UCAT Board) came on board, and that's because the Board of Regents hired me through that process. What was added was [e] The Chair and Vice Chair of the Utah College of Applied Technology Board of Trustees shall be members of the search committee for the president). If for some reason I leave my position and it's opened up for a search, then the Chair and the Vice Chair will serve with the Regents Committee in the search process. The Regents have the final approval. That is fairly typical along with the Regents' activities with all of the colleges and universities.

On page 15/16, there are some key components. On page 16 (lines 475a – 475d), (5) Each campus shall be recognized as a college campus of the Utah College of Applied Technology . . . we had included through this UCAT Board names of our colleges, they took it out because they said it was too cumbersome and then they put it back in to make sure that we had it there. On the bottom (lines 488 – 488a), in cooperation with the Campus Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees, this has to do with your campus presidents. There was a concern and although it was assumed in many cases, I had the responsibility not only for evaluation but for the hiring and firing under the law of the campus presidents. If there was to be any disciplinary action taken with a campus president, it would be in cooperation with the Campus Board of Directors and the UCAT Board of Trustees."

J. Cannon: Requested clarification of Snow College's representation on the UCAT Board. "Will their Advisory Committee have any representation on this Board?"

G. Fitch: "Mr. Albrecht or whomever is the business and industry representative will remain on this Board. They will still have the same full authority as an Advisory Committee. The reason that they aren't called Board of Directors is because they serve under Snow College and Snow already has a Board of Trustees."

J. Cannon: "So what are the powers of the Board of Directors versus the powers of an Advisory Committee?"

G. Fitch: "In this particular case, under this bill, they are identical."

D. Holmes: "If I understood Janet's question, is there anywhere that spells out the duties of the Advisory Board at Snow College Richfield?"

G. Fitch: "In HB 161 and also, your normal Board of Directors with the name changes, etc. is in 53B-2a-109 (HB 232). Under HB 161, page 17 (lines 521 – 522), (1) The Snow College Richfield campus shall have an applied technology advisory committee composed of the following 19 members:, the language is new and it spells out not only the makeup and composition but what the responsibilities are, and it follows the same responsibilities as the Board of Directors. It only changes the title because of the relationship with Snow College."

J. Cannon: Stated that she had additional questions regarding HB 232, page 15 (Attachment D) line 439, which reads: (ii) no [cost] tuition to secondary students within the [college's] campus' jurisdiction. First, why the change from no cost to no tuition? And second, Trustee Cannon mentioned that she is aware of some students in the Salt Lake valley who are interested in going out to Davis ATC for some classes, and questioned whether they could possibly incur some additional fees based on the campus' jurisdiction.

G. Fitch: "The reason for the change from no cost to no tuition is because some of the high school students are assessed fees for materials, equipment, etc. at the institution. But the tuition is the no cost component that they were thinking of. And that has been ongoing ever since the history of the institutions." Regarding a response to Trustee Cannon's second question, "That's an interesting question because in the legislation itself, it spells out specifically which school districts each of these campuses' serves. So what you are talking about is almost a choice component, if they cross districts. I have not heard that addressed. What I would think, since the idea is that it is supposed to be at no tuition cost, that if a student makes that transfer they would be able to do that."

B. Wallis: Commented that it is a common occurrence.

M. Bouwhuis: Stated that they have students at DATC which are from other jurisdictions (in this particular example, from Salt Lake/Tooele). They don't charge Salt Lake/Tooele or the student any additional costs based on jurisdiction, other than normal ancillary costs such as lab fees.

B.3. Intent Language (Tab W/Attachment D)

Budget

G. Fitch: Referred to Attachment E, "Legislative Intent Language FY 04" (75 – 78) which replaces "UCAT Intent Language" under Tab W.

(75) Study of Applied Technology Education in the State/October Annual Report

"This is the Intent Language that impacts our institution, the requirements that they've outlined for us. It has to do with our October report, the annual report that we submit, looking at applied technology education. If you recall, several months ago Governor Bangerter and several members of this Board had talked about a matrix. Linda (Fife) and Mary Shumway have put together an overview, with input from the higher education institutions other than UCAT, of all the technical programs. This will address the intent language on 75 (Attachment E) as one component. The next question will be, now that we know who's doing it, to avoid unnecessary duplication, who's doing the best job? This matrix has no bearing on the school districts. They do a tremendous job in providing the foundation and exploratory options in ATE education. So this matrix will not reflect those particular components because they do that ongoing within their system and they also have that associated wpu."

(76) UCAT Tuition

"This goes back to market value, low cost. What we've learned over the past several months of our operation is UCAT charges different tuition rates in several areas. The one common denominator we have

is what the Board adjusted last year, from 90 to 95 cents per hour, and that is what we apply to tuition for adult learners. However, we are subject to some of the partnership relations that we have with other colleges and universities and tuition costs. We are subject to vendor costs where we utilize the vendor's program or activities to train our students, and the vendor sets the cost. We will be presenting to the UCAT Board and the Board of Regents, an overview and sliding scale of these applications to indicate the actual costs of different programs and activities within UCAT."

(77) Reporting Sequence

"These are financial reports that are due at certain times. I regret that sometimes because of the limited staff of UCAT, reports are late. But in this case they are asking for our reports by November 1 and we'll make every effort to do that."

(78) If Additional Funding Available for FY 04

"This is a new one. Last year the UCAT Board of Trustees was given the authority over Custom Fit funds and how those funds would be allocated. You approved the policy statement and a funding formula in which that was done in all ten of the areas that are involved. This is important because it brings Salt Lake/Tooele (ATC) into the picture for the very first time if additional new funds are there. What makes this interesting is that Salt Lake Community College, SUU and Dixie College all receive Custom Fit funds, so their directors all sit on the UCAT Custom Fit Council, and this (UCAT) Board has authority under that component of the college. So we are already blending in several areas. The good part is that this allows UCAT to make the distribution, with checks and balances, making sure that we are accurate in serving business and industry. Custom Fit, the dollars that are provided for business and industry training, is not a revenue generating component. Any company contributions that are received through Custom Fit remain with Custom Fit and continue to perpetuate the services of the program. If a person is counted as a membership hour person, revenue is associated with that and that's where we get our growth. So there are two distinct money lines in this area and two distinct ways in which we provide services. In the one, Custom Fit provides business services directly, for economic development. In the other, we provide services to high school students and adults to develop for business and industry, but it becomes a revenue source because it's our membership hour application."

Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP)

G. Fitch: "This one has been tabled at this time but I want you to be alert to it. MEP is a body that is supported by state funds of approximately \$300,000, and federal funds with a match around \$900,000. For years they have been providing services for manufacturers specifically. It's a group of engineers that go in as efficiency experts to try to assist the manufacturing groups in developing lines of products and activities that will better enhance their services and increase their profit margin. In this particular case for several years, they have identified Custom Fit and our services to manufacturers as a component of their match dollars consideration. Because of changes in Washington D.C. and changes in the Office of the Inspector General, they can no longer do that. This language was created because they were looking for some way to try to incorporate MEP with our Custom Fit operation. The initial thought was to take all of the Custom Fit money and run it through MEP, which we resisted because the UCAT Board has the authority of the Custom Fit money. With Rob Brems assistance we were able to flip this over and have their money

channel through Custom Fit and the UCAT Board. As you can see with the intent language, the UCAT Board would have had the authority to work with these people. However, since they are still under review by the Office of the Inspector General to ensure that they adhere to the matching requirements, this language was tabled. The reason it is here is because it may resurface again this summer.”

C. Presidents' Evaluation (Tab X)

G. Fitch: Provided the Board with a basic overview (Tab X) of the Campus Presidents' evaluation process. Reminded the Board that last year an extensive evaluation process was conducted on the Campus Presidents to provide a baseline for future evaluations. These evaluations were extensive because UCAT was a new entity and because of the new role of the Campus Presidents. The evaluations involved local board members, who chose additional individuals to participate in the evaluation process. President Fitch expressed that the process went very well and allowed the evaluators to identify the many strengths of each Campus President. “What was really instrumental is that we were allowed to have the regional (local) board identify key areas and goals within their area to operate, giving their presidents direction so they knew what the direction and expectations were for the following year. However, because the evaluation process is so cumbersome (and personnel intensive), what I am asking the Board, is that we evaluate the presidents on a 5 – 4 basis, evaluate 5 presidents this year, 4 next year and then continue to alternate them.” The Campus Presidents had previously discussed and accepted this evaluation timeline during the 26 February Presidents' Cabinet meeting.

M. Madsen: MOVED to accept that each Campus President be evaluated every two years, on a 5 – 4 basis, 5 this year and 4 next year, alternating every year. The motion was seconded by C. Albrecht. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

D. Outcome Tracking Presentation (Tab Y/Attachment F)

The outcome tracking process overview presented will ultimately eliminate errors and improve accountability with the interpretation and reporting of enrollments, completions and placements. The intent is for all the UCAT campuses to collect the data in the same way, and then after consolidating this information, it can be presented as statewide UCAT or as each individual campus. This PowerPoint presentation was previously presented to the Presidents' Cabinet (19 December 02), and will be presented today by Jim Shea (Student Services Vice President at Bridgerland ATC), with technical assistance from Paul Hacking (Student Services Director at Uintah Basin ATC).

J. Shea: Indicated that the development of this reporting system is in response to a requirement documented in HB 1003. The development has been assigned to a group of Student Services Directors (comprising the Student Services Committee), with the assistance of Linda Fife. This “concept” is currently trying to address questions such as, what is the current process of each campus, and what are the differences in operation? Vice President Shea gave a brief history on how this information was previously reported, the effect of the legislative audit and required accountability, identification of desired outcomes and the determination of key components related to the principle of outcome based reporting. “This reporting system gives us the information that we need to provide to you . . . what's happened to every

student that comes to our institution. . . The benefits of this system allow us to provide accurate accounting, usable data, logic, coding to track the same definitions in all systems, is economical and auditable.” Vice President Shea thanked Linda Fife for “pulling us together and spending a lot of time with us and working through a number of issues.”

G. Fitch: “This has been around for a while but hadn’t been utilized, and part of the reason was because of the development funds, and the competition for funds depending on placements and so forth. Previous action by this Board took the development funds and put them into the base budget so we no longer have to worry about competing with each other. This portrays to the legislature and the general public, that this institution ‘is this’ and ‘this is what they are capable of’ and ‘these are the missions they have’ and ‘these are the actual numbers’ because it’s not tied to increased funding for development, other than the normal membership hours and whatever growth components that we have.”

E. Regional Presidents’ Cabinet Report (Tab Z)

President Fitch referred to the Regional Presidents’ Cabinet Agenda from the most recent meeting on 26 February 2003 to present various agenda items.

Item #6 Medical Coding

G.Fitch: Pointed out that there are thousands of jobs currently available in this field. A needs analysis is being conducted and as a result, various UCAT campuses will be actively involved in partnerships, for example with Weber State University, to provide support services for our health industries.

R. Brems: Inquired as to the earnings capability for this type of training.

G. Fitch: “Depending on the level of ability and skill and the amount of work that they are able to do . . . we have quite a range, most of it is the 7 to 9 dollar range at the entry level, and as your skill and expertise improve, it should increase.”

Item #7 UHEAA Scholarship (Presidents’ Scholarship)

G. Fitch: “UHEAA is the body that provides financial aid for everyone in the state. UHEAA has identified \$10,000, and we are working on the process right now of providing \$1000 or more to each of our institutions, so the Presidents’ can identify and give a scholarship now and on an ongoing basis.”

Other Item Criminal Background Checks

G. Fitch: “At MATC there were some concerns by the (local) board, and we are now working through the Attorney General’s office, that our people pass some kind of certification or background check. At this point in time, because of the lack of certification, particularly faculty, and because we are a college by legislation, and criminal background checks are not done by the colleges, they depended on reference checks. However, at MATC they have this concern because of the burgeoning growth of high school students being served in that area. So Bill Evans, our attorney general representative, is looking at that right now. I do not

want to isolate that to a particular institution or force an institution's concept on the whole, so this will be coming back to the UCAT Board at a later date for a policy decision."

Other Item Diploma Cover

G. Fitch: Presented the diploma cover that will be used when awarding the Associate of Applied Technology (AAT) degree.

Other Item Health Benefits (Attachment G)

G. Fitch: "The Health Benefits Committee is looking at health benefits, trying to position us in a way to benefit as a larger group, and keep our health benefits typically in line with what we have now. What they have found with the consultant is that with our current benefits, we are spread all over. The State is trying to determine one common benefit across the board, with some idiosyncrasies, and then try to negotiate from that point with the health agencies providing them. That will be handled through the Board of Regents."

Other Item Waivers (Attachment H)

G. Fitch: "There are 500 tuition waivers for out-of-state students and are at the discretion of the Presidents. UCAT, as a new institution, did not request those waivers, because of the way we operate, not on a semester basis, but as open-entry, open-exit, etc. However, we have learned since that time that these waivers would impact job corp students that we serve. Under that scenario we are now looking at opportunities to try to pick up on the waivers for those job corp students because traditionally they come from out-of-state and go through job corp here and then are students on our campuses."

W. Prows: Trustee Prows wanted to share seven critical issues that he felt need to be considered in an attempt to reevaluate the role of the UCAT Board:

(1) UCAT Board of Trustees

Develop the Board into a body that advocates, lobbies and develops a strong strategic plan should be a major priority.

(2) Resources

Long term funding strategies must be developed if UCAT is going to be able to fulfill its mission.

(3) Mission Solidification and Identity

Develop a strategy to legitimize the time tested and credible operational characteristics of UCAT in the higher education system, and then market it.

(4) Accreditation/Program Approval

It is critical to receive accreditation for the Associate of Applied Technology degree. Need to find new ways to define the one college, nine campus structure to allow for strong campus recognition locally and then carefully define overall governance and support provided by the UCAT centrally.

(5) Campus Development

A rational and viable facility development strategy is critical to assure that the new schools have adequate facilities to conduct basic mission services and resources to develop a viable, long-term campus plan; and for the highly populated and growing areas to obtain desperately needed facilities to deal with growth associated with their population centers.

(6) Improvement of Services and Partnerships

The strength of UCAT is bolstered through local community partnerships and private employer support. Continued success will require policies which reward flexibility and partnerships, and recognize the role local support and local communication play with legislators and state policy makers. Institutions on the other hand must be highly accountable and responsive to the requirements of local employers and local partners.

(7) Oversee Standardization

A serious effort should be undertaken to remove duplication and the associated cost.

D. Mortimer: Agreed that UCAT needs a stronger voice.

D. Holmes: Agreed that UCAT needs to "maximize our power."

G. Fitch: Agreed. "Remember, that one of our great strengths is to be able to respond locally. Even though you are centralizing for certain things, we still need to maintain a local institutional identity. To strike that balance."

D. Mortimer: "Why do we wait until this meeting is over to have our local board meeting? Why shouldn't we take the agenda of our local board meeting before, so now they are acting and I'm coming representing my local board, so now we keep that local attention while we are building a united system?"

D. Holmes: Suggested that Trustee Prows document these seven areas and forward it to President Fitch, who can then forward it to each Board member for review before discussion at the next UCAT Board meeting (7 May).

ADJOURN

Vice Chair Holmes adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at approximately 12:42 p.m.