UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
1 OCTOBER 2003
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES

Board of Trustees Present
Norman Bangerter - Salt Lake/Tooele
Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland
John Busch - Uintah Basin
William Prows - Davis
Tom Bingham - Governor's Appt.
Don Ipson - Dixie
Wayne Woodward - Southeast
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
Janet Cannon - SBOE
Don Roberts - Southwest
Charlie Johnson – SBOR
Carl Albrecht - Snow College Richfield

UCAT Campus Presidents Present
Rob Brems - Mountainland
Mike Bouwhuis - Davis
Bo Hall - Salt Lake/Tooele
Richard Jones - Uintah Basin (interim)
Richard Maughan - Bridgerland
Rich VanAusdal - Dixie
Brent Wallis - Ogden-Weber
Don Reid - Southwest
Miles Nelson - Southeast

Institutional Representation
Gregory G. Fitch, President
Linda Fife, Vice President for Instruction and Student Services
Sandra A. Grimm, Assistant to the President
Kimberly Henrie, Budget Analyst

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

Media Present
Deseret News
Salt Lake Tribune

Others Present
Debbie Headden, Fiscal Analyst
David Hansen, SLTATC
Mary Shumway, SBOE
Rick White, Snow College
Doug Fonnesbeck, SLTATC Board Chair

Excused Absent
Dixie Allen - SBOE
Daryl Barrett - SBOR

MINUTES OF MEETING
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM
1 OCTOBER 2003

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held 1 October 2003 in the Utah State Board of Regents' Board Room.

Call To Order
Chair Bangerter called the meeting to order at 10:11 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 1 October 2003 Board meeting.

D. Holmes: MOVED to amend the agenda to include Information/Discussion Item H, a Letter from Governor Leavitt. The motion was seconded by T. Bingham.   Motion unanimously approved and carried.

Approval of Minutes from 6 August 2003 Board Meeting
Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes to the minutes of the 6 August 2003 Board meeting (Tab N). Being none, motion was made by D. Holmes and seconded by D. Ipson to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Board Election (Tab O)

President Fitch opened the floor for nominations for the 2 year terms of Chair and Vice Chair for the UCAT Board of Trustees.

C. Johnson: Expressed the importance of continuity and nominated to retain the current Chair (N. Bangerter) and Vice Chair (D. Holmes) under a ticket nomination. There were no other nominations.

T. Bingham: MOVED that the nominations cease and that N. Bangerter and D. Holmes be elected by acclamation. The motion was seconded by M. Madsen. Motion approved (12 yea, 1 nay) and carried.

B. UCAT Program Development/Approval Procedure (Tab P)

L. Fife: Introduced Tab P and reminded the Board that this item has been presented twice before with discussion by the UCAT Board regarding the process and that the intent is to move this document forward to the Board of Regents for their information as well. She indicated that the recommendation is to receive this document rather than vote on it. Vice President Fife asked the Board to consider the fact that she met with the Faculty Workgroup Chairs the previous day, and that their recommendation is that the process documented in this procedure does assist the campuses in proposing and/or developing new programs and making modifications to existing UCAT training programs in a timely manner in response to current

_____

business and industry needs. She reminded the Board that this is a dynamic document and if the Board had to vote every time there was a change, the process would become too cumbersome and time consuming, and would ultimately <u>not</u> support a timely response to business and industry needs.

D. Holmes: Expressed continued concern regarding this document. He believes that approval of this document will lead UCAT down a road that would be contrary to the road that has been successful for OWATC and some of the other ATCs. "I'm not sure that everyone is familiar with the 'market-driven' aspect. We develop programs that our local businesses and industries want and we do that in a very straightforward way. What this proposal does is make the whole process 'faculty-driven' rather than 'employer-driven'. I don't have any problem with the program as presented for the AAT degree; I think that it's appropriate that we do it like the colleges do it. The process proposed . . . goes through quite a long process whereby eventually it gets to a group (faculty) where they have one representative from each interested UCAT college. So there's a potential of having nine people going over this proposal. These nine people have to come to a consensus to have a common program. Maybe other campuses have different manufacturer's that want different things in the program, so the result is a compromise. If we go this route, it will lead us to become more and more like a traditional college and we've all said over and over that UCAT is different. . . We want to do things that our local business and industry want and we don't want to get bogged down in the academic process. For the AAT degree it's fine . . . but for the certificate of completion, which I understand is around 90% of the Ogden Weber program, it would be a disservice to our local business and industry, to our employers and really to our students. . . We've gotten to where we are because we can respond to the needs of local business and industry. If we go the direction proposed in this document, we won't be able to do that as efficiently as before. That's one advantage that our ATCs have had over colleges when competing for technical education."

D. Holmes: MOVED to modify the UCAT Program Development/Approval Procedure document so that section I applies only to the AAT degree, that the UCAT certificate of completion be added to section II, that the faculty workgroup standing committee guidelines be modified so they apply only to the AAT degree, and also to ask the Regents to modify if necessary all R401 and any other applicable policy to reflect this motion. The motion was seconded by J. Cannon.

Discussion:

L. Fife: Agreed that a modification to Regents' policy would be necessary to request what Vice Chair Holmes suggested. "The one question that has been unanswered through all of this is, what if you do have a certificate of that length, specific to an industry and you don't want to make that a UCAT offering? So I think that we could ask the Regents to modify the policy to say, we want an exception to a 900 hour certificate if it's specific to a region. If it's a UCAT offering, I think that we should still go through this process . . . so I would like to retain that provision in a UCAT awarded certificate of completion but ask for a revision to Regents' policy which makes all certificates of 900 hours or above Certificates of Completion so that we would have the latitude to have that individually on your campus as we do for the other certificates, but if it's a UCAT-wide offering, still go through this process."

_____

D. Holmes: "How do we know that it's not something that everyone else wants to do unless we run it through this whole faculty group process? I think that if we get the certificates of completion going out to a faculty group of nine people, it will be disastrous for the ATC system . . . we've already seen that we have a problem with the way that we approve the AAT degrees."

L. Fife: ". . . we have inquired about whether we have a problem and there hasn't been any indication that has been the case. I come from a position of not developing policy and procedure on anticipation of possible problems."

D. Holmes: "Ogden-Weber and the other ATCs have used this (current) process as I've described it for 25 to 30 years and it works. And if we've got something that works, why change it?"

R. VanAusdal: Has served on the IPCC Committee, with representation from all the UCAT regions, in meetings where the above issue has been discussed. Although initially there had been some regional concerns, the document that Vice President Fife has presented is the result of that discussion and has been accepted by all UCAT regional representatives on that committee. "One of our concerns is that if we do go for accreditation as one institution, the accrediting bodies are going to be looking for some standardization of curriculum across the system. That's one of the key concerns that we had to deal with. If we don't have federal financial aid, we wouldn't go in that direction, but the caveat that if one institution wants to develop its own 900 plus hour certificate approved by the Regents' for financial aid, that policy could be changed. And I think that it gives us the best of both worlds, we'll still be able to show the accrediting body our normal process of standardizing the curriculum across the institution. Having been involved with Northwest accreditation before, they are a stickler on these kind of things."

D. Holmes: "I think that your point is well taken concerning Northwest, but do we want to have our program driven by our desire for accreditation by Northwest? I think that would be a mistake. We need to keep our programs . . . to serve our local business and industries, not to comply with the academic community. As I understand, the COE does not have this problem, if we get accredited by COE . . . this won't be a problem. The last time that a representative from Northwest was out here, she indicated that they were very flexible on what they would do for us; they were not nearly as rigid as they seemed to be the first time because maybe they knew that they had some competition in the accreditation process. I just think that it's a mistake to have our programs driven by the Northwest Association."

C. Johnson: "I'd like to go back to the principles and make sure that we are dealing with principles. One, from the Regents' standpoint, the Regents want UCAT to remain as nimble as possible. Number two, we had determined that this is one college, and whether its accreditation or whether its quality, the principle is the same, it is one institution . . . UCAT. We need to still look at all campuses, all locations and take that into account. It really is a layer of quality to make sure that we are doing what we should do. Programs are generally intended to cross over multiple employers, there may be one employer who's driving it, but everyone in the program is not going to go to work for that one company. That needs to be taken into account. It's still employer driven, but not always just a specific employer. I just want to make sure that we look at these as principles."

_____

W. Woodward: "Where does the student fit in our philosophy, because our workforce is very mobile. Just because they work for Williams today and go through that program, they may come down to Salt Lake and work for an industry here and if the whole college is collaborating then the training they received for Williams will in fact be training they need for this company also, even though perhaps Williams did one aspect of it. If we are offering quality education for the workforce then we need to take the entire workforce into consideration also."

D. Holmes: "I don't disagree with that but all I can say in answer . . . we've been doing this for 30 years and it works. To have our programs go through and get approved by nine different members and have to reach a consensus, you end up inevitably with a compromise that probably doesn't fit anyone in particular. I think that we need to stick with what we know works."

D. Mortimer: "COE. Are they weighing in the way that Doug (Holmes) is mentioning?"

G. Fitch: "COE is not agreeing with a lot of the activities that we are conducting our operations under at this time."

D. Mortimer: "How would it affect this specific issue?"

G. Fitch: "This specific issue will be affected dramatically because they are recognizing our institutions as nine separate institutions as opposed to one college under Utah law, so they are contrary to law under these circumstances and those are items that we supposed to negotiate out with them. For example, if you allow them to provide certificates of completion or even the associate degree, it is the Board of Regents who grants that authority under their policies and under law and there is only one institution that can do that, and that's UCAT. That's what we are talking about, the UCAT policies. Not the ones that go up to 900 hours, where your institution can do all it wants to meet individual needs, but we are talking about the key components of essentially a one-year full program at 900 hours."

G. Fitch: "But our question is not for you to vote and approve this, our question to you is to receive it as a Board, know that we are trying to set levels of standardization within our system and operation . . . this is a dynamic document, it will be changing regularly. What Vice President Fife and I were trying to do is not to have you vote on it as a policy . . . just receive it and allow us to modify and adjust as we go through . . . but we have to have something consistent for our institutions to operate off of so they have an understanding. And we may well find that we need to change components of this and what we're asking is don't vote on it as a policy because every time we make one little change we'll have to come back to you. As you recall the discussion last time you said '(President) Fitch go ahead and just do it and then come back and tell us' and I said I wouldn't do that, I wouldn't operate against a policy that you voted on and then come back and tell you later. So all that we are asking is that you receive this document, understand that we are working under the consideration of accreditation to set standard levels that each of the institutions up to 900 hours, can do whatever they need. Those programs that are 900 hours are full year programs and should be looked at with some level of quality and standardization."

_____

B. Wallis: ". . . asked me at one of our last Board of Directors' meeting, what really made the institution unique and what particular principles I find that impact the recognition the institution had has over these past few years. . . What has made us different is the market-driven responsiveness to our customers . . ."

N. Bangerter: "Does this proposed policy negate your ability to do that?"

B. Wallis: "Yes and no. We are in a different situation here as we are trying to hold to the ideals that Mr. Johnson has referenced in terms of one college, now trying to make that work within nine institutions. So yes we've had problems. Will we continue to have problems? Yes we will have problems. The point that I would echo in support of my Chairman, is that this is unique. We certainly don't want to let go of the market-driven element and homogenize it to the point that we lose the identity."

N. Bangerter: "I think that it would be fair to say that the objective of the whole education system . . . is to be market-driven, to accommodate the community. We don't want you to cut out doing what works, as quickly as you can do it. The question is, does this unreasonably hogtie anybody in their ability to move forward aggressively and meet that market. Because hopefully, we are the most market-driven organization in education in the state of Utah, at least we are supposed to be."

D. Roberts: "A concern . . . for 30 years it has worked, and has worked well . . . does this system divide us or bring us together?"

R. VanAusdal: ". . . the process has been very dynamic; the people that have been involved have been very willing to work together. All of these issues that you are raising have been discussed during these meetings. We work through those kinds of issues and built in the flexibility with certificates of proficiency . . . to where you can modify the certificate where it is customized to your area."

D. Mortimer: "If we don't vote on this, does that mean that Ogden-Weber can just go ahead and do what it wants to do and then come back and talk about it or if they can't, then voted or not this is procedure, so then we do have to deal with those issues, as opposed to not."

G. Fitch: "As far as the procedures go, as President VanAusdal pointed out, all of the CAOs, your Chief Academic Officers from each one of your campuses participated in the development of this particular procedure. As one college under law we had to develop a procedure to try to accommodate not only accreditation, student financial aid and the law, to be one college and provide these options. We are not nine separate entities that go out and do whatever they want to do. However, the procedure was designed in such a way that from one hour up to 899 hours each of the institutions can meet any industry standard. Now I hope that you put that into perspective, that 900 hours is a full year program. If you think as an institution, talking about quality and response to business and industry, that you could start a new program, have faculty in place, have equipment in place in an overnight turnaround for a one year program, I would challenge you on that. However, it does say that up to that point, the institution can respond to any need and offer any training that is necessary. At 900 (hours) we have another element that kicks in, financial aid. . . What they have done is incorporate the idea that each of the local entities, as they develop this one year program or the associate degree, can put in options, we call them electives, to meet certain local specific

_____

needs . . . We are asking you to receive it, recognize it as our procedure at this time. We are looking for a procedure that we can continue to operate on. What we have brought forward to this Board is a procedure that the academic officers have agreed to and forwarded to us."

T. Bingham: "I am concerned that we are giving so much emphasis to accreditation that we are losing our focus on what we are supposed to be doing here. And if we limit this to the AAT degrees and not the others, I would rather error on that side and come back and say that it's created some other problems that we need to now address. I am just concerned about taking away the flexibility and speed that we have to have with these ATCs to respond to the changing needs."

W. Woodward: Asked Trustee Holmes to review how his amendment would change the presented document.

D. Holmes: ". . . basically what my amendment does is move the UCAT certificates of completion from section I, where it's combined with the AAT degree, to section II 'Development Procedures for Institutional Certificate of Proficiency and Certificate of Technical Competence Level Programs'. I would then add the UCAT Certificate of Completion to this section, which has more flexibility, so that we can operate under the present system."

W. Woodward: "And that's in conflict, apparently, with R401?"

D. Holmes: "I'm not that familiar with R401, there may be some provisions that were made to accommodate some of the policies. If R401 needs to be changed or any other Regents' policy, we ask the Board of Regents to change them. The Board of Regents really want us to develop with as much flexibility as they can. My sense is that the Regents won't object to making changes if that's what we want to do."

W. Wayne: "If we make the change from moving the certificates of completion to section II, does it create problems with the current Regents' R401 policy?"

L. Fife: "It does. We would have to request a change to Regents' policy because all certificates 900 clock hours or more are now defined in Regents' policy as certificates of completion, and they are action items . . ."

C. Johnson: "And I'd like not to make this a Regents issue because I don't think that's core to this. What is core to this is the single institution that you have here and the reason that I argue against this is to say that if we're going to start down a path . . . and that's all we're talking about is what is the direction of the path that we starting down. And we need to prove that we can bring all of these campuses together. The more that we bring them together the better off we're going to be in the long run. The more that this Board helps in that process, the better off we'll be in the long run and I think that we should start the path the way this is written, realizing that if we run into problems, let's change it. But, let's get the path going correctly."

M. Bouwhuis: "What we are finding with UCAT is that the devil is in the details for campuses like ours, and that's what Brent (Wallis) and Doug (Holmes) refer to. Every time that we take away flexibility of an

_____

institution like ours, it hampers our ability to move quickly. We did start a program overnight, two months ago. . 900 hours . . . our Board of Directors approved it in June and we had it up and operational the end of July. So we do move quickly. The problem is definitions. Higher Ed has definitions for things that work in Higher Ed. When you apply those definitions to us, it is very difficult. Certificates in Higher Ed have a whole different meaning than certificates of completion in the ATC. Certificates of completion are our core documents, our core curriculum. That's what we operate from. So when you start to try to move them into a R401, which has a different definition, that's where we get into trouble. And I'm not saying that we ought not to have a document, the document is good, it's served us well, and it's moving us in the right direction. We have to be careful with the wording in the document. . . you have to be very careful that all these things keep adding up and when they add up it takes away what's made us great."

C. Albrecht: "This committee has been working on this for a year and a half, representatives of every institution, and they all come together with something they all agree on, that's worth some value. I think all the administration is asking for is that we accept it, that it's an ongoing dynamic document and that they'll work with these other situations as they come up."

D. Roberts: ". . . when you (DATC) received approval to get it (certificate) up and running, who did you go to for approval?"

M. Bouwhuis: "It went through our Board of Directors and we notified the state office."

D. Roberts: "If we approve it as it is written now, would it change? Could it still be done as you just did?"

M. Bouwhuis: "If we had to negotiate with the nine that would slow the process."

G. Fitch: "If your institution was the only one that wanted that certificate, you wouldn't be negotiating with the nine because you wouldn't need it in other regions. You could move forward independently under this process without any restriction on it, so let's be clear on that."

R. Brems: Referred to 2.A., second sentence, 'Certificate programs that are between 600 and 900 hours and are eligible for financial aid must be approved by the Board of Regents.' "I don't know the scenario that Mike (Bouwhuis) is referring to, it is problematic, he said his program needed to be about 900 hours, but that does present a further limiter in terms of what's being talked about. A program that is 600 or 700 hours and it will be very helpful to have a financial aid option for it. Does that further limit what we're able to do? And can we get any flexibility with that one?"

L. Fife: "I would think that could be submitted through the fast track process under policy. There is a 15 day turnaround and the Commissioner has final approval on that. And that's meant to be quick turnaround for financial aid for those kinds of certificates."

R. Brems: "So the Commissioner can give approval on that without going to the Regents?"

L. Fife: "It goes on the Regents consent calendar."

_____

Commissioner Foxley: "We don't stall it because we want the students to get financial aid. That's why the fast track program is clarified in R401."

R. Brems: "Have we had occasion to use fast track yet for UCAT?"

L. Fife: "Not in UCAT. We've just have the 40 certificates of completion approved and we haven't brought anything forward through the fast track process."

W. Woodward: "So it's my understanding that what we would be approving with this motion would be in direct violation of policy 401?"

L. Fife: "Yes. The policy would have to be modified."

D. Holmes: ". . . and Charlie's (Johnson) point is well taken. We're kind of at the beginning and starting down one path or the other. And I guess my preference is to start down the path knowing that this path works. Whereas if we start down the other path we don't know if it works. It we start down the path that I propose in my motion, and we find out that it's unworkable, it's got problems that we don't foresee, we can come back and go down the other path. I think it's wiser to do that, to start down a path that we know that works as opposed to start down a path that we don't know that works."

G. Fitch: "I would argue the opposite direction. As Rich (VanAusdal) points out, for a year and a half your Chief Academic Officers have looked at that . . . at each of their institutions. With that in mind, why modify your path when you already know one that's working and workable with your particular people? If that one then doesn't change, you've got the other one in sight. So why change something and attempt it before you've already got something established?"

D. Mortimer: SUBSTITUTE MOTION. MOVED to suspend and move on to the next item on the agenda. Motion seconded by M. Madsen. Vote taken: 6 Yea, 7 Nay. MOTION FAILS.

To the main motion to amend the document as suggested by Vice Chair Holmes. Vote taken: 4 Yea, 8 Nay. MOTION FAILS.

D. Ipson: MOVED to 'receive' the document as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Roberts.

Discussion:

D. Holmes: Asked for a better understanding of what is meant by 'receiving' the document as presented.

G. Fitch: "What I would like to do with the Board's recognition and receipt of this particular process, that we move forward applying this process to our program application. If we find any problems or issues, those items will be brought to that group, the CAOs who work with this and the process. Then it will be brought back to you (UCAT Board) to inform you that we've had a problem. Our original purpose in receiving this

_____

as opposed to declaring it as policy is so that you don't have to vote on it every time. This becomes a working process and procedure for us. If there's a glitch, it's brought back to you and your local boards."

N. Bangerter: "I don't know if it's my prerogative, but I'm going to rule that receiving it is the same as approving it and that is the process under which we will be working with the capability of this Board to amend or do what they want. Personally I see no difference if we receive it, we're authorizing them to operate under that program."

W. Prows: Expressed concern about the campuses losing their identity. "I don't know what this is going to mean to the institution and the way of life that we have had.   But if what I'm hearing is that we will have the flexibility down the road to modify this if it gets in our way of doing the business we need to do, if the Regents will be interested in helping us get that done because they don't want to get in our way. . . I think that we're a little worried that something is going to change and happen a little at a time and then all of a sudden we'll wake up one day and find out that we're something that we don't want to be. If you're telling us that it's not going to happen that way, we should probably pick our battles carefully, and I don't know if this is one that I want to fall on the sword on. So from my perspective, I'm willing to support what you're asking for with the caveat that we continue to have lively debate on this because it's going to be one chip at a time. But if you're telling us that we're not going to get hurt, I'm willing to support it. But I guess that we've got to move forward and got to make some decisions."

D. Holmes: Requested clarification on what is meant by the CAOs 'having a problem.' "Does that mean if one CAO has a problem or a majority . . . what triggers the bringing of a concern of one CAO back to the UCAT Board?"

C. Johnson: Suggested a monthly report until the Board gets more comfortable.

N. Bangerter: "I think that there is another step in between that triggers it faster, and I think it's the administration of the nine institutions. If they think they've been violated in any way in what they are trying to do, that they let that be known."

To the main motion to approve the document as presented. Motion was approved (11 Yea, 1 Nay) and carried.

N. Bangerter: Instructed staff to provide monthly report on any problems that are occurring with the approval of new programs in any institution.

C. Utah Chamber of Commerce Membership (Tab Q)

N. Bangerter: "We'd like to recommend that the President (Fitch) be able to join the Chamber of Commerce.

T. Bingham: Requested point of clarification as to whether this is the Utah Chamber of Commerce or the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce.

_____

G. Fitch: Responded that this is the Utah Chamber of Commerce.

T. Bingham: Provided some background on the Utah Chamber of Commerce and his concerns, and urged against joining. "What he (head of Utah Chamber of Commerce) is looking for in this process is to deliver a lobbying service to a number of companies and organizations throughout the State. It is not a Chamber of Commerce as you think of a Chamber of Commerce. This is not associated with your other Chambers of Commerce.

N. Bangerter: Asked if the motion should be amended so that President Fitch could join the other Chamber of Commerce.

G. Fitch: Expressed concern with joining the local Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce only since UCAT is located statewide. He requested that this agenda item be withdrawn.

D. Annual Report to the Legislature (Tab R)

G. Fitch: Referred to the final copy of the UCAT Second Annual Report provided to the Trustees today. Requested that the Board accept this report so that it can then be forwarded to the Interim Education Committee. Any changes that had been suggested from the draft copy previously sent to the Board members and the campus presidents were incorporated into this final copy as presented. "The emphasis of last year's annual report was on the organizational structure of UCAT. We talked about what we were doing and moved ahead with changes in legislation. This particular report highlights the campuses and student interests, particularly high school, and the client base that we serve, on an educational level and on a business level. We are trying to highlight UCAT. . . we have the nine institutions, and my position as President as always been to recognize that local autonomy, so we have incorporated each of their emblems in the report."

President Fitch then referred to the Table Contents and briefly discussed each section listed. He also thanked Campus President Brems for his recommendation to highlight each UCAT campus with specific campus informational pages presented throughout the report (campus logo, pictures, quick facts, and quotes from business and industry, and campus highlights provided by each institution).

Specifically addressing section VII, Snow College Richfield, President Fitch briefly explained the relationship between UCAT and Snow College Richfield resulting from HB 161, and then introduced Dr. Rick White from Snow College Richfield.

G. Fitch: "What we are obligated to do under this section of the annual report is to monitor the Richfield campus to ensure that the programs that are offered there, that have been offered historically, goes to ATE applications. What we found in the analysis is that because of some of the changes that occurred in the transition, we're using this year under the new operation to do an analysis of maintenance of effort to set a baseline, and then review and monitor and continue to support them in their efforts."

_____

R. White: Referred to the Snow College Richfield program information provided in Appendix I in the annual report. "With the passage of HB 161 and the merger of the Central Applied Technology College with Snow College we are able to provide a variety of services. We have the best of both worlds in that we can provide both credit and noncredit to our high school students and provide credit and noncredit offerings to our adult students."

D. Mortimer: MOVED that the Board accept the Second Annual Report, have it reproduced and moved forward to the legislature. The motion was seconded by D. Holmes. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

E. Custom Fit for the SLTATC (Tab S)

N. Bangerter: "As you know, there have been some real challenges in the Salt Lake/Tooele area with our relationship with the Community College and there's been a change in administration. There's a lot of work going on to try to put this program together, where we are going to be in a cooperative mode. There's been a lot of negotiation going on . . . without going into the detail before we get everything together, just know that we are making some good progress in that area. When we get past this, the next one will be to strengthen our relationships with the high schools, and this agreement that is moving along, it's not final, will help us do that."

Adjourn for lunch 11:40 a.m. – Reconvene at 12:20 p.m.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Nursing Re-entry Efforts (Tab T)

L. Fife: "As you know, there has been a nursing initiative during the last two years to try to get funding from the legislature to increase the nursing graduates in Utah. As a companion piece to that effort, there has been a refresher re-entry program run through the continuing ed division of the College of Nursing at the University of Utah to try to get nurses back in the workforce who may not be working at this time. The University has now decided to concentrate their efforts on faculty preparation. But there is still a desire to do re-entry for nurses that are licensed and would like to go back to the workplace. So we've been involved in discussions with the University of Utah and with the nursing leadership forum in Utah to ask what UCAT can do in terms of helping to prepare those nurses in that situation to get back in the workforce because we do have access to clinical sites and skill labs and there is a skill component to this refresher re-entry program. We wanted to let you know that we are engaged in that dialogue with the nursing forum and expect that we will be participating in that effort and it's a very good thing for UCAT in terms of being visible and participating in this nursing initiative."

B. DXATC – DSC MOU for Custom Fit (Tab U)

R. VanAusdal: Explained the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) partnership created between the Dixie campus of UCAT and Dixie State College for the delivery of Custom Fit training in their shared region.

_____

"This is in response to the directive of this Board to review how Custom Fit services are provided in each region and report on that. This memo, based on concept, began some 12 years ago. At that time we had a situation in Washington County where a variety of services were available for business and industry but they were kind of disjointed. At that time we had an opportunity because we were just in the process of starting to design a new business building to go on the campus of Dixie College and we felt like there might be an opportunity to bring all of these entities together to provide service in a centralized location to do this kind of training. So we called a meeting and discussed a concept and they were all very anxious to become involved so they formed an alliance that later became known as the Dixie Business Alliance. Custom Fit is part of that, a very important part, and has been ever since. When UCAT legislation was passed there was a little bit of confusion as to what does that mean in terms of Dixie College and their role and responsibility with Custom Fit training. So in going through this process . . . we clarified that funding for Custom Fit does flow through UCAT and Dixie Applied Technology College. I hired the director for the Custom Fit Training program, but I still feel that it's important to maintain that partnership and maintain that standard for delivery of one stop shop for services. So we reassigned our training director to the Dixie Business Alliance and that person is a member of that team. It eliminates the duplication of services, eliminates turf, eliminates a lot of confusion that business and industry has and brings together all of the experience that each can bring to the table."

G. Fitch: "I placed that on the agenda for a couple of reasons. First, to recognize President VanAusdal and President Huddleston. Our relationships and our partnerships are not always challenges. Second, this UCAT Board had indicated that you would like all of the Boards of Directors to consider in their own areas, the Custom Fit operation and make recommendations. This is an end result of that particular activity. I compliment our President because this isn't going to be exactly what we can have in every area, because of the different needs, but it is something we can use as a model."

D. Roberts: "How many places are functioning this way . . . does the individual ATC handle the Custom Fit in most places or the colleges?"

G. Fitch: "The ATCs handle it in most places, with the agreement with Dixie at this time, SUU in Cedar City handles it and Salt Lake Community College handles it except for the $52,000 portion that went to Salt Lake/Tooele this year under that penalty phase."

D. Roberts: "Would you recommend that we enact . . . through us to the college and they deal with it. Should we approach that?"

G. Fitch: "It makes sense. But that's why this Board asked each of the Boards of Directors to look within their own region to see how it was operating. Obviously, it we made an absolute shift, we wouldn't have the type of document that we are dealing with now from Dixie and the cooperation that is going on. So I would hate to just automatically say that this is the way it goes unless there are sound agreements struck to best serve business and industry."

_____

C. UCAT Tuition Rate and Payment of 100% of Instructor Cost Exception Form (Tab V and Attachments A-1, A-2, and A-3)

K. Henrie: Referred to Tab V and presented Attachments A-1 through A-3, distributed at the Board meeting.

Attachment A-1 is the UCAT Membership Hour Decision Tree. Steps 6 and 8 refer specifically to exceptions to the previously approved tuition rate and payment of 100% of instructor cost. The decision tree does allow for exceptions in classification to occur with respect to charged tuition rates and payment of 100 percent of the instructor cost. In these instances it is necessary for the campus to obtain approval for an exception from the Board of Trustees on how these membership hours should be classified.

Attachment A-2 (which replaces the Attachment 2 material in the agenda packet) is the Instructions for Requesting Tuition Rate and Payment of 100 Percent of Instructor Cost Exception draft, dated 9/24/03. This is a procedural document with instructions on how to use the Exception Request form.

Attachment A-3 is the UCAT Exception Request form draft, dated 9/16/03 to be used by the campuses when requesting an exception from the UCAT Board of Trustees.

D. Holmes: "How long does it take to work through this decision tree? It looks very complicated to me."

K. Henrie: "As the institutions' financial officers try to determine what the budgetary needs are . . . as they ask the questions on the left hand side, it is a relatively quick process to determine the kind of membership hours. It is just the process of going through and looking to see whether you need an exception or waiver."

D. Holmes: "When is this done?"

L. Fife: "It is used for audit purposes to audit whether or not membership hours should or should not be budget related. It gives the campuses guidance in how to structure their programs and it gives the auditors something to audit by."

J. Cannon: "I have a question about the overlap between secondary students served by UCAT and the secondary students served by public ed and the dollars. Is this a problem for UCAT instructors that teach in a public ed setting?"

L. Fife: "I don't think that it is. But if you look at number 4, 'Are the hours generated by secondary students', and 'Does the UCAT campus pay 100 percent of the instructor cost for the course/program', that was your recommendation (7 May 03 UCAT Board meeting) when you brought it forth, we put 'UCAT campus' in there."

G. Fitch: "This decision tree has been before the Board and you did move it forward, and that particular component that you are asking about is one that we incorporated from your comments earlier on."

_____

B. Hall: " . . . if there is any cost sharing so that the UCAT campus is paying less than 100 percent, you'd need to ask for an exception to support that partnership and that's what I would anticipate. I think that there are some regions that do that. So I think this creates a process to ensure that happens."

G. Fitch: "This is a process that we are following, not just for audit principles, but for coordination of our efforts. Much like our earlier discussion that took some time. It's taken us down a path and we are back to you as a Board letting you know that we needed some changes in here, some exceptions, much like in previous policies and procedures."

R. Brems: "We are in the process of filling out a couple of these because we do have some sharing situations. Will the process be for that request to come to Administration and can Administration provide approval for that or does it need to come to the Trustees?"

K. Henrie: "It needs to come to the Trustees but we'd like to have it come to Administration so that we are aware."

D. Budget Review (Tab W, Attachments B, C-1, C-2, and C-3)

K. Henrie: In preparation for the UCAT budget presentation and Board approval on November 5, a preliminary budget request process was presented.

Attachments C-1, C-2, and C-3 replaced the attachments in Tab W of the agenda packet.

Attachment B was a PowerPoint presentation which highlighted the following:
1) UCAT Budget Request Process
2) Serving UT Students (number of individuals, % of eligible Utah population, projected participation rates and membership hour growth)
3) Regional Budget Needs
   Attachment C-1 detailed:
      a) Operational Request
      b) Standard Mandated Costs
      c) UCAT System Initiatives
      d) Institutional Issues
4) UCAT Funding Formula
   Three components: Formula Financing, Formula Request, and Formula Distribution
5) Next Steps (in the process)
The remainder of Attachment B provided the supporting documentation for the above listed areas.

E. Strategic Planning – Direction (Tab X)

G. Fitch: "One of the concerns that I have is that this Board has asked for a strategic planning effort. We've organized our particular committees and have a guideline in developing our strategic plan. What I

_____

need to know from this Board and why it's an information item is, where do you want to go from here? All of you are business people, assigned to other boards and doing other things; I know that your time is limited. I would like some direction from this Board on how you would like to handle it. Do you want, for example, to try to utilize part of our regular Board meetings as a component and breakout and have each of the committees working? Would you like us with our facilitators to call particular meetings with the Chairman of each of the committees and have those committees meet independently with reports back to the Board? Would you like to set up a conference call network of some kind so that we can coordinate these activities? These groups that we've talked about, the IPCC, the Presidents' Cabinet and so forth, how many of them do you want engaged in this particular activity? How would you like us to do this? We have got to get this going. And I would like to be able to report this to the legislature."

W. Prows: Suggested that the committee meetings be held the same day as the Board meetings.

D. Holmes: Suggested that since he and Governor Bangerter normally meet with President Fitch prior to the Board meetings, that the Committee meetings be held following the Board meetings.

N. Bangerter: Suggested that the Chairman of each Committee decide how often they would like to meet.

J. Cannon: Suggested, based on advice from the National State Boards of Education, that strategic planning should be part of every meeting and should be done as a full Board because people have such strong feelings about giving input. "I'd like to recommend that we devote a portion of each meeting to the strategic planning process."

G. Fitch: "I have no problem, with this Board's consent, as we develop our agendas that if there's an hour at the end where we could break out into individual groups, we could provide documents of preparation because you already have the foundation document which was given to you in a planning notebook, you could look at that and be prepared to work with that. In each of your groups you have (Campus) Presidents assigned, who on their campuses are already involved in strategic planning and campus planning overall. They could be the facilitators to coordinate that and then coordinate with our staff people here at the central office to get these going."

M. Madsen: Agreed that committee meetings after the regular Board meeting would be preferable.

N. Bangerter: "We'll leave that to you (President Fitch) and the Committee Chairmen to set forth an agenda for us on how we are going to handle that."

F. COE Update (Tab Y)

G. Fitch: "The full body commission for COE met and they are in the process of changing Executive Directors; Dr. Gary Puckett has been selected. I met with them and presented our concerns and questions (Tab Y).   As you look at these concerns and questions, you can see that we have some distinct differences between what their standards are and what we intend. My position has been and my approach to the

_____

Commission last week in Memphis is, we are not going to be a square peg hammered into a round hole, to meet standardization requirements of that particular organization. As recently as yesterday evening, we received a letter and the Commission has authorized their Executive Director to look at certain concerns that we have and try to consider what we can do to negotiate it. However, they will not deviate from their standards nor will they change anything with the integrity of their program, in their operation, that the DOE analyzes and reviews. So right now, we'll try to determine which items they are willing to negotiate on, what items they will not negotiate on and then I will come back to this body and report. There is a strong consideration that if they are unwilling to do these things, then we need to accelerate our activities with Northwest Association. The key is, we are paid up through June 30 and our students are eligible for financial aid under this candidacy application. We do not want to jeopardize that, so I am working with them and their Executive Director on these components during that period of time as we work in other arenas."

M. Madsen: "If we are not able to negotiate these and we have to accelerate with Northwest, could we meet the requirements to continue on with financial aid by getting Northwest to facilitate that . . .?"

G. Fitch: "That's the period of time that we paid for. We anticipate moving into Northwest candidacy next year, 2004, and we're hoping they run concurrently and then if this doesn't work out, we'll have the Northwest component and under their candidacy we would still be able to offer financial aid."

D. Holmes: "I just want to be sure that when we deal with Northwest we are going to be as strong with them as we have been with COE about meeting our needs, not just roll over and do what Northwest wants us to do, because the more that we do that, the more we will become like a traditional college. It looked like COE was going to be a better fit for us than Northwest."

G.   Campus Presidents' Cabinet Report (Tab Z)

President Fitch referred to the Campus Presidents' Cabinet Agenda from the most recent meeting on 24 September 2003 to present various agenda items.

Item #1 Purchasing
"We are running audits across all of our campuses right now, as part of not only an initiative from the Board of Regents but also the State Auditor's Office. We are running independent audits with our people from the Commissioners office, going to the campuses. One of the consistent problems that we found is the purchasing requirement.   That is ensuring that you go to bidding, purchasing at certain levels, and so forth; the Business Officers are working on that right now. I wanted to let you know that some audits are coming back with discrepancies and problems. So we are looking at them very carefully."

Item #4 Use of Private Schools by UCAT for High School Students
"A couple of our institutions are engaged in providing high school students services. We provide those services through a private business, most specifically Cosmetology. So what it means is that we are paying for the hours for a high school student to go to a Cosmetology school because our ATC does not have it there. The question came up, why are we paying for that student to go to a Cosmetology school

_____

and how come the secondary school is not paying for it? We were looking for some way that they would pay for that student to move on. From our understanding, there is not a restriction on that. In some areas, like Dixie, where you pay for a student to go to another private school however you only pay for that component for the actual instruction of that student, so it's not in addition to, it's the actual instruction. What we are looking at here philosophically is should we be paying for a high school student to go to a private school using UCAT funding?"

Item #8 Degree Prioritization
"The question right now is, there is a moratorium on new programs but we are still moving ahead internally to ensure that we have programs ready to go. We met with the Presidents Cabinet and did not set single priorities, but we did set up a group of degree options that we are considering that would be our priority in moving forward. For example, the AAT, the degrees that we'll be looking at are Business, Electronics, Apprenticeship, Machining, Welding, Diesel Mechanics, Mining and Nursing."

Item #15 Data Reporting to the Public
"This is more than just data reporting to the public. All of our institutions are at different levels of maturity and levels of application in MIS. The Higher Education system itself is looking primarily at Banner. Now the problem that we run into is that Banner, at this particular time, doesn't meet our needs. So we've had a committee operating for the last year and a half looking at all the different things, and right now they are moving forward with a vendor neutral proposal. . . This occurred on the basis of the legislative analysts, they asked us a question two years ago, you need 2.5 million dollars in your budget for this, but what do you really need? What we've tried to do is get to a point where we know exactly what we need and how to do it, so we will go back to the legislature with a legitimate request based on this information. So from that we'll be able to centralize data, provide better reports and better information, coordinate with our partners at the State Board of Education and around with business and industry, the legislature and the public. Let them know exactly what we are doing."

H. Letter from Governor Leavitt (Attachment D)

G. Fitch: Introduced Attachment D, a letter from Governor Leavitt to David Lauriski, Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health. "(Campus President) Miles Nelson has been working with CEU and Southeast and some other groups trying to put some things together. One of the steps that we had to follow through is that the Governor had to recommend that UCAT would be part of the grant application and be able to receive the grant to provide this type of training."

M. Nelson: Southeast ATC has been partnered with CEU for the last 8 or 9 years in the mining programs. CEU has now decided to move all mining programs as quickly as possible to UCAT. Currently, the MSHA (Mine Safety and Health Administration) grant is with the Utah Labor Commission, and CEU has been a sub-grantee of that grant. Campus President Nelson expressed that it was quite a process to put together a training plan for UCAT that MSHA would find met their standards. MSHA toured SEATC in the spring, and several other UCAT campuses, and were impressed with the system and the possibility of UCAT providing the training. The Governor has now made the official change, that UCAT will become the

_____

recipient of the grant resources effective October 1, 2003. The Utah Labor Commission will remain a partner in the grant as the testing certification portion of that.

D. Ipson: "How much does that grant usually amount to?"

M. Nelson: "About $160,000."

N. Bangerter: "What is the status of the mining industry down there these days?"

M. Nelson: "The mining industry is healthy. The jobs in the mining industry are dwindling because of technology. They are delivering more coal than they ever have, but more and more technology that requires less manpower. So it's been pretty flat on the expansion end of jobs, however, the average coal miner age is 54 years old. So there will be a large turnover coming up for mine laborers in the next 10 years. . . "

ADJOURN

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

Chair Bangerter adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 1:13 p.m.