

UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
28 AUGUST 2002
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
MINUTES

Board of Trustees

Norman Bangerter, Chair - Salt Lake/Tooele
Doug Holmes, Vice Chair - Ogden-Weber
Pamela J. Atkinson - SBOR
Thomas Bingham - Gov. Appt.
Janet Cannon - SBOE
Don Ipson - Dixie
Charlie Johnson – Regents (excused early)
Michael Madsen - Bridgerland
A. Earl McCain - SBOE
Wayne Woodward - Southeast
Carl Albrecht - Central
Doyle Mortimer - Mountainland
William Prows - Davis
Don Roberts - Southwest

Regional ATC Presidents

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
Carl Holmes - Central
Rob Brems - Mountainland
Miles Nelson - Southeast

Institutional Representation

Gregory G. Fitch

Commissioner's Office

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
Deanna D. Winn, Associate Commissioner of Academic Affairs

Media Present

Deseret News

Others Present

Commissioner Cecelia Foxley
Collette Mercier – VP, Ogden-Weber ATC
Jared Haines - VP, Mountainland ATC
Calvin Hunt - VP, Southeast ATC
K. Chad Campbell - VP, Finance, BATC
Marv Johnson - SBOE
Mary Shumway - SBOE
Debbie Headden - Fiscal Analyst
Boyd Garriott - Fiscal Analyst
Race Davies - Governor's Office

Excused Absent

John Busch – Uintah Basin

MINUTES OF MEETING
UTAH COLLEGE OF APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
REGENTS' BOARD ROOM
28 AUGUST 2002

The meeting of the UCAT Board of Trustees was held on 28 August 2002 in the Utah State Board of Regents Board Room.

Call To Order

Chair Bangerter called the meeting to order at 10:04 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 28 August 2002 Board meeting. Being none, motion was made by D. Holmes and seconded by P. Atkinson to approve as presented. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes from 05 June 2002 Board Meeting

Chair Bangerter asked if there were any additions and/or changes for the minutes of the 05 June 2002 Board meeting (Tab U). Being none, motion was made by D. Ipson and seconded by D. Roberts to approve as presented. Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Budget (Tab V)

1. General Fund

President Fitch presented the budget exhibits (Tab V, Exhibits a, b, c), explaining that this reflects some of the background involved with the most recent budget cut of .56%, the fiscal impact and institutional recommendations. He stated that the UCAT Board has the authority to determine the distribution among the four categories, UCAT Administration, Custom Fit, Development and Equipment. Exhibit "a" presents three scenarios for the distribution of funds: (1) equal distribution based on legislative cuts of .56% for each college and within the four categories, (2) hold harmless Custom Fit and the increased reduction in Administration, Development and Equipment categories, and (3) hold harmless for Custom Fit and Administration and the increased reduction in Development and Equipment. Exhibit "a" also presents the impact on all the areas if an additional rainy-day amount of 1% was held back.

G. Fitch: "All of these recommendations have been considered by the Presidents' Cabinet. If you look at the recommendation, it was agreed by the Regional Presidents to recommend a budget that would potentially hold harmless UCAT Administration and Custom Fit. If you recall during the last budget cycle, the UCAT Administration took significant cuts to ensure the continuation of programs and services. The other area where we took additional cuts was in Custom Fit because the cuts came late in the year where we felt that contracts had been issued, agreements had been struck, funds were available, and there was a balance of funds that we could take from there. The inference that I got from the Board in dealing with budget cuts is that we cannot afford to have Custom Fit jeopardized any more. . . . Custom Fit is a key component of our operation. That's what makes us very different and distinct from the other institutions of which we are part. . . . The Presidents reviewed and recommended to hold harmless Custom Fit and Administration, and through their recommendation, I endorse and support that."

“If you recall during our budgeting process, we sat here during the cut period looking at 4.75 and 9.00% cuts with potential cuts as high as 11% for UCAT in some component areas. Our colleges and the staff at those colleges responded in a very positive way, they addressed the needs and made some very hard decisions, they didn't fill positions, they reduced positions, and those programs that were weak they eliminated and have made some rather significant adjustments. And that was based on the projected cuts. Under those circumstances, there are some things that the institutions have done that they cannot reverse. So with that idea in mind, I took back to the Presidents' Council, at the bottom of the page, a recommendation that they hold 1% of their funding that had been projected for initial cuts, back as a rainy-day fund to continue to support their budget if there are potential cuts in the future or a downturn in the economy. So my recommendation to the Presidents' Cabinet was that we hold back at each institution a minimum of 1% . . . This Board may want to choose to hold back more than that, but this at least addresses our smaller institutions with smaller budgets.”

B. Mortensen: Explained the “2003-2004 Budget Request Template” handout (Attachment A). Columns A through E reflect what has happened to the budget for FY 2002-03 with the original base budget with no one-time funds included, budget increases that the campuses received, base adjustments and budget reductions that were enacted by the Legislature to get to the appropriated total. Columns F and G reflect areas where growth might be requested or where other program enhancements can be requested. He also referred to the short list of six ideas under “Potential System Requests” at the bottom of the handout. Column H reflects the total amount to be requested for 2003-2004, which would add in the growth, add in the program enhancements, and also add back the budget reductions that were enacted in Column D with the current base budget to get to the total request.

2. Board of Trustees Authority Area

G. Fitch: Presented the four criteria used in the past to evaluate the amount of the development funds to the institutions (Attachment B): (1) Membership Hours, (2) Growth of the Institution, (3) Competency (certificates awarded) and (4) Placement (where are they located and have they gotten jobs). One of the key issues and responsibilities of UCAT is placement. “My recent meetings with the Coalition and the Governor's office, they have all come to the same question, ‘If you are the business and industry college, what is your placement record? Are you placing students in jobs that they are training for and are they qualified for the jobs?’ That's why we have been working with the Matrix to determine the type of services that we have, who's best providing those services, and are the students qualified upon exit and are they being placed? So we are trying to calculate that data. What we have with development is a unique and interesting issue. It was given initially to provide to the institutions that excelled in certain areas of application. Obviously you recognize with Bridgerland, Davis, Ogden-Weber ATC, those institutions, because of size, numbers and growth patterns, always benefited from development. Other institutions also benefited, but on different marginal levels. Remember, that when you work with the ten UCAT colleges, each one is at a different level of maturity. This was a way and means designed to let all of those institutions make effort to try to gain funds and support for their programs as they excelled in certain areas. What happened during a time when the state was faced with severe budget cuts and reductions, this essentially became incorporated into the base budget. When we were faced with cuts, on base budget application by the legislature and when they also came back and also reduced development funding, it also became almost like a double cut. Our Presidents' have discussed these (4 competencies—categories), and still see these as viable and accountable in trying to identify the use of those funds. However, we have ten institutions available for these funds, rather than a lesser number originally under the State Board of Education. So with that idea in mind, there is still the potential that those four will still be shifted around and divided so that less money will be available among the ten institutions and their service needs. I've added a fifth category that I think that this Board needs to think about, and that's Student

Objectives. One of the areas that the ATC gets criticized in and often challenged in is the fact that students, both high school and adult, enter for a particular sequence, need or interest area, but step back prior to completion. There's no way to account for them under the competency because they may or may not have finished a certificate. The idea is that when a student comes in, and enrolls, one of the components that we are dealing with is 'What Is Your Purpose For Being Here?' Right now, the data and the data gathering that we do through our data warehouse will be important as we project budgets down the line through the years 2005, 2007 and also important for accreditation standards. And we must convince business and industry that we are meeting their needs and not shirking their interests. With the idea of Student Objectives, when the student enters, the student could cite what their purpose is for being there. If that objective is met, clearly defined, established and certified, then the institution could receive credit for that recognition whether it is short-term or long-term. The reason that we suggest this category is to provide the smaller institutions will have more of an opportunity. Overall what that means is that institutions that are larger that are having tremendous success will be getting a lesser amount of the pie. But we are here as the Board of UCAT, for the statewide application, and we need to look at bringing all of our institutions up together without holding any back in a critical way. . . . You would receive partial recognition for the objective that they've met, the growth component, the membership hour, and if they complete the program, the competency based recognition. So the institution can benefit in all of the categories. What we'll need to do is to create a formula to embrace this last one . . . So this is one way to look at development and try to deal with, in a more forthright approach, to handling this money that has now been a part of our essential base budget but now under the control of the UCAT Board. Before the institution still had the opportunity to delegate it within their own operation, and they will still have that with their local Board. The process will allow UCAT to will make the distribution determination.

Those were two key areas that were reviewed: Custom Fit and Development. We have others as I have indicated, UCAT Administration . . . and the last one is Equipment. We've run into a situation historically dealing with Equipment that sometimes additional funds are provided to an institution, such as Salt Lake/Tooele, who needs the additional funds to start up a particular program, or have replacement costs. What we are looking at and one of our Presidents' Cabinet discussions, is some means of looking at equipment application and distribution of funds and equipment by setting up criteria. So as we look at equipment formulas or distribution in that area, it could be, for example, on an even basis of ten. However, the smaller institutions may or may not need those equipment dollars for a particular program at their present status or level of growth. But there may be other institutions that need the extra equipment. . . . One of the things that we need to do at UCAT right now, we need to determine are we 10 of 1 or 1 of 10? So what we need to do is to make a determination and this Board is the one to make the determination that says basically, we are the Utah College of Applied Technology, and each of the colleges are member colleges and they will benefit from our system efforts. And that's basically where we are at on the budget."

P. Atkinson: "I think that the other category are those people that are working toward a particular course or class which enhances their value to the company in which they are employed. It's a different category, but an important one. They've already placed, but it's a different kind of placement, it's really of added value."

G. Fitch: "What I think I hear you saying is the Upgrade component. When we do an analysis, and do our numbers in our reporting sequence, we have an upgrade component where the institutions identify that this is an upgrade for an employed individual, upgraded skills training of some kind . . . it gives us a good checks and balance requirement in an institution to give us some credibility. . . . We have to establish our own identity, our own policies, our own procedures and our own requirements for distributing our funds and how we operate."

Chair Bangarter: "We've always had reports on placements . . . technical colleges or community colleges that

provided technical education would generally report in the 80 percentile of placements or above. Whereas the universities would report in the 20 percent for placements on a specific area of training. How did you arrive at those kind of numbers in the past?"

R. Maughan: "Our determination was based on our role. And that role being . . . deal mostly with business and industry. Those jobs would come to us from business and industry and we would fill them . . . which would indicate that we would know where more jobs are than workforce services, because of our close relationship to business and industry. So in many cases we would have more jobs on the board than students to fill them... Our close alliance with business and industry is what has put us at 80 to 90 percent . . . and in the past if we were at 40 to 50 percent then we were struggling to review our programs to see if they needed some content."

B. Wallis: ". . . become quite complex for us just in the vast numbers that we put out on the jobs. . . . What we've done is gone to an automated process through workforce services to try to link these up. The real key to this is the employer teams that Richard (Maughan) is talking about. Those employer teams are the ones that are hiring your people and you are meeting with them at least once or twice a year and they will tell you whether or not your people are performing. They'll tell you whether or not they need more. That's where you really get the sense. So on one side you are trying to balance the books and on the other side you are trying to get a feel for the market driven aspects of it."

G. Fitch: Represented the Commissioner with DWS at one of their meetings. Part of the Governor's 1000 day plan is the continued effort for coordination with the ATCs . . . over the next six months the UCAT Regional Presidents will be taking their staff to train DWS staff and counselors. What's happening is that DWS will have a potential employee come in for a job assignment, and they'll have two out of three requirements met for a job, and our institutions can provide the third one. The DWS counselors don't have that knowledge of UCAT so with the training that we will provide over the next six months they will not only have the training to understand UCAT but also make referrals for those students and potentially look at additional funding.

T. Bingham: MOVED to recommend that each institution holdback a minimum of 1% of their budget. The motion was seconded by D. Ipson. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

D. Ipson: MOVED to recommend that the overall budget be approved, holding both Custom Fit and UCAT Administration harmless. The motion was seconded by D. Roberts. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

D. Mortimer: Indicated an error on Exhibit "c". The numbers indicate 25% and should reflect the 50% to be distributed.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

President Fitch introduced Deanna D. Winn, Associate Commissioner of Academic Affairs. He thanked Mary Shumway and the State Board of Education for their assistance with the UCAT policy and procedures, number counts and audits and other financial elements and also thanked the Fiscal Analysts (Boyd Garriott and Debbie Headden) for their attendance at this Board meeting. He introduced Collette Mercier from the Ogden-Weber ATC, who represents UCAT on the Academic Officers Council.

A. Update on CATC/Snow College Agreement

President Fitch introduced Carl Holmes, CATC President and the “Statement on Richfield Coordination Plan (Attachment C).

C. Holmes: Regional President Holmes gave background on the creation of the coordination plan and all the individuals involved, and highlighted the changes documented in this coordination plan. He felt that the result of this coordination plan is now a position to create a serviceable institution in Richfield. One of the challenges encountered in development of this document was the conflict in interest and attitudes, and what was going to happen and what should happen. Eventually the attitude shifted from “lets not try to divide things up” to “lets try to work together” to provide the very best services on that campus, recognizing the fact that there are five entities providing service (CATC, Snow South, SUU, USU, and Weber State) in the area. The changes represent a solution to take the team approach rather than the conflict approach, which should result in a more workable solution for all involved in the Richfield area.

C. Albrecht: “. . . the key will be if it is implemented correctly . . . but I think that you’ve got good people in good places right now . . .”

G. Fitch: “One important item in the agreement indicates where the funding goes. That the efforts by the CATC, the funding that they create, the support that they get from the state, remains at CATC for potential growth . . . so we have an real opportunity for the President to take that particular system, expand services throughout and start to reach out into those other geographical regions.”

B. Introduction of Regional President Brems and Assistant Commissioner Linda Fife

President Fitch introduced Rob Brems, the new MATC Regional President and Linda Fife, Assistant Commissioner of Programs and the newest UCAT employee.

C. Regional Presidents' Cabinet Report (Tab W)

President Fitch explained the makeup of the Regional Presidents' Cabinet and the design of this Cabinet to do what is requested from the UCAT Board, allowing them to take it back to their Boards and personnel and to work with their institutions.

President Fitch referred to the board (Attachment D) for an explanation of a simplified Budget Process.

“The divisions, departments and areas within the colleges develop the budget internally within their institutions. This is what we have, this is our base, and this is our growth in conjunction with other variables. Then it is given to their Regional Administration (Regional Presidents). They examine it with their staff people, Vice Presidents, Deans, etc. to make determinations on the budget. By the time it reaches their Regional Boards, it is clearly outlined what a particular institution needs. When it gets to that particular point, it goes to the UCAT Board. Just before it gets to the UCAT Board, the Regional Presidents' Cabinet works with me to work through some of the budget issues. Often times because of the sequence, you don't get to follow the full process to reach that particular point so it essentially comes down to this is our base, this is our growth, because of the budget circumstances today. Hopefully with this process the Regional Presidents' Cabinet will be able to refine those items for you over a period of time so that when we do come back to you (UCAT

Board) it is clearly outlined with what we need and the purposes for it. To make you a well informed Board, to make decisions for UCAT. At this point, the Presidents' Cabinet is very important to the overall operation, particularly since UCAT does not have the staff to provide for a Vice President or those kinds of activities in those areas. I'm dependent on the Presidents to not only know their institutions well, but to respond to the system needs and help us move forward in every way. From the Presidents' Cabinet the budget typically moves to the UCAT Board. The UCAT approves the particular item and then it moves to Commerce and Revenue Committee and into the Legislature. The other areas listed are direct line items as far as the UCAT Board, and are my presentations to the Governor's office, the Regents, the Legislature and legislative services. We provide budget information to the Regents and Higher Education Committee as a courtesy and as we do that, the Presidents' Cabinet is extremely important."

President Fitch referred to the Regional Presidents' Cabinet Agenda from the most recent meeting on 14 August 2002 (Tab W), to present various agenda items.

Item #2 Budget

There is an essential budget sequence because that is the way it would operate to ensure not only a review of the budget by the UCAT Board, but also a review by the Presidents' Cabinet and the Regional Boards. "One of the things that we want to maintain is not only a statewide perspective on how the budget is determined but also regional ones where the regional trustees have local control and can operate within their budgets. Within the law the UCAT Board with your representation has the authority to set these priorities but it should be priorities based on proper information not only from the Presidents' Cabinet but also the Regional Board. That's why the budgeting process is there."

Item #3 MIS Committee Membership

This is the Committee made up of people in this state that represent UCAT. It is comprised of different colleges with different levels of application and with different forums of management information systems and computer applications. Kevin Cummings will be the Chairperson of this Committee from Davis and will be coordinating this committee and working with the Commissioner's staff. There was a study conducted for Higher Education to determine what type of MIS computer applications are needed in the state. At this particular time, the U of U uses Peoplesoft, and eight other institutions are seeking or involved with Banner... "This committee has already conducted some studies through the UCAT Administration offices, made requests from all the institutions and they have replied on the types of things that they need to have done within their systems. It has become obvious that there is not any one system that will be able to do all that and meet all of the needs of our institutions. Particularly with the maturity levels of our institutions who are dependent on other colleges or universities. If they switch to Banner, and a partner institution of UCAT has to be on the Banner system, how is it going to relate to the present VSR4 system? This Committee will look at exactly what we need. Other issues to consider, open-entry/open-exit, competency based levels...how do they fit? Some have developed programs associated with the types of things that we do that are different from the traditional seat time, credit hour semester applications. So we are looking for systems that are more compatible with what we do, help us to centralize our effort, providing for the placement information that we need on an accurate basis, and to provide data warehouse materials to help in making projections for budgets, programs and activities. We need to find out what is best for us, we don't want to be exactly like them if it restricts our mission responsibilities but we do want to be part of the overall system and to coordinate our ten colleges at this time."

Item #4 ATE Accreditation

"There was originally a time schedule given for accreditation, we are still on that time schedule with the Northwest Association, we have found some interesting circumstances that we will have to deal with. It comes

down to (1) Who is in charge . . . is it the President of UCAT, is it the UCAT Board, is it the Regional Boards? (2) With the Northwest accreditation, a key word is the “preponderance” of the college activities and degrees awarded in recognition of that. Basically, my interpretation is that a preponderance of your activities has to be degrees, but are we truly moving within our mission and role responsibilities at this point? Or have we vacated the role of providing short-term technical training in this industry to meet that preponderance request? Preponderance is not defined but I interpret it to mean the majority of, in some cases. So we looked at alternatives. For example, at COE (Council of Occupational Education). It is a national accrediting body, which is recognized nationally.”

President Fitch then referred to article on Elitism (Attachment E).

“As you look at these components and more demand is made by business and industry to provide this type of training, higher education needs to open its eyes a little wider and recognize the fact that we can’t all embrace the credit hour requirements and the seat time requirements. As we look at accreditation, we are looking for an accrediting body that has the stature and recognition qualities that we are looking for that will allow us to continue to meet our needs not only on the degree application but also on the short-term training, open-entry/open-exit, competency based issues. It is a key model that we are looking at right now. I think that it is possible that as we look at accreditation, that because of accreditation requirements that may be potentially inflexible . . . accreditation requirements that meet traditional concepts of delivery of higher education and recognition by the public, I don’t want us to be a ‘square peg driven into a round hole, losing our edge.’ Because that’s the difference we have, the edge we create with business and industry support. So we are looking at a multiple accreditation sequence that we can go through and COE is one of them.”

R. Brems: Discussed the background of the creation of COE and his past association with them. The reason that COE exists is because some states were trying to figure a way to move the technical college status from technical institutes, like here in Utah. The regional accrediting group (Southeast) was at a loss to do that. So they created a section that they eventually turned into COE to address those accreditation meetings. Now COE has gotten recognition from the U.S. Department of Education to do what they do. Regional President Brems had visited some technical colleges in Georgia a year ago that were at the stage where UCAT is at now. He found that some had already gotten COE accreditation and were also seeking additional accreditation (Southeast). “So seeking multiple paths for accreditation, as President Fitch is doing, is not unprecedented.”

R. Maughan: Voiced his support of the plan to pursue COE accreditation in addition to Northwest accreditation at this point.

D. Holmes: “If we went with COE accreditation, would the credits be accepted by other colleges and universities in Utah for transfer?”

G. Fitch: “Higher education in this state has reached out because they are creating the Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) degree. If we look at accreditation in step sequence, we’ll look at COE accreditation and then continue to pursue Northwest accreditation. The idea of the BAT degree is to absorb fully the Associate of Applied Technology degree under COE as an accrediting body and they would accept it because it would make sense that the BAT meshes with the AAT. “By being recognized by the Department of Education, they are accredited to provide for student financial aid . . . but there is no guarantee at the universities across the U.S. that all the courses will transfer.”

“Some of our institutions have been accredited under Northwest Association as “special purpose” institutions.

One of the issues that bring this to the forefront is the financial aid issue. This is a critical issue because under the Special Purpose schools, we are extending under that blanket coverage to ensure that our students get financial aid. But there have been some issues that Linda (Fife) has run into with financial aid and student services.”

L. Fife: “. . . the challenge that we are faced with is Northwest’s concern with being one institution looking like a multiple institution and offering our programs per institution . . . we are also working on academic policies for a catalog. The catalog needs to be general enough with policies to cover all 10 of the campuses but still refer to individual campuses with regional concerns. This (COE accreditation) would be a step toward Northwest accreditation . . . we were advised by Northwest when they first visited us to make sure that ‘all of our ducks were in a row’ when we submit our application materials. . . . The standards are very similar (between COE and Northwest accreditation), we would be preparing similar type materials and this would give us the opportunity to prepare those materials, go through an accreditation process in preparation for Northwest later . . . in terms of the difficulties that we face, we are faced with difficulties with student services and also with the academic people for trying to develop all of the materials that we need that presents a very strong case that we are one college . . . so we need to be very precise and careful in how we develop those materials, which is a very challenging process . . . it’s critical to that regional identity, but it’s critical that we are one institution for accreditation purposes.”

W. Woodward: Expressed concern regarding the time frame with accreditation and financial aid. “If we don’t receive that accreditation in the specified amount of time then the financial aid goes away. And there’s a question that even if our ducks are in a row, we can go through this process quick enough with Northwest to meet that timeframe.”

L. Fife: “That’s a concern and that’s why the accreditation process with COE would be a very good thing. The standards are the same, the process is similar . . . but they (COE) appear to have a shorter timeframe.”

G. Fitch: “It’s one time frame under Northwest accreditation and you have to be offering the degrees for a period of time. Under COE guidelines, it says that you have to be in operations for one year. As of September 1, UCAT will have been in operation for one year.”

D. Holmes: “What is the timeline for COE? How quickly will we get accreditation under COE?”

G. Fitch: “COE has quite a file on Utah from the previous visits mentioned by Regional President Brems and they are anxious to meet with us. . . . They said that they feel comfortable enough to work with us on accreditation for UCAT . . . accreditation could probably be within the 18 month time frame because we have that kind of deadline hanging over us (financial aid).”

D. Ipson: “What is the cost of membership?”

G. Fitch: “It varies with COE . . . each of the institutions, as I previously discussed regarding different levels of maturity, what they have within their system and how they accredit them, is that they recognize the college, the Utah College of Applied Technology, and then they would recognize each one of the standalone colleges, like Bridgerland, as a branch of the Utah College of Applied Technology, Bridgerland Applied Technology College, so it would be a component. For accreditation purposes, would technically be called a branch of UCAT. The other institutions that are small and do not have some of the component requirements of the standalone would be recognized for accreditation purposes, and this is my interpretation, as ‘centers’, and as they grow they can

become a branch as they develop. So the potential to recognize all of the institutions and the maturity levels is strong while still allowing them to grow. Theoretically we can have a Utah College of Applied Technology with ten equal branch campuses identified for accreditation. The cost of that varies. For branch campuses it's about \$500 and for centers it's about \$250 per year."

President Fitch also commented that there are set costs, for example, application fee, travel for the self-study and review, and regarding travel, the question is, do they come here or go to the institution? They will want to see the institutions and there will be a considerable dollar amount associated with their travel and any reports. Another cost will be how they determine FTE. They use 990 hours, which is considerably more than we use at 792. And then they charge so much per FTE.

"Right now I believe that it's (cost) reasonable, we'll be looking at things like that as far as our budget projections and needs in that area for accreditation. So it would be system need not a burden placed by an institution."

B. Wallis: Questioned the impact on student financial aid if we do not get the accreditation done in a timely manner. Another concern expressed was, where are we really going? "With Northwest the issue of saying we are going to write one catalog, so precisely and carefully that it won't differentiate between the colleges in any way . . . so what I'm pleased with in terms of the approach that the President (Fitch) is making is that it will still give us the ability to have the diversity within our organization, which needs to be recognized and preserved. So when we are forced by accreditation to write standards that homogenize us all to the point that we all look the same. . . . I think that this will at least give us the ability to maintain diversity, still be strong and recognize the institution and be able to establish accreditation at all of our organizations. . . . I believe it's an excellent direction for us to go under the circumstances. I support the President's (Fitch) recommendation, either in the interim or as a step toward the Northwest accreditation."

Chair Bangarter: Questioned what percent of students apply for and receive financial aid.

B. Wallis: Sixty-five to 70% of the total student body.

M. Bouwhuis: Probably 45% at Davis.

C. Holmes: "If you separate out the high school from the adult students – the high school students don't receive financial aid, we would be at 75 to 85%."

G. Fitch: Requested a directive from the Board to pursue COE accreditation as an interim step, indicating that the Regional Presidents are united behind the effort.

D. Ipson: MOVED to endorse policy program currently being followed by the Council of Presidents on the accreditation process. The motion was seconded by D Roberts. Motion unanimously approved and carried.

ADJOURN FOR LUNCH 11:57 a.m.

Reassemble at approximately 12:25 p.m.

Item #13 – High School Guides

President Fitch explained that the High School Guides would be distributed to Utah high school seniors. The

colleges and universities have selected periods of time when they go out to the high schools and present information. UCAT will have a representative from the local ATC attend to discuss their specific programs and to also reference overall UCAT. Thank you to Cyd Grua, Sandi Kronenberg and Linda Fife for their help with this effort.

Item #16 – Pay for AAT and other Committee Effort

President Fitch cited the significant costs associated with all Committees' efforts, creating financial difficulty for the local colleges. Thanked Marv Johnson and Mary Shumway for their support in looking for additional funding that would be available for the technical colleges through the State Board of Education. President Fitch expressed appreciation for Mary's efforts to help coordinate that plan and to Regional President Brems for suggesting it. Additionally, there is a suggestion that when looking at the cost of accreditation, this may also help with that support.

Item #17 – Training for DWS Counselors

Institutions have approximately six months to contact the DWS counselors and will be looking for a final report to see what they did, how they contacted them, the types of courses, have they been getting referrals from this training? Looking at contact information that would give these DWS counselors basic information on how to refer a client to UCAT.

Item #14 – UCAT Website

President Fitch introduced the new UCAT website to the Board and introduced Sandi Kronenberg to present the features.

S. Kronenberg: Thank yous to Bridgerland Applied Technology College, Rex Nethercott for development, Chad Campbell for monitoring the effort at BATC, as well as Matt Brace in our IT department, for working with Rex to transfer the website information onto the UCAT server.

Presented the website address, www.ucats.org and the use of the UCAT colors (same as on the UCAT seal). Explained that this project involves different timelines for different parts of this project – specifically, the first timeline needed to correspond with the High School guide and tour. This first timeline was critical because of the importance of access for the high school students to the UCAT website and to links to individual ATC websites for specific UCAT college information.

Highlighted the map on the website and how to access a particular ATC this way. Also pointed out the buttons on the left which would eventually link the user to information within the website. The final goal is to have the website complete by October. Upon completion, the website will be maintained by UCAT Administration.

G. Fitch: The reason for the October deadline is to coordinate the website with the October 31 report and to allow President Fitch to be able to step before the Legislative Committees, and say “here we are” with a presence and an identity.

Item #11 – Open HB 1003 and the changes

There are some cosmetic changes that need to be made, for example, the removal of the “s” in Mountainland(s). Originally the intent was to look at the legislation, make appropriate changes as necessary to allow people to come to grips with the UCAT. However, because of budget requirements and because of the accreditation component, we need to look at strengthening the legislation, redefining some of its components and make it better legislation for UCAT and its services.

President Fitch asked this Board to grant permission to work through the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs Committee by presenting recommendations and changes in the Legislation that will enhance UCAT's position and help move forward and meet organizational questions, structural problems and budgetary issue questions. "The sole effort is to improve what has already been created as the foundation for UCAT. Taking what the State Board of Education has done over the years and taking the interest in our students and service areas into consideration and then making a better UCAT. I would then start working directly with our Committee in Planning, sending them revisions and changes and then come back to this Board for a change in legislation that we see fit. The change in legislation has to be in by December 1."

M. Madsen: MOVED to support President Fitch's request to work through the Committee to create recommendations for revisions and changes to HB1003. The motion was seconded by D. Holmes. Motion was unanimously approved and carried.

President Fitch announced that the next UCAT Board of Trustees meeting would be October 9.

Chair Bangerter asked to be excused from the October 9 meeting; D. Holmes will Chair that meeting.

Chair Bangerter: One comment "... be as aggressive as you can within your budget parameters to do everything that you can to increase and expand your services ... and I know that's hard to do within your budget constraints ... change is in the air ... and this is an opportunity to capitalize. ... The Presidents need to move forward and develop every opportunity to serve these people." "If implemented correctly," "... if it is implemented correctly, all decisions will be based on better service to the recipients of our service, the student, if we can keep that in mind constantly and be aggressive as well as responsive to your community, I think that will go further than anything else that we can do to take initiative ... I think that one of the challenges we face is not to be afraid to be wrong."

ADJOURN

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

Chair Bangerter adjourned the UCAT Board of Trustees meeting at 12:45 p.m.