UTAH BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TELECONFERENCE
Friday, December 18, 2020

AGENDA

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

1. Call to Order

2. Student Presentation
   a. Anna Lightheart - Surgical Technology
   b. Ish Magalei – Welding
   c. Bryce Krieger – Utah Valley University
   d. Aarushi Rohaj – University of Utah

3. Committee Updates TAB A
   a. Lisa-Michele Church
   b. Pat Jones
   c. Wilford Clyde
   d. Shawn Newell

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Equity Lens Framework TAB B
2. Scholarship Discussion TAB C
3. General Consent Calendar TAB D
4. Cicero Report, Dixie State University Name Impact TAB E

INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Campus Safety Baseline Report TAB F
2. Innovation Task Force TAB G
3. COVID – 19 Update

CLOSED SESSION

Projected times for the various meetings are estimates only. The Board Chair retains the right to take action at any time. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify ADA Coordinator, 60 South 400 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84180 (801-646-4783), at least three working days prior to the meeting. TDD # 801-321-7130.
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Student Affairs Committee Report

The Student Affairs Committee met on November 20, 2020. Commissioner Woolstenhulme started the meeting reviewing a charge to the committee to approve a definition for the Access strategic priority. The committee recommends the following definition:

*Each student has equitable access to higher education.*

The committee also discussed potential goal(s) for the Access priority and supporting data for those goals. A primary point of discussion was on the definition of *underrepresented*. Chair Church advised revisiting data to help determine the groups the Board should focus on. Board member Damron agreed to seek student feedback. The committee recommends the goal use disaggregated data for *underrepresented* and that there be latitude to establish concurrent goals that might be supportive, but not explicitly part of the metric or goal.

**Equity, Diversity and Inclusion**

Laís Martinez presented the USHE Equity Lens Framework as provided in the agenda and stated she is excited we are moving the plans of understanding to action. Chair Church asked the committee for feedback. There was a lot of discussion on this. Chair Church noted there should be a report at every meeting regarding equity work. Chair Church asked the committee to think about the following terms and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting:

- Social economic
- Underserved
- Underrepresent
- Disparity
- Attainment gap
- Academically underprepared
- Operationally based under-thinking

**Access Advisors Update**: Assistant Commissioner Melanie Heath provided an update on funding.
Nicole Batt, Director, noted she is reaching out to the new high schools where advisors will be placed. Chair Church asked if the expansion is being applied through an equity lens: when will advisors be hired, are we looking for bilingual candidates, etc.?

**Mental Health:** Spencer Jenkins provided an update on funding for technical colleges. He noted The JED Foundation is just starting to move into the technical college arena. Board member Glen Rivera noted each technical college has their own mental health program. Mental health is not a one plan fits all; each person is different. This will be very helpful for technical colleges to receive resources and will help students on campus instead of referring them to community resources. There was additional discussion.

**Campus Safety Baseline Report:** Marlon Lynch, Chief Safety Officer from the University of Utah, noted this was an extensive task, but long overdue. Overall, having taken inventory and receiving feedback has provided opportunity. Board member Damron said it has been interesting to dive into this with students as there’s a need for greater cohesion and better training across campuses. This report will be given to the full Board at the December 18, 2020 Committee of the Whole.

**USHE Scholarship Revisions:** USHE Scholarship Manager Cassidy Stortz provided a review of proposed scholarship revisions to the New Century and Regents’ Scholarship. Associate Commissioner Carrie Mayne noted that her team looked at course-taking patterns to see what type of courses, grades, etc. best predicted success in the first year of college. The new scholarship proposes incentivizing completion of advanced coursework proven to most likely lead to college success, an approach based on USHE evidence and peer-reviewed literature. An advanced course is defined as courses offered via:

- Concurrent Enrollment
- Advanced Placement
- International Baccalaureate

The proposed eligibility requirements for an award under this program, effective for 2022 high school graduates are:

- Graduate from a Utah high school
- 3.3 minimum cumulative high school GPA
- Complete one advanced mathematics course (CE, AP, or IB)
- Complete one advanced language arts course (CE, AP, or IB)
- Complete one advanced science credit (CE, AP, IB)
- Completion of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)

The committee recommended the scholarship revisions be advanced to the full Board for consideration.

**Commissioner’s Recommendation**

This is an information item only; no action is required.
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Academic Education Committee Report

At its November 20, 2020 meeting, the Academic Education Committee received updates on two of its priority initiatives:

- The Board Transfer Council and its work on aligning transfer pathways
- The status of the Board’s compliance with the new state code on Credit for Prior Learning and the next steps for implementation, including revisions to board policy on Credit for Prior Learning

The committee also discussed the Board’s strategic plan and made the following motions:

- To recommend the adoption of the equity lens framework to the full Board, with the following additional recommendations:
  - that equity means focusing not only on access but also on improving completion for all students;
  - that enrollment and completion patterns should mirror and provide parity to our state demographics;
  - to focus on equity within various types of programs and degree levels;
  - to find ways to help students explore and be successful in the pathway that will be most meaningful to them and not default them into particular programs;
  - that the Board needs to communicate the value of higher education to everyone in the state—potential students, families, government officials, etc. in all communications;
  - that data will be necessary to measure progress; and
  - that helping students who are academically underprepared will be essential.

- To recommend the definition of timely completion for the Board’s strategic plan as “All students who enter the Utah System of Higher Education earn a certificate or degree in a timely manner.”

- To adopt the following goals, while reserving the flexibility to revisit the definitions to include specific numbers and to define standards of measurement in the future, in order to align with the state’s 2030 attainment goal:
  - Increase timely completion of all students by X% by 2025.
  - Increase timely completion of underrepresented students by X% by 2025.

Commissioner’s Recommendation

This is an information item only; no action is required.
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Finance and Facilities Committee Report

At its November 20, 2020 meeting, the Finance and Facilities Committee discussed institutional finances given the recent challenges relating to the coronavirus pandemic. Included in the discussion were financial information and narratives from the degree-granting and technical colleges describing the financial challenges faced, long-term impacts, and how the institution mitigated the impacts. Three institutions discussed these challenges: the University of Utah, Utah State University, and Salt Lake Community College. The committee also reviewed the annual Auxiliary Enterprise Report as part of this discussion item.

The committee discussed the Affordability strategic priority and affirmed the definition of affordability for the Board’s strategic plan as:

Cost of attendance should not be a barrier to accessing or completing a certificate or degree. Affordability is the ability of a Utah student to cover the cost of attendance at a USHE institution utilizing a combination of financial aid and other resources.

The committee further discussed potential goals for this strategic priority, including the creation of an expanded standard of affordability and ensuring that institutional cost of attendance remains within a defined standard. As part of the discussion, Laís Martinez presented on the Equity Lens Framework, and the committee discussed how the equity lens could inform the Affordability priority.

Other topics of discussion during the November meeting included:

- A presentation by the Board Audit Director on internal audits of USHE tuition and fees and a motion to create a workgroup to further review and implement the audit recommendations.
- A presentation by the USHE CIO describing the use of $47 million from federal CARES funds to enhance USHE online learning and IT security and infrastructure.
- An update on the progress toward creating and issuing an RFP for a consultant to review and recommend shared services within USHE.

The committee also took action to recommend the elimination of Board Policy R504, Budget Adjustments for Declining Enrollments, (last approved in 1995). The policy details how future appropriations may be affected in the event of several consecutive years of declining enrollments below funded targets. Staff
identified this policy as obsolete, since new student growth appropriations are no longer determined based on enrollment targets, and recommends elimination. The policy is included on the consent calendar for final Board approval to eliminate.

The committee also heard six informational reports that are available for review of the full Board:

1. Annual Auxiliary Enterprise Operations Report
2. Annual Contracts and Grants Report
3. Annual Report on Leased Space
4. Office of the Commissioner Quarterly Budget Update
5. Moral Obligation Pledge
6. Revenue Bond Results

As a concluding conversation, the committee discussed the current meeting schedule and noted the challenge of meeting every month to approve institutional items and conduct committee business. The committee proposes to meet the week of the full Board meetings instead of on the off-months in order to condense the number of meetings and have more time for discussion.

**Commissioner’s Recommendation**

This is an information item only; no action is required.
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Technical Education Committee Report

At its November 20, 2020 meeting, the Technical Education Committee welcomed Priscilla Martinez, Chief Diversity Officer at Ogden-Weber Technical College. Priscilla will serve as an equity, diversity, and inclusion advisor to the committee.

The committee also reviewed an updated committee charter with sections for governance, programs, and workforce development, which had been approved in a previous committee meeting.

Lais Martinez, State Director for Equity & Advocacy, presented a draft of the USHE Equity Lens Framework. The committee discussed how scholarship availability, revision of tuition and fees policies, and performance funding impacts access. The committee recommended the Board adopt the framework with a request for consideration of the following feedback:

- Analyze data used to measure equitable access to provide a historical baseline and guide and inform attainable goals.
- When referencing college graduation, consider adjusting the wording to "postsecondary credential" to represent both technical college and degree-granting credentials.
- Emphasize the need for support and cooperation from partners, including the Department of Workforce Services and the Utah State Board of Education, which are essential to this effort’s success.

The committee also discussed the Board’s strategic plan draft and made the following motions:

- To support the Board’s adoption of the strategic plan draft mission, vision, and values and principles.
- To affirm the definition of the Workforce Alignment and Economic Impact strategic priority as, "Utah System of Higher Education graduates earn degrees and certificates that deliver a positive return on investment, long-term economic mobility, and enhance the quality of life for individuals and communities."
- To affirm the draft goals for the Workforce Alignment and Economic Impact strategic priority with the following feedback to the Board:
  - Specific and measurable outcomes should align with statewide attainment goals.
  - Programs should lead to high-wage, high-demand occupations. The committee would like to include jobs deemed as having significant industry importance in cutting edge industries or as
a lead-in to high-wage, high-demand occupations. The Department of Workforce Services data should be used to justify and validate the need for a program.

- Additional goals to consider for inclusion:
  - Application of pathway agreements in student transfer to reflect time and tuition and fee savings
  - Student participation in work-based activities (internships, externships, clinicals)
  - Student job placement as an indicator of program need
  - Graduation and student job placement for underrepresented populations

The committee recommended the Board approve the creation of a task force to study and inform the Board regarding a potential strategic initiative to convert clock-hour to credit-bearing institutions. Such a decision would require accreditation and Department of Education approval with impacts to financial aid, tuition schedules, the student information system, and scheduling mechanisms, as well as requiring a clock-hour to credit-hour conversion formula. The committee recommended the following members serve on the task force:

- Kim Ziebarth, Associate Commissioner of Technical Education (Chair)
- Jessica Gilmore, Associate Commissioner for Workforce Development
- Scott Theurer, Board member
- Glen Rivera, Student Board member, Technical Education
- Jim Taggart, President, Ogden-Weber Technical College
- Jennifer Saunders, Salt Lake Community College Dean, School of Applied Technology and Technical Specialties
- Carrie Mayne, Chief Economist
- Zachary Barrus, Assistant Commissioner of Research
- Will Pierce, VP of Instruction, Southwest Technical College
- Tammy Wilkerson, VP of Instruction, Uintah Basin Technical College
- Richard Amon, Chief Financial Officer
- Russell Galt, VP of Administrative Services, Davis Technical College
- Two individuals for financial aid from clock-hour and degree-granting institutions

The committee also heard reports of in-office work from Kim Ziebarth, Jessica Gilmore, and Jared Haines.

**Commissioner's Recommendations**

This is an information item only; no action is required.
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Equity Lens Framework

The USHE Equity Lens Framework is a tool, developed after months of work with institutional Chief Diversity Officers and System and Board leadership, comprised of three major components: 1) critical equity questions, 2) shared beliefs, and 3) common definitions, through which an organization can continually evaluate any existing or new strategy, policy, or initiative.

Below is a description of how each component should impact decision-making:

1. Critical equity lens questions ask decision-makers to reflect on how their decisions will impact all students, staff, and faculty, starting with those who are underrepresented and/or marginalized on campus. The equity questions also ask decision-makers to utilize data to inform their decisions as well as to critique the limitations of data in understanding students, staff, and faculty holistically. Lastly, the questions ask decision-makers to identify which stakeholder groups have been historically excluded from the decision-making processes and who should be included if new outcomes are desired.

2. Shared beliefs provide the foundational framework and commitment of an organization. Reviewing these beliefs can help an organization evaluate its responsibility and commitment to a shared equity framework.

3. Common definitions provide a common language to discuss and understand equity, diversity, and inclusion terms and what is needed to move the needle.

Board members from each of the four standing Board committees will demonstrate the use of the Equity Lens Framework through guided examples tied to System priorities and strategic planning during the December Board meeting.

Commissioner’s Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends the Board adopt the Equity Lens Framework to utilize in its future work, including but not limited to evaluating any new or existing strategy, policy, or initiative.

Attachments:
Utah System of Higher Education Equity Lens Framework

An equity lens framework is a tool comprised of shared beliefs, common definitions, and critical questions through which an organization commits to continually evaluating any existing or new strategy, policy, or initiative. The beliefs and definitions ensure the organization begins from a common understanding and sets the groundwork for clear accountability, allowing all efforts to be focused on closing opportunity gaps for marginalized populations. Underlying this framework is how data is collected and synthesized to impact policy and systemic change.

USHE Equity Lens Framework

To guide the Utah Board of Higher Education in their implementation of strategies and initiatives, policymaking, and more, the Board must ask itself the following questions that make up the Equity Lens. These questions will guide state education leaders through the decision-making process to ultimately take action in essential areas.

Equity Lens Questions

Assess

- Does the decision being made maintain, sustain, or intervene in existing educational disparities, or does it produce other unintended consequences?
- What is the impact of this decision on eliminating attainment gaps?
- How does the policy, initiative, resource allocation, or strategy, etc. advance opportunities for historically underserved students and communities?
- What are the barriers to more equitable outcomes?
- What resources exist that could be leveraged to challenge these barriers? These might include political, emotional, financial, programmatic, or managerial resources.

Examine Data

- What does the current data tell us about representation among students, staff, and faculty groups? Check the source of the data for quality and impartiality.
- Where do current data collection methodologies fail to measure the extent of underrepresentation?
- Does your data infrastructure support forward-thinking measures of representation?
- What data sources will you use to understand the impacts of race, ethnicity, gender, and native language?
- Is qualitative data needed to support and better understand impacted communities more holistically?
Engage and Plan
- What is your commitment to, and understanding of, equity, specific to the policy, initiative, resource allocation, or strategy?
- What resources are you allocating for training that includes stakeholder instruction?
- How have campus and community stakeholders, who may be affected by this potential course of action, been purposefully involved?
- How will you modify or enhance your strategies to ensure the needs of the community and each learner’s individual higher education and career goals are met?

Implement
- What is your decision after looking at this course of action through the Equity Lens?
- Has your approach or decision changed after looking at this topic through the Equity Lens?
- What action will be taken, if any?

Measure Success
- How do you identify and measure the success of a potential policy, initiative, resource allocation, strategy, etc.?
- Does that success measure properly evaluate the success relative to underrepresented populations?

The Board recognizes the following set of shared beliefs:

We believe that every student has the ability to learn, and that the System has an ethical and moral responsibility to ensure optimal learning and workplace environments exist on USHE campuses for all students, faculty, and staff.

We believe students who are academically underprepared for college are being failed by the educational system. To remedy this reality, the System and its 16 colleges and universities must meet students where they are and work to build on and improve each student’s educational outcomes.

We believe that speaking a language other than English is an asset for participating in a growing global economy and workforce. We celebrate those qualities and are committed to culturally-responsive support and academic pathways for students.

We believe we must be inclusive in all facets, including accessibility services, by providing appropriate accommodations through the Americans with Disabilities Act, and celebrating diverse populations, including those with disabilities.

We believe that ending disparities and gaps in college attainment begins in the delivery and quality of college and career readiness programs, initiatives, and policies. These statewide efforts are best coordinated through regional K-16 alliances.

We believe that underrepresented communities have unique and important solutions for improving educational and career outcomes. Our work will only be successful as we sincerely partner with each of Utah’s 16 public colleges and universities and their local communities.

We believe every learner should understand the broad array of college and career pathways available at Utah colleges and universities, the importance of advanced course-taking while still in high school (e.g., Concurrent Enrollment, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate coursework), and other career-focused opportunities such as apprenticeships.
We believe our institutions will provide students with the best educational outcomes when students, faculty, and staff reflect the growing diversity in Utah and across the nation.

We believe each student’s history and culture is a source of pride that we should embrace and celebrate. Our ability as an educational System to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population is critical to achieving state attainment and other strategic goals.

We believe that all students should graduate from college having better cultural awareness and a greater understanding of why diversity, equity, and inclusion are important values that will help them be better workforce participants, community members, and global citizens.

Finally, we believe in the importance of instruction, processes, policies, goals, and strategies that adapt to the changing global society. An equitable education system requires we provide faculty and staff with the tools and support necessary to meet the needs of each student.

Shared Definitions

The Board recognizes the following definitions of common equity, diversity, and inclusion terms:

1. **Anti-racism**: We define anti-racism in accordance with the Alberta Civil Liberties Research Centre:

   Anti-racism is the active process of identifying and eliminating racism by changing systems, organizational structures, policies and practices, and attitudes, so that power is redistributed and shared equitably.\(^1\)

2. **Attainment Gap**: We define the attainment gap as:

   The lack of access that underserved groups face, due to systemic barriers, when seeking educational advancement or gainful employment.

   This framing shifts the attention from the current emphasis on individuals to more fundamental questions about social, systemic, and structural access. In the State of Utah, students of color are disproportionately impacted by lower rates of enrollment and completion.\(^ii\) The same is true when socioeconomic status is factored in for rural and urban students.

3. **Culturally Responsive**: We define culturally responsive as:

   Recognizing the diverse cultural characteristics and knowledge of learners as assets.\(^iii\) Culturally responsive teaching and advising empower students intellectually, socially, and emotionally by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes.\(^iv\)

4. **Equity**: We define equity in line with the Lumina Foundation’s Equity Imperative:

   Equity is the recognition and analysis of historic, persistent factors that have created an unequal [higher] education system.\(^v\)

   This includes assessing, identifying, acknowledging, and addressing System policies, and initiatives supporting and/or sustaining inequity and disparities.

5. **Intersectionality**: A term originally coined by law professor Kimberlé Crenshaw;\(^vi\) we define intersectionality consistent with the Oxford English Dictionary:
The interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage; a theoretical approach based on such a premise. vii

Students who are underserved based on multiple identities (e.g., race, gender, class, etc.) may face additional discrimination and marginalization.

6. **Marginalization:** We define *marginalization* as:

*The process through which persons are peripheralized based on their identities, associations, experiences, and environment.* viii

LGBTQIA+, veterans, students with disabilities, previously incarcerated, and students facing food, housing, or technology insecurity are all examples of marginalized student groups. These students or student groups may be treated or feel as insignificant or unseen on a college campus.

*see #10 Underrepresented

7. **Privilege:** As defined by dictionary.com:

*A right, immunity, or benefit enjoyed by a particular person or a restricted group of people beyond the advantages of most.* ix

These special rights, advantages, or immunities may be granted by a state, system, or another authority to a restricted group, either by birth or on a conditional basis.

8. **Race:** As defined by the National Museum of African American History and Culture:

*The dictionary’s definition of race is incomplete and misses the complexity of impact on lived experiences. It is important to acknowledge race is a social fabrication, created to classify people on the arbitrary basis of skin color and other physical features. Although race has no genetic or scientific basis, the concept of race is important and consequential. Societies use race to establish and justify systems of power, privilege, disenfranchisement, and oppression.* x

Racial or Ethnic groups are generally recognized in society and often by the government. When referring to such groups, we often use the terminology *people of color, students of color, or communities of color* (or name of the specific racial and/or ethnic group), and white. Because race is a social construct, we also understand that racial and ethnic categories differ internationally and that race and ethnicity categories and hierarchies differ globally and internationally. We recognize many local communities come from other international communities. In some societies, ethnic, religious, and caste groups are oppressed and racialized. These dynamics can occur even when the oppressed group is numerically in the majority.

9. **Underserved:** We define *underserved* as:

*Any group or individual that has been denied access and/or whom systems have marginalized due to operationalized deficit-based thinking.*

Deficit-based thinking is the focus on a community’s needs, deficits, or problems rather than its assets, strengths, or opportunities. xi Operationalized systemic barriers can create a disproportional representation of certain groups based on identity characteristics.
*see #10 Underrepresented

10. **Underrepresented**: We define *underrepresented* as:

   *Any student group that has traditionally held a smaller percentage of the total higher education population. For the purposes of this framework these are student groups who are disproportionately represented in comparison to an equivalent counterpart.*

Including but not limited to students facing economic barriers, students of color, and English Language Learner students are all examples of student groups who historically and presently continue to be disproportionately underrepresented in their higher education pursuits.

Both underrepresented and marginalized groups are underserved students who face unique challenges in accessing and completing college certificates and/or degrees due to the systemic barriers that exist.

**Methodology and Context**

**Developing a USHE Equity Lens Framework**

To increase equitable higher education outcomes, the Utah Board of Higher Education created its own equity lens framework, modeled after the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission’s Equity Lens,\(^{xii}\) which was further developed by USHE Chief Diversity Officers and the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education. The USHE Equity Lens employs an anti-racist, equity-focused framework with Critical Race Theory\(^{xiii}\) as a cornerstone.

This lens considers the following emergent, fluid, and intersectional identities as part of the Board’s efforts to value the perspective and knowledge that each student brings to higher education learning spaces; this list is neither comprehensive nor exhaustive:

- Age
- Gender identity and expression
- Sexual orientation
- Religious affiliation
- Socioeconomic status
- Citizenship status and country of origin
- Ability/disability
- Veteran status
- First-generation student status
- English language learners
- Geographic location (including rural, urban, sheltered, and unsheltered).

The Equity Lens Framework was developed to achieve educational equity when collecting data, allocating resources, developing policies, engaging stakeholders, and implementing strategic initiatives.

**Establishing a Set of Shared Beliefs**

The Board recognizes the biases and barriers to accessing higher education that have existed throughout the state’s history that have led to systemic disparities. Higher education in Utah was initially developed to serve a narrow slice of the state’s population, namely white men of privilege, on the ancestral homelands of native peoples.\(^{xiv}\) As the state has progressed, education systems have been slow to change from this original framework. To eliminate these disparities, the framework must change.
Equity, as defined within this *new* framework, *re-examines* systemic barriers with an intentional commitment to empowerment and educational justice.

In the newly combined System, made up of all public technical and degree-granting colleges and universities in Utah, the Board has the opportunity to reimagine spaces of higher learning that foster success, create pathways for economic mobility and a high quality of life for students and their communities. It is through this recognition and commitment that the shared beliefs included in the Equity Lens Framework were developed in collaboration with USHE’s Chief Diversity Officers.

**Knowledge, Data Collection, & Measuring Progress**

Both qualitative and quantitative data are needed for the Board and System to have a holistic view, and understanding of, equity disparities. These data inform how stakeholders are educated about the individuals, groups, communities, and institutions served by Utah’s higher education System.

The questions within the Equity Lens will determine the need for qualitative data to guide the development of new strategies, initiatives, and policies, and to measure progress made.

The Board will work with the USHE Chief Diversity Officers and institutional research departments to develop a practical plan to collect System and institutional demographic and sociocultural data in the following categories:

1. Race and ethnicity
2. Gender identity and expression
3. Sexual orientation
4. Socioeconomic status
5. First-generation status
6. Language proficiency
7. Citizenship and residency status

By collecting this data, we can impact intersectional populations through our strategies, initiatives, and policies. We will incorporate these key metrics into our strategic plan.

**Further Reading**


Equity Lens Framework: A Call to Action

**Assess**
- Does the decision being made maintain, sustain, or intervene in existing educational disparities, or does it produce other unintended consequences?
- What is the impact of this decision on eliminating attainment gaps?
- How does the policy, initiative, resource allocation, or strategy, etc. advance opportunities for historically underserved students and communities?
- What are the barriers to more equitable outcomes?
- What resources exist that could be leveraged to challenge these barriers (e.g., political, emotional, financial, programmatic, or managerial resources)?

**Examine Data**
- What does the current data tell us about representation among students, staff, and faculty groups? Check the source of the data for quality and impartiality.
- Where do current data collection methodologies fail to measure the extent of underrepresentation?
- Does your data infrastructure support forward-thinking measures of representation?
- What data sources will you use to understand the impacts of race, ethnicity, gender, and native language?
- Is qualitative data needed to support and better understand impacted communities more holistically?

**Engage & Plan**
- What is your commitment to, and understanding of, equity, specific to the policy, initiative, resource allocation, or strategy?
- What resources are you allocating for training that includes stakeholder instruction?
- How have campus and community stakeholders, who may be affected by this potential course of action, been purposefully involved?
- How will you modify or enhance your strategies to ensure the needs of the community and each learner’s individual higher education and career goals are met?

**Measure Success**
- How do you identify and measure the success of a potential policy, initiative, resource allocation, strategy, etc.?
- Does that success measure properly evaluate the success relative to underrepresented populations?

**Implement**
- What is your decision after looking at this course of action through the Equity Lens?
- Has your approach or decision changed after looking at this topic through the Equity Lens?
- What action will be taken, if any?
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Proposed Revisions to Utah System of Higher Education Scholarships

In 2019, the former USHE Board of Regents recommended eliminating the New Century and Regents’ Scholarship programs after applicants from the high school graduating class of 2021. This memo summarizes the proposed revisions to eliminate and revise state aid programs managed by the Utah Board of Higher Education.

These changes are designed to provide meaningful levers to the Board in achieving the strategic priorities of Access and Affordability, with a focus on equity. Flexibility within the existing Utah Promise Scholarship and the new scholarship outlined below will enable the Board to maximize the impact of state aid funds toward those goals in the coming years.

If adopted by the Board, these proposed revisions require conforming adjustments to state statute determinant on successful legislative support in the upcoming 2021 Utah Legislative Session. The Commissioner’s office has verbal commitments from Senator Derrin Owens and Representative Melissa Ballard to sponsor priority legislation to reflect the statutory adjustments needed to implement these changes by March 2021. In September 2020, the Board’s Student Affairs Committee directed staff to develop plans that reflect those recommendations.

Regents’ Scholarship
Established in 2008, the program was originally designed to improve college readiness by requiring high academic performance in high school, including a prescribed high school curriculum. Based on the adopted recommendations of the then-Board of Regents, the high school graduating class of 2021 will be the last applicant cohort under this program. Assuming legislative approval, this program will be replaced by the proposed new scholarship outlined below. Current eligible recipients will continue receiving awards under the original terms they were awarded. The Regents’ Scholarship will fully sunset as soon as all eligible recipients complete their award period or when the five-year eligibility period expires in 2026, at the latest.
New Century Scholarship
Established in 1999, the New Century Scholarship was intended to encourage Utah high school students to accelerate their education by earning an associate degree in high school or by completing a specific math and science curriculum. On average, students who received the New Century Scholarship graduated only one semester earlier than a traditional USHE college student, despite having an associate degree. With only 300-400 recipients annually, the program isn’t scaled and doesn’t markedly accelerate a student’s college persistence. Based on the adopted recommendations of the then-Board of Regents, the high school graduating class of 2021 will be the last applicant cohort under this program, and funding would be repurposed toward the Utah Promise Scholarship as award obligations diminish over subsequent years.

New Scholarship
For the 2021-22 academic year and beyond, this new scholarship focuses on incentivizing completion of advanced coursework proven to most likely lead to college success, an approach based on USHE evidence and peer-reviewed literature. An advanced course is defined as courses offered via:

- Concurrent Enrollment
- Advanced Placement
- International Baccalaureate

The Commissioner’s office, in partnership with the Utah State Board of Education maintains a list of all current advanced courses in mathematics, language arts, and science, access to these courses is already established. For example, CE courses are available in almost every district high school and 44 (85%) secondary-level charter schools. Under the direction of the Utah Board of Higher Education, USHE institutions would be required to prioritize availability of CE courses to students to meet the requirements of this new scholarship. The proposed eligibility requirements for an award under this program are:

- Graduate from a Utah high school
- 3.3 minimum cumulative high school GPA
- Complete one advanced mathematics course (CE, AP, or IB)
- Complete one advanced language arts course (CE, AP, or IB)
- Complete one advanced science credit (CE, AP, IB)
- Complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)

A state aid program focused on advanced course completion in high school would be a significant factor in increasing CE participation of students from underrepresented groups, which is proven to impact a student’s likelihood to continue to college. For example, USHE has found that low-income high school students who take one CE course are almost twice as likely to attend college than low-income students who do not take CE.

Award amounts will be determined on an annual basis depending on the number of eligible applicants, available appropriated funds, and carry-over balances. The Board may also direct a portion of the
available funds for this new scholarship to the Utah Promise Scholarship. Award eligibility may be
determined by additional criteria due to funding limitations (e.g. first come, first served; pre-allocation to
participating institutions).

As there is a dedicated technical education scholarship now in place, this new scholarship would be
available for use at all of the institutions currently allowed under the Regents’ Scholarship, with the
exception of technical colleges.

**Commissioner’s Recommendation**
The Commissioner recommends that the Utah Board of Higher Education direct staff to pursue necessary
statutory revisions that enable implementation of these plans by March 2021, with regular status updates
to the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee. Additionally, USHE institutions that offer Concurrent
Enrollment courses shall prioritize Concurrent Enrollment courses listed in the attachment above all
other approved Concurrent Enrollment courses to ensure adequate course availability for the 2021-22
academic year. Commissioner’s staff shall propose revisions to Utah Board of Higher Education policy
that reflect this priority requirement.
General Consent Calendar

A. MINUTES
   1. Minutes of the Board Meeting—October 30, 2020, Board of Higher Education Office, Salt Lake City, Utah (Attachment)

B. FINANCE AND FACILITIES
   1. Elimination of Policy R504, Budget Adjustments for Declining Enrollment (Attachment)
   2. University of Utah – Revenue Bond Authorization (Attachment)
   3. University of Utah – Property Acquisition (Attachment)
   4. Revision to Policy R516, General Student Fees (Attachment)

C. STUDENT AFFAIRS
   1. Revision to Policy R609C, Regents’ Scholarship (Attachment)
      i. In response to the pandemic, and in accordance with several system institutions, this policy revision will remove the ACT requirement from the Regents’ Scholarship eligibility criteria only for those applying in the 2021 cohort. Additionally, the revisions allow scholarship recipients to transfer between degree-granting institutions and technical colleges and retain the scholarship award.

D. ACADEMIC EDUCATION PROGRAM NOTIFICATIONS
   1. New Programs
      • University of Utah – Post-baccalaureate certificate in Latin American Studies
      • University of Utah – Post-master Certificate in Latin American Studies
      • University of Utah – Post-baccalaureate Certificate in Software Development Systems and Data
      • Utah State University – Emphasis in Interventions for Secondary Students within the Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction and within the Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction
      • Utah Valley University – Certificate of Proficiency in Electrical and Control Technology CA
      • Dixie State University – Certificate of Proficiency in Marketing
      • Salt Lake Community College – Certificate of Proficiency in Writing
      • Snow College – Certificate of Proficiency in Communications
      • Snow College – Certificate of Proficiency in Writing and Rhetoric

   2. Administrative Unit Restructure
• University of Utah – Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy divided into two units as follows:
  Department of Neurobiology
  Division of Anatomical Sciences
• Utah State University – Department of Languages, Philosophy and Communication Studies split into two new departments as follows:
  Department of World Languages and Cultures
  Department of Communication Studies and Philosophy

3. Name Change
• Southern Utah University – Nursing-Licenses Practical Nurse (LPN) to BSN Emphasis to Nursing- Health Professionals to BSN Emphasis
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Molecular Biology-Biochemistry to Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
• Dixie State University – Emphasis in Experience Industry Management within the Bachelor of Science in Recreation and Sport Management to Emphasis in Experience Management

4. Program Reviews for Programs with Specialized Accreditation
• Dixie State University – Associate of Applied Science in Emergency Medical Services
• Dixie State University – Associate of Applied Science in Medical Radiography
• Dixie State University – Associate of Applied Science in Physical Therapy
• Dixie State University – Associate of Applied Science in Surgical Technology
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Accounting
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Business Management
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Finance
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Medical Laboratory Science
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Nursing

5. New Institute
• University of Utah – Marriner Stoddard Eccles Institute for Economics and Quantitative Analysis

6. New Center
• Dixie State University – Park Visitor Data Center

7. Three-Year Follow-Up Report
• Dixie State University – Bachelor of Science in Recreation and Sport Management

8. Program Discontinuation
• Weber State University – Emphasis in Radiologic Sciences within the Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Sciences, Advanced
• Salt Lake Community College – Certificate of Completion in Writing
E. GRANT PROPOSALS

1. University of Utah – Air Force Office of Scientific Research; “AFOSR GA203 MURI Years 4-6”; $3,000,000. Principal Investigator, Michael A Scarpulla.
6. University of Utah – National Science Foundation; “CFACT”; $1,495,707. Principal Investigator, Zhaoxia Pu.
7. University of Utah – US Department of State; “Greenland Mine Training”; $1,196,850. Principal Investigator, Rajive Ganguli PhD.
17. University of Utah – DHHS National Institutes of Health; “MFMU Renewal”; $1,220,000. Principal Investigator, Torri Derback Metz.
20. University of Utah – DHHS Health Resources & Services Admn; “HRSA Med Student Education”; $6,981,478. Principal Investigator, Ty Dickerson; 
34. University of Utah – Boston University; “Welsh Boston U Sub 2020.09.18”; $2,120,463. Principal Investigator, Robert Cary Welsh.
42. University of Utah – DHHS National Institutes of Health; “FEBIO”; $1,756,774. Principal Investigator, Jeffrey A West.
43. Utah State University – UT Department of Workforce; “Create Better Health SNAP-Ed Program Year 2 Flow through grant, FNS is the funder. USU is reimbursed for programming each month”; $1,540,251. Principal Investigator, Heidi Reese LeBlanc; Co-Investigators, Casey Coombs, Mateja Renee Savoie Roskos.
44. Utah State University – UT Department of Workforce; “URPD FY21-FY26”; $1,269,277. Principal Investigator, Ann Marie Berghout Austin.
45. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; “App for Best Child Development”; $1,012,705. Principal Investigator, Mark S Innocenti; Co-Investigators, Nelson Alberto Atehortua De la Pena, Roque Hernandez, Marcel Santos.
46. Utah State University – Raytheon Space and Airborne Systems; “The Space Dynamics Lab will provide four Thermal Straps for Robert Yuen for the Next Generation Overhead Persistent Infrared program at Raytheon”; $1,888,864. Principal Investigator, Matt Sinfield.
47. Utah State University – Air Force; “Space Dynamics Lab will build an operations center”; $13,674,777. Principal Investigator, Jack Field.
48. Utah State University – Misc Federal Sponsors; “This is a Space Dynamics Lab Proprietary Program”; $4,872,199. Principal Investigator, Adam Shelley.
49. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; “Uncover Spatial-Constraint Related Morphome Using Tissue-on-a-Chip Platform and Data-Driven Mathematical Modeling”; $1,754,656. Principal Investigator, Yu Huang; Co-Investigators, Kevin R Moon, Jia Zhao.
50. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; “Determining the role of ovarian somatic tissues in ovarian aging”; $2,955,398. Principal Investigator, Jeffrey Mason.
51. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; “Human Cerebral Organoid-on-a-Chip, a Micro-Engineered Physiological System”; $1,757,767. Principal Investigator, Yu Huang.
52. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; “Cellular Factors Involved in Zika Virus Entry”; $1,367,818. Principal Investigator, Lee Young-Min.
54. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; “Data-driven atlas of user-guided visualizations for studying cancer treatment resistance”; $1,440,325. Principal Investigator, Kevin R Moon.
55. Utah State University – University of Miami; “All-sky Multi-messenger Lobster Eye Telescope”; $10,415,302. Principal Investigator, Asal Naseri.


58. Utah State University – Air Force; “Republic of Korea Global Hawk Tasking Collecting, Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination Cost Overrun and Request for”; $1,042,455. Principal Investigator, Kyle Palmer.


60. Utah Valley University – National Science Foundation; “Collaborative Research: Culture as a Bridge to STEM at UVU”; $1,186,752. Principal Investigator, Suzy Cox; Co-Investigator, Krista Ruggles.

61. Utah Valley University- National Science Foundation; “Investigating faculty, student and administrator perceptions of the impact of integrating education specialists into the US Science Departments over the last decade”; $750,000. Principal Investigator, Michael Stevens.

62. Utah Valley University – Utah Department of Workforce Services; “Care About Childcare”; $588,509. Principal Investigator, Joyce Hasting.

F. AWARDS

1. University of Utah – National Science Foundation; “CLOUDLAB3”; $4,393,345. Principal Investigator, Robert Preston Riekenberg Ricci.


4. University of Utah – Army Research Office; “Minteer Muri Multistep Catalys”; $2,000,000. Principal Investigator, Shelley D Minteer.


10. University of Utah – Intermountain Healthcare; “Hemophilia Treatment Center”; $1,350,428. Principal Investigator, George M Rodgers III.
13. University of Utah – Utah Department of Health; “Contact Tracing”; $1,000,000. Principal Investigator, Sharon Louise Talboys.
17. Utah State University – NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory; “Sun Radio Interferometer Space Experiment”; $1,857,810. Principal Investigator, Tim Neilsen.
18. Utah State University – Ball Aerospace and Tech; “Roman Relative Calibration System”; $1,026,328. Principal Investigator, Jeff Coleman.
23. Utah State University – Misc Federal Sponsors; “Odyssey Under Scylla”; $1,102,000. Principal Investigator, Tim McKenzie.
24. Utah State University – Misc Federal Sponsors; “Dark Knight Under Scylla”; $1,000,000. Principal Investigator, Chris Cannon.
25. Utah State University – Misc Federal Sponsors; “Dark Knight Under Scylla”; $1,057,000. Principal Investigator, Chris Cannon.
27. Utah State University – UT Department of Workforce Services; “Create Better Health Utah, SNAP-Ed”: $1,549,251. Principal Investigator, Heidi Reese LeBlanc; Co-Investigator, Casey Coombs, LaCee Nicole Jimenez, Mateja Renee Savoie Roskos.

28. Utah State University – UT Department of Workforce Services; “Relationship Skills 2020”; $1,200,000. Principal Investigator, Brian J Higginbotham.

29. Utah State University – UT Department of Workforce Services; “URPD FY21-FY26”; $1,269,277. Principal Investigator, Ann Marie Berghout Austin.

30. Utah State University – Air Force; “Steelhead”; $2,575,085. Principal Investigator, Don Thompson.


33. Utah Valley University – Utah Department of Workforce Services; “Care About Childcare”; $588,509. Principal Investigator, Joyce Hasting.

34. Utah Valley University – Utah State Board of Education; “CTE – Perkins Consortium”; $3,071,531. Principal Investigator, Kim Chiu.
Chair Simmons called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
Committee of the Whole

Institution Updates

Institutional updates were provided by President Huftalin, Salt Lake Community College, President Hacking, Tooele Technical College and President Watkins, University of Utah. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

Equity Lens Framework Presentation

Laís Martinez, Adrienne Andrews, and Dr. Tasha Toy led the discussion on the equity lens framework. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

Committee Updates

Committee updates were provided by Board member Church, Board member Jones, Board member Newell, and Board member Clyde. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

Bridge Training

A short update on the Bridge program was provided from Malissa Jones. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

2021-22 Operating and Capital Budget Request (TAB A)

Rich Amon provided a summary of the capital budget request to the Board members. **Board member Angus made a motion to approve the FY2021-22 USHE operating and capital budget priorities in Tab A and authorize the Commissioner to make any subsequent technical adjustments, including rounding, necessary to finalize the budget prior to submitting to the Governor and Legislature; Board member Clyde seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

Revision to Policy R516, General Student Fees (TAB B)

Rich Amon provided a summary of the R516, General Student Fees Policy to the board. **Board member Clyde made a motion for the Board to adopt the proposed changes to Board Policy R516, General Student Fees in Tab B, effective immediately; Board member Arthur Newell seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

Tuition and Fee Setting Process for Boards of Trustees (TAB C)

Rich Amon provided a summary of the tuition and fee setting process to the board. **Board member Arthur Newell made a motion to approve the processes described in Tab C for institutional Board of Trustee involvement in setting tuition and general student fees; Board member Osmond seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

Academic Program Approval Process (TAB K)

Julie Hartley provided a training for Board members on the process for academic program approval. This was an information item only; no action was taken.
Out-of-mission program request for the Psy.D. at SUU (TAB L)

Board member Jones provided a summary of the out-of-mission request from SUU. Southern Utah University is proposing a new Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D), a professional doctoral program in Clinical Psychology. **Board member Church made a motion to approve the out-of-mission program request for a Psy.D. in Clinical Psychology from Southern Utah University; Board member Barnes seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

Statewide Attainment Goal

Carrie Mayne provided information to the Board members on the Statewide Attainment Goal. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

Strategic Plan Priorities (TAB N)

Commissioner Woolstenhulme led the discussion for the strategic plan priorities. Each committee staff member provided a summary of the four suggested priorities. **Board member Osmond made a motion that the Board approve the System priorities Access, Completion, Affordability and Workforce Alignment & Economic Impact; Board member Maggelet seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

Innovation Taskforce (TAB O)

Commissioner Woolstenhulme provided a summary of the proposal for the new Innovation Taskforce. **Board member Hall moved that the Board establish an Innovation Taskforce to begin exploring and developing systemwide innovations in online education and other areas of high potential and direct the Commissioner to select its membership and serve as its chair; Board member Shawn Newell seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

College Access Advisors (TAB P)

Spencer Jenkins and Nicole Batt presented information on the College Access Advisors Program. **Board member Jones made a motion that the Utah Board of Higher Education approve the transfer of $2 million per year for three years from the Utah Higher Education Assistance Authority program funds to the Commissioner's office; Board member Osmond seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

Statewide Industry Advisory Committee (TAB Q)

Jared Haines, Senior Advisor of Technical Education provided a summary of the Statewide Industry Advisory Committee. **Board member Arthur Newell made a motion to establish the Industry Advisory Council as described in Tab Q; Board member Barnes seconded the motion and the motion passed.**

General Consent Calendar (TAB R)

**On a motion by Board member Jones and seconded by Board member Osmond the following items were approved on the Regents’ General Consent Calendar**

- Minutes - Minutes of the Board meeting August 21, 2020
- Finance and Facilities Items
- Academic Education Items
- Grant Proposals
- Awards
Shared Services

Rich Amon provided an update and timeline for the shared services project. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

Learn & Work Program

Jessica Gilmore provided updated information on the Learn & Work Program. This was a discussion item only; no action was taken.

UHEAA and my529 Update

Board member Church gave an update on the UHEAA Board and the my529 program during the Student Affairs committee report. This was an information item only; no action was taken.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Geoffrey Landward, Secretary

Date Approved:
November 20, 2020

Elimination of Board Policy R504, Budget Adjustments for Declining Enrollments

Board Policy R504, Budget Adjustments for Declining Enrollments, was last approved in 1995, during a time when enrollments were partially funded by legislative appropriations using a full-time equivalency enrollment target, and details how future appropriations may be affected in the event of several consecutive years of declining enrollments below funded targets.

The Office of Commissioner’s financial staff has identified this policy as obsolete, since new student growth appropriations are no longer determined based on enrollment targets.

Commissioner’s Recommendation
The Commissioner recommends that the Board eliminate Policy R504, Budget Adjustments for Declining Enrollments, effective immediately.

Attachment:
R504, Budget Adjustments for Declining Enrollments

R504-1. Purpose: To provide controlled base budget reductions in the event of declining enrollments at a System institution.

R504-2. References

2.1. Utah Code §53B-7-101 (Combined Requests for Appropriations:)
2.2. Utah Code §63J-1-217 (Budgetary Procedures Act: Over-expenditure of Budget by Agency)
2.3. Policy and Procedures R521, Dedicated Credits

R504-3. Definitions

3.1. Appropriated Base Budget: The legislative appropriated budget for the institution, including state tax funds and dedicated credits.
3.2. Dedicated Credits: Revenues other than state tax funds and mineral lease funds included in the appropriated budget, largely made up of tuition.
3.3. Enrollment: For purposes of this policy, enrollment generated in courses that are designated as budget-related. Budget related enrollment is state funded.
3.4. Funded Enrollment Target: The number of full-time equivalent students at an institution funded by the legislature for the target year.
3.5. Non-Action Interval: The initial period of three consecutive years during which actual enrollments remain below funded enrollment targets by 2 percent or more. Summer and fall enrollments are used in the third year to estimate the annualized enrollment and determine whether an institution has remained below funded enrollment targets for the third consecutive year.
3.6. The Spread Period: The four budget years following the non-action interval during which the appropriated base budget is reduced for an institution whose enrollments remain below funded levels by 2 percent or more. The spread period ends prior to four years in the event the institution comes within 2 percent of funded enrollment targets.

R504-4. Policy

4.1. Policy Applicability: For each institution, appropriated base budget reductions for declining enrollments may only apply to fully funded enrollment growth.

4.2. Tuition Driven Budget Adjustments: Enrollments below funded enrollment targets result in reduced tuition collections and internal budgets below what has been planned and programmed by the institution. Consequently, the institution must manage and reduce the internal budget accordingly.

---

4.3. **Non-Action Parameter**: appropriated base budget - Realized enrollments less than 2 percent below the funded enrollment target shall not call for a appropriated base budget adjustment. Realized enrollments must be 2 percent or more below the funded enrollment target before action is taken to decrease the appropriated base budget.

4.4. **Non-Action Interval**: appropriated base budget - Actual enrollments must remain 2 percent or more below the funded enrollment target for the non-action interval of three consecutive years before action is taken to decrease the institution's appropriated base budget.

4.5. **Spread Period**: Reductions in appropriated base budget for an institution that has remained below the funded enrollment target by 2 percent or more for the non-action interval shall be taken during the spread period of the following four budget years.

4.6. **Reduction Rate**: The reduction in appropriated base budget shall be made by reducing funding for students at the same amount per full-time equivalent student as the institution last received for enrollment growth.

4.7. **Reductions in Funded Enrollment Targets**: The institution's funded enrollment target shall be reduced by the number of full-time equivalent students for which appropriated base budget reductions are made.

4.8. **Budget Reduction Limitation**: Budget reductions shall cease when the institution's enrollments are no longer 2 percent or more below the institution's funded enrollment target.

4.9. **Governor's Reductions in Budget**: Any reduction in appropriated base budgets ordered by the Governor (pursuant to Utah Code §63J-1-217) shall be deducted from any amounts calculated as reductions in budgets pursuant to this policy.
December 16, 2020

University of Utah – Revenue Bond Authorization

Board Policy R590, Issuance of Revenue Bonds for Colleges and Universities, requires the Board to review and approve the issuance and sale of revenue bonds. The University of Utah requests Board authorization to issue revenue bonds for the purposes described in the following sections.

Request to Issue up to $237,500,000 Authorized by State Legislature

The University of Utah requests Board authorization to issue General Revenue Bonds for the following purposes that have been authorized by the state legislature:

- $100,000,000 for the construction of the Health Sciences Campus Office Building as approved by the Board in November 2019 and authorized by the 2020 Legislative Session (H.B. 9); clinical and other institutional non-state revenues will be the primary source of repayment for the bonds.

- $137,500,000 for the construction of the Medical Education and Discovery Complex (MEDX) as approved by the Board in November 2016 and authorized by the 2017 Legislative Session (S.B. 9). $52,500,000 of the original $190,000,000 authorization was issued in Series 2017A for a rehabilitation hospital. The remaining $137,500,000 is authorized for the MEDX complex where donations will be the primary source of repayment for the bonds.

Request to Issue up to $10,000,000 of Utah Industrial Facilities Bonds

Pursuant to Utah Code 11-17 and Board Policy R590, Issuance of Bonds for Colleges and Universities, the University of Utah does not need legislative approval for Utah Industrial Facilities and Development (IFD) bond issuances under $10 million per calendar year. These bonds encourage economic growth in the state through the development and improvement of research facilities. The university requests authorization to issue up to $10,000,000 for various research projects listed in the supplemental material attached.

Request to Refinance up to $60,000,000 for Short-term Cash-Flow

Board Policy R590 allows institutions to request authorization to issue revenue refunding bonds without legislative approval. Typically, the Board issues refunding bonds to provide net cost savings to the institution by replacing existing bonds with a new issuance at lower interest rates. In this case, the university requests the ability to re-amortize up to $60,000,000 of existing debt in order to free up cash for short-term needs and to replenish shortfalls caused by the pandemic. Such a transaction is permissible under statute and Board policy; however, this is a new development and a new direction that the Board
should consider and discuss prior to approval. Additional details on the costs and financing of this proposed transaction are included in the attached supplemental material.

**Prior Authorization to Refinance up to $100,000,000 for Economic Savings**

In the November 2019 meeting, the Board approved the University of Utah to refund up to $100,000,000 prior to May 15, 2021, if economic conditions present opportunities for cost savings. The University has not yet issued bonds under this authorization, but may include some refunding bonds in the current transaction if market conditions allow for cost savings of at least three percent.

The relevant parameters of the requested issue are:

- Principal amount not to exceed $375,000,000 (including costs of issuance and capitalized interest)
- Interest rate not to exceed 5%
- Discount from par not to exceed 2%
- Final maturity not to exceed 30 years from the date of issue

A copy of the request letter from the university, supplemental information relating to the IFD and short-term cash flow bonds, the Approving Resolution, and a financing summary from the financial advisor are attached. Representatives from the university will attend the meeting to provide additional information and answer questions from the Board.

**Commissioner’s Recommendation**

The Commissioner recommends approval of the proposed Authorizing Resolution to issue General Revenue Bonds for the University of Utah as proposed. The Commissioner further recommends examination and discussion of the request to refund existing bonds for short-term cash-flow in terms of precedent and the current economic environment.

**Attachments:**
December 3, 2020

Mr. David R. Woolstenhulme  
Commissioner, Utah System of Higher Education  
Board of Regents Building  
The Gateway  
60 South 400 West  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1284  

Dear Commissioner Woolstenhulme:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the University of Utah’s plans to submit a bond parameters resolution (the “Resolution”) to the State Board of Higher Education of the State of Utah (the “Board”), to be considered during its December 2020 meeting, for the issuance of a General Revenue Bond or Bonds on behalf of the University of Utah (the “University”) for the purpose of and (i) financing a portion of the costs to construct (a) a health science office building (the “Health Science Office Building Project” or “HELIX Project”), (b) the Medical Education and Discovery Building (MEDX) to replace the existing Medical School complex (the “MEDX Project”), and (c) various research projects as permitted by the Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act (collectively, the “Research Project,” and together with the Health Science Office Building Project and the MEDX Project, the “Series 2021 Projects”) together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest and fund any debt service reserve requirements. (ii) refunding all or any portion of the outstanding bonds issued by the Board on behalf of the University (the “Re-Amortization Refunding Authorization”) together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance and fund any debt service reserve requirements.

Details are as follows:

**Authorization to Bond up to $100,000,000 for the Construction of the Health Sciences Campus Office Building**

The HELIX Project is to provide space for the relocation of certain offices that are in a building that will be demolished in the future to accommodate School of Medicine on-campus growth needs. The project includes the design and construction of a five-story, 250,000 sq. ft. office building and construction of a dedicated elevator and bridge connecting the new office building to an existing bridge that connects to the Health Sciences Campus. The project is expected to cost $105.1 million. Funding will come from $100 million of bond proceeds plus monies of the University. No state funds will be requested for the new facility.

The University received bonding authorization for this project during the 2020 Legislative Session of up to $100 million, together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest, and fund any debt service reserve requirements.

**Authorization to Bond up to $137,500,000 for the Construction of Medical Education and Discovery Complex**

The Medical Education and Discovery Complex (“MEDX”) is a 350,000 square-foot building that will replace the University’s existing Medical School Complex. It will house the new medical school, the Global Health Institute and collaborative space for clinicians, researchers and students. The University estimates the cost of building the MEDX at $185 million. Funding will come through appropriation from the State Legislature, long-term private donations and $137.5 million from bond proceeds.

The University received bonding authorization for both the MEDX project and its Rehabilitation Hospital during the 2017 Legislative Session to finance up to $190 million for costs of constructing these two projects, together with other
amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest, and fund any debt service reserve requirements.

During 2017, the University bonded for $52.5 million of the $190 million authorization to finance a portion of the costs of constructing the Rehabilitation Hospital. The University is now requesting to bond for up to $137.5 million of the remaining bonding authorization, for construction of the MEDX, together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest, and fund any debt service reserve requirements.

**Authorization to Bond up to $10,000,000 for the Construction of various research projects permitted under the Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act.** The Board is empowered to issue up to $10,000,000 of bonds in any one fiscal year to finance the acquisition, construction, improvement, equipping and furnishing of buildings and projects on behalf of the University and desires to finance various research projects as permitted by the Act together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest and fund any debt service reserve requirements. In no case shall the total par amount of this bond exceed $10,000,000.

**Authorization to Bond up to $60,000,000 for the refunding of outstanding debt to re-amortize the principal of such outstanding bonds for cash-flow relief.** The University is looking to provide cash flow relief due to pandemic-related shortfalls by re-amortizing the principal of certain outstanding bonds for short-term cash-flow relief (without any requirement of net present value savings) and pay costs of issuance related thereto. Such bonds may be issued in one or more series and combined with any other series of general revenue bonds. This capacity is possible due to the historical debt management by the Board and the University with shorter maturities in its bond issuances to reduce interest costs. Any re-amortization is expected to be favorably accepted by the market and rating agencies because of the relationship between the new amortization and the useful life of the projects originally financed, and the universal understanding of the pandemic on higher education budgets.

The University received previous authorization in a resolution adopted by the board dated November 15, 2019 to refund up to $100,000,000 for all or any portion of the outstanding bonds issued by the Board on behalf of the University prior to May 15, 2021, pursuant to certain parameters therein (including net present value savings of at least three percent) and such bonds may be issued in one or more series and combined with any other series of general revenue bonds. The University is analyzing such opportunities and may include such refundings in the upcoming bonding should favorable conditions appear.

It is the University’s current plan to issue the first series of bonds related to the Resolution in January and close the transaction in early February. The University is currently in the process of determining which projects are expected to be included in the bonding in early 2021.

Please feel free to call me should you or others have questions about the details of this funding request.

Sincerely,

Cathy Anderson
Chief Financial Officer

cc: Ruth V. Watkins, President
    Michael Good, Senior Vice President
    Daniel Reed, Senior Vice President
    Richard Amon
    Blake Wade
    Kelly Murdock
    Robert Muir
Potential Research Projects for $10M Financing under the Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act

Projects that are being considered for financing include, but are not limited to:

- Emma Eccles Jones Vivarium Renovation - $5.9 million
- Biology and Crocker Science Center Vivaria Renovation - $4.5 million
- HCI Vivarium Renovation - $1.9 million
- Chemistry Lab 3rd and 4th Floor Renovation - $2.5 million
- Nora Eccles Harrison Cardiovascular Research and Training Institute Addition - $5.6 million
- Population Health Sciences remodel in Williams Building - $0.5 million
- Biopolymers Research Building remodel = $6.7 million
Example of Taxable Re-amortization for Cash Flow Relief

Analysis: Re-amortization of Non-Callable Principal for Cash Flow Relief

• Commentary:
  • Final structure may vary from this analysis
  • Re-amortized principal does not mature beyond final maturity of refunded bonds
  • Net present value impact: (2.54%) / ($1.24 million)


*Preliminary, subject to change. FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY.
Taxable Advance Refunding Analysis*

- Taxable refunding statistics represent a refunding of all callable maturities within each series.
- GRB’s beyond Series 2016A currently provide no positive economic benefit to the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Original Par</th>
<th>Par Outstanding</th>
<th>Tax Status</th>
<th>All-In TIC</th>
<th>Final Maturity</th>
<th>Call Date</th>
<th>Callable Par</th>
<th>NPV Savings (%)</th>
<th>NPV Savings ($)</th>
<th>Negative Arbitrage</th>
<th>Savings Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2014B</td>
<td>$76,200,000</td>
<td>$24,975,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>8/1/2038</td>
<td>8/1/2023</td>
<td>$15,425,000</td>
<td>13.536%</td>
<td>$2,087,999</td>
<td>($707,086)</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2014A-1</td>
<td>26,045,000</td>
<td>20,045,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>8/1/2027</td>
<td>8/1/2024</td>
<td>3,780,000</td>
<td>2.467%</td>
<td>$93,241</td>
<td>($159,372)</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2015A-1</td>
<td>39,405,000</td>
<td>9,380,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>8/1/2034</td>
<td>8/1/2024</td>
<td>5,815,000</td>
<td>9.611%</td>
<td>$558,895</td>
<td>($366,773)</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2015B</td>
<td>91,570,000</td>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>8/1/2035</td>
<td>8/1/2025</td>
<td>17,260,000</td>
<td>1.227%</td>
<td>$211,723</td>
<td>($1,307,593)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2016A</td>
<td>68,210,000</td>
<td>56,870,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>8/1/2036</td>
<td>8/1/2025</td>
<td>25,895,000</td>
<td>1.781%</td>
<td>$461,288</td>
<td>($1,707,419)</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2016B-1</td>
<td>128,550,000</td>
<td>124,690,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>8/1/2036</td>
<td>8/1/2026</td>
<td>78,815,000</td>
<td>13.536%</td>
<td>$2,087,999</td>
<td>($707,086)</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2017A</td>
<td>155,930,000</td>
<td>140,135,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td>8/1/2039</td>
<td>8/1/2027</td>
<td>85,315,000</td>
<td>2.467%</td>
<td>$93,241</td>
<td>($159,372)</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2017B-1</td>
<td>84,900,000</td>
<td>84,900,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>8/1/2038</td>
<td>8/1/2027</td>
<td>48,615,000</td>
<td>9.611%</td>
<td>$558,895</td>
<td>($366,773)</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2018A</td>
<td>80,040,000</td>
<td>78,355,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>8/1/2044</td>
<td>8/1/2028</td>
<td>61,385,000</td>
<td>1.227%</td>
<td>$211,723</td>
<td>($1,307,593)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2019A</td>
<td>74,050,000</td>
<td>74,050,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>8/1/2039</td>
<td>8/1/2029</td>
<td>37,535,000</td>
<td>1.781%</td>
<td>$461,288</td>
<td>($1,707,419)</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2019B</td>
<td>30,165,000</td>
<td>30,165,000</td>
<td>Taxable</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>8/1/2039</td>
<td>8/1/2029</td>
<td>30,165,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2020A</td>
<td>84,635,000</td>
<td>84,635,000</td>
<td>Tax-Exempt</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>8/1/2040</td>
<td>8/1/2030</td>
<td>68,990,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$939,700,000</td>
<td>$798,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>410,005,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Preliminary and subject to change.
2. The use of the AA+ rating is consistent with the ratings of the outstanding prior bonds.
3. Interest rate assumptions are based on current market conditions and similar credits.
4. University's actual results may differ.
5. Costs of issuance and underwriter's discount are estimates for discussion purposes.
6. Analysis was performed with no changes to the term or the structure of the debt service from the currently outstanding issues.

*Preliminary, subject to change. FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY.
### Example of Taxable Refunding for Present Value Savings

**Taxable Advance Refunding Analysis**

- **Projected Annual Savings**
- **Solved for Uniform Savings**
- **Net present value savings:** 12.463% / $2,647,235
- **Rates as of November 2, 2020**
- **Estimated New Par Amount: $24.3 Million**

#### Targeted Callable Maturities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2014B</td>
<td>$15,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 2015A-1</td>
<td>5,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,240,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TAXABLE REFUNDING ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>Proposed Refunding</th>
<th>Existing Debt Service (Not Refunded)</th>
<th>Net Debt Service (1)</th>
<th>Old Net Debt Service</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$872,958</td>
<td>$4,409,500</td>
<td>$5,279,267</td>
<td>$5,471,500</td>
<td>$192,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>882,035</td>
<td>4,412,000</td>
<td>5,294,035</td>
<td>5,474,000</td>
<td>179,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>879,359</td>
<td>4,409,375</td>
<td>5,288,734</td>
<td>5,471,375</td>
<td>182,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2,668,278</td>
<td>984,000</td>
<td>3,652,278</td>
<td>3,835,125</td>
<td>182,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2,756,879</td>
<td>2,756,879</td>
<td>2,944,625</td>
<td>187,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2,705,347</td>
<td>2,705,347</td>
<td>2,887,250</td>
<td>181,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2,638,810</td>
<td>2,638,810</td>
<td>2,827,625</td>
<td>188,815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>2,785,763</td>
<td>2,785,763</td>
<td>2,970,500</td>
<td>184,738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,384,199</td>
<td>1,384,199</td>
<td>1,565,000</td>
<td>180,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1,382,718</td>
<td>1,382,718</td>
<td>1,566,125</td>
<td>183,407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>1,379,673</td>
<td>1,379,673</td>
<td>1,564,500</td>
<td>184,827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>1,380,096</td>
<td>1,380,096</td>
<td>1,565,000</td>
<td>184,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>1,384,028</td>
<td>1,384,028</td>
<td>1,567,375</td>
<td>183,347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1,381,623</td>
<td>1,381,623</td>
<td>1,566,500</td>
<td>184,878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>690,744</td>
<td>690,744</td>
<td>826,250</td>
<td>135,506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>691,655</td>
<td>691,655</td>
<td>827,375</td>
<td>135,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>686,966</td>
<td>686,966</td>
<td>826,750</td>
<td>139,785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>1,472,242</td>
<td>1,472,242</td>
<td>1,609,250</td>
<td>137,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,023,369</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,214,875</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,235,052</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,131,073</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Less rounding amount.

Notes:
1. Preliminary and subject to change.
2. The use of the AA+ rating is consistent with the ratings of the outstanding prior bonds.
3. Interest rate assumptions are based on current market conditions and similar credits.
4. University's actual results may differ.
5. Costs of issuance and underwriter's discount are estimates for discussion purposes.
6. Analysis was performed with no changes to the term or the structure of the debt service from the currently outstanding issues.

*Preliminary, subject to change. FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY.*
PRELIMINARY FINANCING SUMMARY
For

Utah State Board of Higher Education
$375,000,000*
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
General Revenue and Refunding Bonds
Series 2021A and Series 2021B
(The “Series 2021 Bonds”)

Purpose: To finance (1) A portion of the costs to construct a health science office building (the “Health Science Office Building Project” or “HELIX” project); (2) A portion of the costs to construct the Medical Education and Discovery Building (“MEDX”) to replace the existing Medical School complex; and, (3) To finance the acquisition, construction, improvement, equipping and furnishing of research-related buildings and projects; together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest and fund a debt service reserve requirement, if any.

The Series 2021 Bonds may also include up to $60 million of taxable refunding bonds for purposes of re-amortizing certain upcoming principal maturities to provide cash flow relief due to pandemic-related shortfalls.

Depending on future interest rates as well as other factors, the University may also issue refunding revenue bonds as part of the Series 2021 bond issue for purposes of generating net-present-value savings of at least 3.00%, in accordance with the $100 million approval given by the former State Board of Regents of the State of Utah in its November 15, 2019 board meeting.

Not-to-Exceed Par Amount: $375,000,000 ($100,000,000 for the Health Science Office Building Project, $137,500,000 for the Medical Education and Discovery Building; $10,000,000 for research-related capital improvements; $60,000,000 for cash flow savings refunding bonds, $30,000,000 for present-value savings refunding bonds, with the remainder for capitalized interest, costs of issuance, and a debt service reserve fund, if necessary).
Preliminary Financing Summary  
University of Utah Series 2021 Bonds  
Page 2 of 2

Security: The Series 2021 Bonds will be payable from and secured by a General Revenue pledge which consists of substantially all income and revenues of the University authorized to be pledged, with the exception of (i) legislative appropriations, (ii) tuition and certain fees, and (iii) certain other revenues and income.

Ratings: ‘Aa1’ and ‘AA+’ ratings are expected by Moody’s Investors Service and S&P Global Ratings, respectively.

Method of Sale: Negotiated Public Offering

True Interest Cost: TBD (given current market volatility, a preliminary rate is difficult to determine)

Underwriters: The University recently engaged the firms of JP Morgan and Wells Fargo Securities to serve as underwriters for the Series 2021 Bonds.

Sale Date: Current Calendar calls for a January 21, 2021 sale date, subject to market conditions

Closing Date: TBD – Current Calendar calls for settlement early February 2021.

Principal Payment Dates: August 1 of each year, beginning August 1, 2024

Interest Payment Dates: August 1 and February 1, beginning August 1, 2021

Interest Basis: 30/360

Parameters: Not-to-Exceed Par for the Projects: $375,000,000  
Not-to-Exceed Term: 30-years from the date of the Bond’s issuance  
Not-to-Exceed Coupon: 5.00%  
Not-to-Exceed Discount from Par: 2.00%

Optional Redemption: May be non-callable or callable (par or make-whole) at the option of the University, as determined at the time of the sale

University Contacts: Ms. Cathy Anderson, Chief Financial Officer (801-581-6940)  
Mr. Robert Muir, Executive Director – Debt and Asset Management (801-585-5598)

Bond Counsel: Mr. Blake Wade, Gilmore & Bell (801-258-2725)

Municipal Advisor: Mr. Kelly Murdock, Stifel, Nicolaus & Company (385-799-1734)

*Preliminary, subject to change
APPROVING RESOLUTION
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
-RESEARCH PROJECT
-HEALTH SCIENCES BUILDING
-MEDICAL EDUCATION AND DISCOVERY COMPLEX
-GENERAL REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS

December 18, 2020

The Utah Board of Higher Education (the “Board”) met in regular session by electronic means on December 18, 2020, commencing at 10:00 a.m. The following members were present:

Harris H. Simmons  Chair
Nina Barnes        Vice Chair
Aaron V. Osmond   Vice Chair
Jesselie B. Anderson  Member
Mike Angus        Member
Jera L. Bailey    Member
Stacey K. Bettridge  Member
Lisa-Michele Church  Member
Wilford W. Clyde Member
Candyce Damron   Student Representative
Sanchaita Datta  Member
Alan E. Hall      Member
Patricia Jones    Member
Crystal Maggelet Member
Arthur E. Newell  Member
Shawn Newell      Member
Glen J. Rivera    Student Representative
Scott L. Theurer  Member

Absent:

Also Present:

David R. Woolstenhulme  Commissioner of Higher Education
Geoffrey Landward       Secretary
After the meeting had been duly convened and called to order by the Chair, the roll had been called with the above result, the agenda noted that one of the purposes of the meeting was the consideration of various matters with respect to the issuance and sale of the Utah Board of Higher Education, University of Utah General Revenue and Refunding Bonds.

The following resolution was introduced in written form and after full discussion, pursuant to motion made by ____________ and seconded by _____________, was adopted by the following vote:

AYE:

NAY:

The resolution is as follows:
RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION OF THE UTAH BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF ITS UNIVERSITY OF UTAH GENERAL REVENUE AND REFUNDING BONDS, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF NOT TO EXCEED $375,000,000 (EXCLUSIVE OF ANY PRIOR REFUNDING BOND AUTHORIZATIONS THAT MAY BE COMBINED HEREWITH); AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURES, BOND PURCHASE AGREEMENTS, OFFICIAL STATEMENTS, AND OTHER DOCUMENTS REQUIRED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF ALL OTHER ACTIONS NECESSARY TO THE CONSUMMATION OF THE TRANSACTIONS CONTEMPLATED BY THIS RESOLUTION; AND RELATED MATTERS.

WHEREAS, the Utah Board of Higher Education (the “Board”) is established and exists under and pursuant to Section 53B-1-103, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended (the “Utah Code”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Title 53B, Chapter 1, Utah Code, the Board is authorized to act as the governing authority of the University of Utah (the “University”) for the purpose of exercising the powers contained in Title 53B, Chapter 21, Utah Code, Title 11, Chapter 17 Utah Code (the “Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act”), the specific authorizations of Section 63B-30-201(1) and 63B-27-202(3) of the Utah Code and the Utah Refunding Bond Act, Title 11, Chapter 27 of the Utah Code (collectively, the “Act”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to a General Indenture of Trust dated as of July 1, 2013, between the Board (formerly known as the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah) and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., as trustee (the “Trustee”), as heretofore amended and supplemented (the “General Indenture”), the Board has issued, for and on behalf of the University, various series of revenue bonds; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Utah Refunding Bond Act, Title 11, Chapter 27 of the Utah Code (the “Refunding Bond Act”) and a resolution adopted by the Board on November 15, 2019 (the “2019 Refunding Resolution”) the Board authorized up to $100,000,000 of bonds to refund all or any portion of the outstanding bonds issued by the Board on behalf of the University prior to May 15, 2021 (the “2019 Refunding Authorization”) pursuant to certain parameters therein (including net present value savings of at least three percent) and such bonds may be issued in one or more series and combined with any other series of general revenue bonds; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Refunding Bond Act the Board now desires to authorize the issuance of up to $60,000,000 of additional bonds to refund all or any portion of the outstanding bonds issued by the Board on behalf of the University (the “Re-Amortization Refunding Authorization”) and paying costs of issuance related thereto in
order to re-amortize the principal of such outstanding bonds for cash-flow relief (without any requirement of net present value savings) and such bonds may be issued in one or more series and combined with any other series of general revenue bonds; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act, the Board is empowered to issue up to $10,000,000 of bonds in any one fiscal year to finance the acquisition, construction, improvement, equipping and furnishing of buildings and projects on behalf of the University and desires to finance various research projects as permitted by the Act (collectively, the “Research Project”) together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest and fund any debt service reserve requirements; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 63B-30-201(1) of the Utah Code, the Board, for and on behalf of the University, is authorized to issue bonds for the purpose of planning, designing and constructing the Health Sciences campus office building (the “Health Sciences Project”) in an amount not to exceed $100,000,000 for acquisition and construction proceeds, together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest and fund any debt service reserve requirements; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 63B-27-202(3) of the Utah Code, the Board, for and on behalf of the University, is authorized to issue bonds in an amount not to exceed $190,000,000 for the purpose of constructing a Medical Education and Discovery Complex (the “MEDX Project”) and a Rehabilitation Hospital (the “Rehab Hospital Project” and collectively with the Research Project and Health Sciences Project, the “Series 2021 Projects”), together with other amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance, pay capitalized interest and fund any debt service reserve requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Board has previously authorized and issued $52,500,000 of the $190,000,000 of Bonds authorized by Section 63B-27-202(3) for the Rehab Hospital Project and the Board desires to issue the remaining $137,500,000 for the MEDX Project; and

WHEREAS, to accomplish the purposes set forth in the preceding recitals, the Board desires to authorize and approve the issuance and sale of its University of Utah General Revenue and Refunding Bonds (with such additional or other title and/or series designation(s) as may be determined by the officers of the Board) in one or more series and to be issued from time to time (the “Bonds”) in an aggregate principal amount of not to exceed $375,000,000 (exclusive of the 2019 Refunding Authorization” pursuant to the General Indenture and one or more Supplemental Indentures of Trust between the Board and the Trustee (each a “Supplemental Indenture” and collectively with the General Indenture, the “Indenture”); and

WHEREAS, the Bonds shall be payable solely from the University’s revenues and other moneys pledged therefor in the Indenture and shall not constitute nor give rise to a general obligation or liability of the Board, the University or the State of Utah or constitute a charge against their general credit; and
WHEREAS, there has been presented to the Board at this meeting a form of a Bond Purchase Agreement (the “Bond Purchase Agreement”) to be entered into among the Board, the University and the underwriters or purchasers for the Bonds (the “Purchaser”), a form of a Preliminary Official Statement relating to the Bonds, in the event the Bonds are publicly sold (the “Preliminary Official Statement”), and a form of Supplemental Indenture; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to grant to the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee of the Board, the authority to approve the interest rates, principal amount, terms, maturities, redemption features, and purchase prices at which the Bonds shall be sold and any changes with respect thereto from those terms which were before the Board at the time of adoption of this Resolution; provided such terms do not exceed the parameters set forth in this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UTAH BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. All terms defined in the foregoing recitals hereto shall have the same meanings when used herein.

Section 2. All actions heretofore taken (not inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution) by the Board and the University and the officers of the Board or the University directed toward the issuance of the Bonds are hereby ratified, approved and confirmed.

Section 3. The Board hereby authorizes, approves and directs the use and distribution of the Preliminary Official Statements substantially in the form of the Preliminary Official Statement presented to the Board at this meeting in connection with the offering and sale of the Bonds, in the event the Bonds are publicly sold. The Chair, Vice Chair and/or Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee of the Board and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver on behalf of the Board and the University final Official Statements in substantially the same form and with substantially the same content as the form of the Preliminary Official Statement presented to this meeting with any such alterations, changes or additions as may be necessary to finalize each Official Statement. The preparation, use and distribution of the Official Statements are also hereby authorized. The Board and the University may elect to privately place the Bonds with or without the use of an Official Statement.

Section 4. Supplemental Indentures in substantially the form presented to this meeting are in all respects authorized, approved and confirmed. The Chair, Vice Chair and/or Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee and Secretary of the Board and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Supplemental Indentures in substantially the same form and with substantially the same content as the form of such document presented to this meeting for and on behalf of the Board and the University with such alterations, changes or additions as may be authorized by Section 8 hereof.
Section 5. For the purpose of providing funds to be used for (i) financing the cost of the Series 2021 Projects (including capitalized interest), (ii) refunding all or any portion of the outstanding bonds issued by the Board on behalf of the University and (iii) paying costs of issuance of the Bonds, the Board hereby authorizes the issuance of the Bonds, from time to time and in one or more series, in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed $375,000,000 (exclusive of the 2019 Refunding Authorization). The Bonds shall mature on such date or dates, be subject to redemption, and bear interest at the rates as shall be approved by the Chair or Vice Chair of the Board or the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee, all within the parameters set forth on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The issuance of the Bonds shall be subject to the final advice of Bond Counsel and to the approval of the office of the Attorney General of the State of Utah. The Bonds authorized herein may be issued in one or more series at any time and from time to time, and may be combined with any other series of general revenue bonds of the University.

Section 6. The form, terms and provisions of the Bonds and the provisions for the signatures, authentication, payment, registration, transfer, exchange, interest rates, redemption and number shall be as set forth in the Indenture. The Chair, Vice Chair and/or Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee and the Secretary of the Board and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University are hereby authorized to execute and seal by manual or facsimile signature the Bonds and to deliver the Bonds to the Trustee for authentication. All terms and provisions of the Indenture and the Bonds are hereby incorporated in this Resolution. The appropriate officials of the Board and the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver to the Trustee the written order of the Board for authentication and delivery of the Bonds in accordance with the provisions of the Indenture.

Section 7. Bond Purchase Agreements in substantially the form presented to this meeting are hereby authorized, approved and confirmed. The Chair or Vice Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Bond Purchase Agreements in substantially the same form and with substantially the same content as the form of the Bond Purchase Agreement presented at this meeting for and on behalf of the Board with final terms as may be established for the Bonds within the parameters set forth herein and with such alterations, changes or additions as may be necessary or as may be authorized by Section 8 hereof. The Chair or Vice-Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University are hereby authorized to specify and agree as to the final principal amounts, terms, discounts, maturities, interest rates, redemption features and purchase price with respect to the Bonds for and on behalf of the Board and the University and any changes thereto from those terms which were before the Board at the time of adoption of this Resolution, provided such terms are within the parameters set by this Resolution, with such approval to be conclusively established by the execution of the related Bond Purchase Agreement and Supplemental Indenture. In the event that the foregoing officers determine that all or any portion of the Bonds should be privately placed, the Bond Purchase Agreements and Supplemental Indentures may be modified to conform to the agreement with such Purchasers, including agreement to pay breakage fees, default
rates, taxable rates and other similar provisions customary in such placements, provided that such obligations are limited to the sources provided under the Indenture.

Section 8. The appropriate officials of the Board and the University, including without limitation the Chair or Vice Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance and Facilities Committee and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University are authorized to make any alterations, changes or additions to the Indenture, the Bonds, the Bond Purchase Agreement, the Preliminary Official Statement, the Official Statement, or any other document herein authorized and approved which may be necessary to correct errors or omissions therein, to complete the same, to remove ambiguities therefrom, to conform the same to other provisions of said instruments, to the provisions of this Resolution or any resolution adopted by the Board or the provisions of the laws of the State of Utah or the United States or to permit the private placement or public sale of the Bonds, to conform such documents to the terms established for the Bonds and to update such documents with current information and practices.

Section 9. The appropriate officials of the Board and the University, including without limitation the Chair, Vice Chair, the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee, Commissioner of Higher Education and Secretary of the Board and the President and/or Chief Financial Officer of the University, are hereby authorized and directed to (i) execute and deliver for and on behalf of the Board and the University any or all additional certificates, documents (including escrow agreements for certain refundings) and other papers and to perform all other acts they may deem necessary or appropriate in order to implement and carry out the matters authorized in this Resolution and the documents authorized and approved herein and (ii) take all action necessary or reasonably required by the Indenture, the Preliminary Official Statement, the Official Statement, or the Bond Purchase Agreement to carry out, give effect to and consummate the transactions as contemplated thereby and are authorized to take all action necessary in conformity with the Act.

Section 10. Upon their issuance, the Bonds will constitute special limited obligations of the Board payable solely from and to the extent of the sources set forth in the Indenture. No provision of this Resolution, the Bonds, the Bond Purchase Agreement, the Official Statement, the Indenture or any other instrument executed in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, shall be construed as creating a general obligation of the Board or the University, or of creating a general obligation of the State of Utah or any political subdivision thereof, nor as incurring or creating a charge upon the general credit of the Board, the University, the State of Utah or any political subdivision thereof.

Section 11. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, the Board shall cause the following “Notice of Bonds to be Issued” to be (i) published one (1) time in the Deseret News, a newspaper of general circulation in the State of Utah, (ii) posted on the Utah Public Notice Website (http://pmn.utah.gov) and (iii) posted on the Utah Legal Notices website (www.utahlegals.com) created under Section 45-1-101, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, and shall cause a copy of this Resolution and the Indenture to be kept on file in the Board’s office in Salt Lake City, Utah, for public examination during the regular business hours of the Board until at least thirty (30) days from and after the date of
publication thereof. The “Notice of Bonds to be Issued” shall be in substantially the following form:
NOTICE OF BONDS TO BE ISSUED

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to the provisions of the Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act, Title 11, Chapter 17, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, and the Utah Refunding Bond Act, Title 11, Chapter 27, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, that on December 18, 2020, the Utah Board of Higher Education (the “Board”) adopted a resolution (the “Resolution”) in which it authorized (among other bonds) the issuance of the Board’s University of Utah General Revenue and Refunding Bonds (with such other or further designation as the officers of the Board may determine) (the “Bonds”) in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed seventy million dollars ($70,000,000) (exclusive of any prior refunding bond authorizations that may be combined herewith), to bear interest at a rate or rates of not to exceed five and one-half percent (5.50%) per annum, to mature not later than thirty (30) years from the date thereof and to be sold at a price or prices not less than 98% of the total principal amount thereof, for the purpose of (i) financing a portion of the costs of various research projects for the University of Utah (the “University”) and (ii) refunding any portion of the Board’s outstanding revenue bonds issued to finance facilities and improvements for the University, including amounts necessary to pay costs of issuance and fund any debt service reserve requirements of the Bonds.

The Bonds are to be issued and sold by the Board pursuant to the Resolution, including as part of said Resolution a form of a General Indenture of Trust previously executed by the Board and the University and a Supplemental Indenture of Trust (collectively, the “Indenture”).

The Bonds are secured by a pledge of revenues of the University auxiliary and campus facilities system, hospital system, research facilities and other legally available moneys of the University (as described in the Indenture).

A copy of the Resolution and the Indenture are on file in the office of the Board at 60 South 400 West, 5th Floor, Salt Lake City, Utah, where they may be examined during regular business hours of the Board from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. for a period of at least thirty (30) days from and after the date of publication of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that a period of thirty (30) days from and after the date of the publication of this notice is provided by law during which any person in interest shall have the right to contest the legality of the Resolution, the Indenture (but only as it relates to the Bonds), or the Bonds, or any provision made for the security and payment of the Bonds, and that after such time, no one shall have any cause of action to contest the regularity, formality or legality thereof for any cause whatsoever.

DATED this December 18, 2020.

/s/ Geoffrey Landward
Secretary
Section 12. After the Bonds are delivered by the Trustee to or for the account of the Purchaser and upon receipt of payment therefor, this Resolution shall be and remain irrevocable until the principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds are deemed to have been fully discharged in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Indenture.

Section 13. If any provisions of this Resolution should be held invalid, the invalidity of such provisions shall not affect the validity of any of the other provisions of this Resolution.

Section 14. All resolutions of the Board or parts thereof inconsistent herewith, are hereby repealed to the extent only of such inconsistency. This repealer shall not be construed as reviving any bylaw, order, resolution or ordinance or part thereof.

Section 15. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.
PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE UTAH BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION THIS DECEMBER 18, 2020.

UTAH BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

______________________________
Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Secretary
After the conduct of other business not pertinent to the above, the meeting was, on motion duly made and seconded, adjourned.

Chair

ATTEST:

Secretary
STATE OF UTAH )
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE )

I, Geoffrey Landward, do hereby certify that I am the duly qualified and acting Secretary of the Utah Board of Higher Education.

I further certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of an excerpt of the minutes of a meeting of said Board held on December 18, 2020 and of a resolution adopted at said meeting, as said minutes and resolution are officially of record in my possession.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and impressed hereon the official seal of said Board this December 18, 2020.

__________________________________________
Secretary

(SEAL)
STATE OF UTAH  
: ss.
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE  

I, Geoffrey Landward, the undersigned, the duly qualified and acting Secretary of the Utah Board of Higher Education, do hereby certify, according to the records of said Utah Board of Higher Education in my official possession, and upon my own knowledge and belief, that:

(a) in accordance with the requirements of Section 52-4-202, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, public notice was given of the agenda, date, time and place of the December 18, 2020 public meeting held by the Members of the Utah Board of Higher Education by causing a Notice of Public Meeting, in the form attached hereto as Schedule 1 to be: (i) posted at the principal office of the Utah Board of Higher Education at 60 South 400 West, Salt Lake City, Utah, at least 24 hours prior to the convening of such meeting, said Notice of Public Meeting having continuously remained so posted and available for public inspection during the regular office hours of the Utah Board of Higher Education until the convening of the meeting; (ii) published on the Utah Public Notice Website (http://pmn.utah.gov), at least 24 hours prior to the convening of such meeting; and (iii) provided at least 24 hours prior to the convening of such meeting, to the Deseret News and The Salt Lake Tribune, newspapers of general circulation within the geographic jurisdiction of the Utah Board of Higher Education, pursuant to their subscription to the Utah Public Notice Website (http://pmn.utah.gov), and to each local media correspondent, newspaper, radio station or television station which has requested notification of meetings of the Utah Board of Higher Education;

(b) in accordance with the requirements of Section 52-4-202, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, public notice of the 2020-2021 Annual Meeting Schedule of the Utah Board of Higher Education was given, specifying the date, time and place of the regular meetings of the Utah Board of Higher Education scheduled to be held during said years, by causing a Notice of Annual Meeting Schedule for the Utah Board of Higher Education, in the form attached hereto as Schedule 2, to be (i) posted at the principal office of the Utah Board of Higher Education at 60 South 400 West, Salt Lake City, Utah in June 2020; (ii) published on the Utah Public Notice Website (http://pmn.utah.gov) during the current calendar year, and (iii) provided to a newspaper of general circulation within the geographic jurisdiction of the Utah Board of Higher Education pursuant to its subscription to the Utah Public Notice Website (http://pmn.utah.gov); and

(c) the Utah Board of Higher Education has adopted written procedures governing the holding of electronic meetings in accordance with Section 52-4-207 Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended (a copy of which is attached hereto as Schedule 3). In accordance with said Section and the aforementioned procedures, notice was given to each member of the Utah Board of Higher Education and to members of the public at least 24 hours before the meeting to allow members of the Utah Board of Higher Education and the public to participate in the meeting,
including a description of how they could be connected to the meeting. The Utah Board of Higher Education held the meeting (the anchor location) in the building where it normally meets and provided space and facilities at the anchor location so that interested persons and the public could attend and participate.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and impressed hereon the official seal of the Utah Board of Higher Education, this December 18, 2020.

__________________________
Secretary

(SEAL)
SCHEDULE 1

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

(See Transcript Document No. ___)
SCHEDULE 2

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

(See Transcript Document No. ___)
SCHEDULE 3

ELECTRONIC MEETING POLICY
EXHIBIT A
PARAMETERS OF THE BONDS

Principal amount not to exceed $375,000,000 (exclusive of any prior refunding authorizations that may be combined herewith)

Interest rate not to exceed 5.50%
Discount from par not to exceed 2.0%
Final maturity not to exceed Thirty (30) years from the date thereof

May be non-callable or callable at the option of University as determined at the time of sale
No Net Present Value Savings required in order to re-amortize Refunded Bonds

[Note: 2019 Refunding Authorization limited to 3% NPV Savings, 5.0% and 25 years unless we re-authorize here with higher total amount inclusive of such refunding]
December 16, 2020

University of Utah – Property Acquisition

Board Policy R703, Acquisition of Real Property, requires the Utah Board of Higher Education to approve institutional property purchases that exceed $500,000. The University of Utah requests Board approval to purchase 96 stalls in the 102 Tower parking garage located at 102 South 200 East in Salt Lake City, Utah. The purchase price has been set within the existing Parking License Agreement at $2,100,000.

The university's Board of Trustees will review and consider this request during their meeting on December 8, 2020. Additional information about this request can be found in the attached letter and presentation from the university. Representatives from the university will present additional information and respond to questions from the committee.

Commissioner’s Recommendation
The Commissioner recommends that the Board authorize the University of Utah to acquire parking stalls in the 102 Tower parking garage as proposed.

Attachments:
November 24, 2020

Mr. David R. Woolstenhulme  
Commissioner  
Board of Higher Education Building, The Gateway  
60 South 400 West  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1284

Dear Commissioner Woolstenhulme:

The University of Utah hereby requests approval from the Board of Higher Education to proceed with exercising its Purchase Option for 96 stalls in the 102 Tower parking garage located at approximately 102 South 200 East in Salt Lake City, Utah. The purchase price has been set within the existing Parking License Agreement at $2,100,000 until January 10, 2021.

The 102 Tower in downtown Salt Lake City, is the home of the University’s IT groups for both the academic campus and health system. The ability to purchase these parking stalls will allow the University to obtain fee title to the parking garage. Ownership of the parking garage will achieve the following:

- Additional parking capacity for the overall downtown Salt Lake City University occupancy allowing the University to reduce reliance on third party leased parking stalls.
- Increase the resiliency of the market value for the 102 Tower office building.
- Allow parking administration to be handled by the University’s Commuter Services improving consistency for employees.
- Revenue from parking permits will offset garage maintenance and overall cost of occupancy for University departments occupying space within the 102 Tower.

The University of Utah’s Board of Trustees will review and consider approval for this request on December 8, 2020.

Accordingly, the University of Utah would appreciate an opportunity to present this request to the Board of Higher Education.

Thank you as always, for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Ross
Chief Business Strategy Officer

c:  Dr. Ruth V. Watkins  
Malin Francis  
Jonathon Bates
Recommendation

Approval to close on the acquisition of 96 stalls located in the 102 Tower garage located at 102 South 200 East in Salt Lake City.
102 Tower Garage Acquisition

102 Tower

Garage

102 Tower

BBB

525 Tower

515 Tower

525 Plaza

Umbrella Garage

102 Tower

200 E 200 S
Purchase Agreement Terms

- 102 Tower Garage, 102 South 200 East, Salt Lake City
  - 96 stalls + fee-title ownership of the garage parcel
- Purchase Price: $2.1M
- Option Period Expiration: January 10, 2021
- Closing to occur no later than February 9, 2021.

The History: 102 Tower Parking Garage

- **December 1, 2017**: U began to occupy space under a Lease Agreement with a Purchase Option.
- Based on development plans from the owner incorporating a shared approach to parking, Purchase Option included a Parking License to ensure perpetual access to parking stalls for the 102 Tower.
- **May 6, 2020**: U exercised option to begin Due Diligence on Purchase
- During due diligence, and based on revised development plans, owner realized that retaining 96-stalls and management responsibility for the parking garage was a challenging situation with little to no upside.
- **August 18, 2020**: U closed on the purchase of the 102 Tower
  - Updated Parking License included a Purchase Option for the 96 stalls.
The Why – 102 Tower Parking Garage

- Acquiring the garage will achieve the following:
  - 96 additional stalls will provide additional parking capacity for the overall downtown University occupancy allowing the University to reduce reliance on 3rd party leased parking stalls.
  - Increase the resiliency of the market value for the 102 Tower office building.
  - Allow parking administration to be handled by University Commuter Services ensuring consistency for employees.
  - Revenue from parking permits will offset garage maintenance and overall cost of occupancy for University departments in 102 Tower.

Purchase Approval Schedule

- Board of Trustees Executive Committee
  - November 24, 2020
- Board of Trustees
  - December 8, 2020
- Board of Higher Education (information item)
  - January 15, 2021
- Close no later than February 9, 2021
Recommendation

Approval to close on the acquisition of 96 stalls located in the 102 Tower garage located at 102 South 200 East in Salt Lake City.
December 16, 2020

**Revision of Policy R516, General Student Fees**

During the October 30, 2020 meeting, the Board adopted the recommended changes to [Board Policy R516, General Student Fees](#), with a request to revise the threshold for the exception in subsection 6.6.4. The Board asked the workgroup to review the threshold and create an alternative that would account for the size of the institution. That subsection originally read:

> “General student fees that are proposed to renovate or replace an existing student-approved facility do not require a vote of the student body if the project does not expand the facility’s capacity and does not exceed $10,000,000.”

The workgroup reviewed the language and suggests the following alternative to replace the language in subsection 6.6.4:

> “General student fees that are proposed to renovate or replace an existing student-approved facility do not require a vote of the student body if the project does not expand the facility’s capacity and does not exceed $10,000,000 for institutions with a research mission, $6,000,000 for other degree-granting institutions with more than 10,000 student headcount, and $4,000,000 for other degree-granting institutions.”

**Commissioner’s Recommendation**

The Commissioner recommends that the Board adopt the proposed changes to subsection 6.6.4 in [Policy R516, General Student Fees](#), effective immediately.
R609C, Regents' Scholarship

R609-1 Purpose: The Regents' Scholarship encourages students to complete the Regents' Recommended High School Curriculum, in order to provide better access to higher education opportunities and to reward students for preparing academically for college.

R609-2 References

2.1. Utah Code Section 53B-8-108 et seq., Regents' Scholarship Program.

2.2. Utah Code Section 53B-2-101(1), Institutions of Higher Education

2.3. Utah Admin. Code §R277-700-7, High School Requirements (Effective for Graduating Students Beginning with the 2010-2011 School Year).

R609-3 Definitions


3.2. “Board” means the Utah Board of Higher Education.

3.3. “College Course Work” means any instance in which college credit is earned, including but not limited to, concurrent enrollment, distance education, dual enrollment, or early college.

3.4. “Eligible Institutions” means institutions of higher education listed in Utah Code Section 53B-2-101(1), or a private, nonprofit college or university in the state that is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

3.5. “Excusable Neglect” means a failure to take proper steps at the proper time, not in consequence of carelessness, inattention, or willful disregard of the scholarship application process, but in consequence of some unexpected or unavoidable hindrance or accident.

3.6. “Good Cause” means the student’s failure to meet a scholarship application process requirement was due to circumstances beyond the student’s control or circumstances that are compelling and reasonable.

3.7. “High School” means a public school established by the Utah State Board of Education or private high school within the boundaries of the State of Utah. If a private high school, it shall be accredited by a regional accrediting body approved by the Board.

3.8. “Scholarship Appeals Committee” means the committee designated by Commissioner of Higher Education to review appeals of Regents’ Scholarship award decisions and take final agency action regarding awards.

3.9. “Scholarship Award” means a scholarship awarded to all applicants who meet the eligibility requirements of section R609-4.

3.10. “Scholarship Staff” means the employees assigned to review Regents' Scholarship applications and make decisions awarding the scholarships and deferments.

3.11. “Substantial Compliance” means the applicant, in good faith, demonstrated clear intent to comply with the scholarship application requirements and has demonstrated likely eligibility, but failed to precisely comply with the application specifics.

R609-4 Award Requirements

4.1. To qualify for the Regents' Scholarship, the applicant shall satisfy the following criteria:

   4.1.1. Graduate from a Utah high school with a minimum, non-weighted GPA of 3.3.
   4.1.2. Complete four credits of English.
   4.1.3. Complete four credits of math, including one course of advanced math.
   4.1.4. Complete three credits of lab-based biology, chemistry and physics.
   4.1.5. Complete two credits of world languages.
   4.1.6. Complete three credits of social science.
   4.1.7. Complete the ACT with a minimum score of 22 unless exempted under subsection 5.2.4.1.
   4.1.8. Complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

4.2. A student may satisfy a course requirement through a competency-based assessment provided it is documented for credit on an official transcript.

4.3. The courses completed must be unique except when repeated for a higher grade.

4.4. Repeated course work will not count toward accumulation of required credits.

4.5. College Course Work: College course work will only be evaluated if the applicant submits an official college transcript. If an applicant enrolls in and completes a college course worth three or more college credits, this shall be counted as one high school credit toward the scholarship requirements.

4.6. Mandatory Enrollment: An award recipient attending a credit-granting eligible institution shall enroll beginning with the fall semester after high school graduation. An award recipient attending a non-credit granting institution must enroll full time in a program eligible for federal aid by September 1 after high school graduation.

   4.6.1. Scholarship recipients must elect whether to use the award funds at credit granting institutions or non-credit granting institutions. The decision is irrevocable; recipients may not transfer awards between non-credit granting and credit granting institutions.
4.7. **New Century Scholarship**: A recipient shall not receive both a Regents' Scholarship and the New Century Scholarship established in Utah Code Section 53B-8-105.

609-5 Application Procedures

5.1. **Application Deadline**: Applicants shall submit an official scholarship application no later than February 1 of the year that they graduate from high school. The Board may establish a priority deadline each year. Applicants who meet the priority deadline may be given first priority or consideration for the scholarship. Subject to funding, students may be considered based on the date of they completed and submitted their application.

5.2. **Required Documentation**: Applicants shall submit the following documents:

5.2.1. The online Regents' Scholarship application.

5.2.2. An official high school paper or electronic transcript, official college transcript(s) when applicable, and any other miscellaneous official transcripts demonstrating all completed courses and GPA.

5.2.3. If a student completed coursework at an educational institution outside of the district from which the student graduated, the student must submit an official transcript from the school at which he or she completed the coursework if the courses completed and grades earned are not reflected in the official high school transcript.

5.2.4. Verified ACT score(s) **unless exempted under subsection 5.2.4.1.**

5.2.4.1. Students who applying for the 2021 cohort are not required to provide an ACT score.

R609-6 Award Amounts and Renewals.

6.1. **Funding Constraints of Awards**: The Board will determine award amounts, depending on the annual legislative appropriation, whether the institution is a credit granting or non-credit granting institution, and the number of qualified applicants. Awards shall be adjusted for students enrolled at an eligible private or nonprofit college or university based on 53B-8-205.

6.2. **Scholarship Award**: Students who meet the eligibility criteria and enroll at a credit granting institution will receive a four-semester scholarship award, a maximum amount will be determined annually by the Board. Students who enroll in a non-credit granting institution will receive a one-time scholarship award, the amount of which will be determined annually by the Board, which the institution may disburse over the course of a recipient’s enrollment within this policy’s limits and requirements.

6.3. **Ongoing Eligibility**: If a student receives an award disbursement, the recipient must enroll at a credit granting institution, maintain a 3.0 GPA and complete a minimum of 12 credit hours per academic semester to remain eligible for future disbursements. Students who earn less than a 3.0 Semester GPA will be placed on probation. If the recipient again at any time earns less than a 3.0 GPA the scholarship may be revoked. Institutions shall verify the recipient has met these requirements. Recipients who do not maintain eligibility forfeit the remaining award amount.
R609-7. Time Constraints and Deferrals

7.1. **Time Limitation:** Scholarship funds are only available to a recipient for five years after their high school graduation date.

7.2. Upon the first day a recipient begins courses using the scholarship funds at a non-credit granting institution, the recipient must use the award in its entirety within two years, unless extended under section 7.3. This time limit does not extend the five-year award availability under section 7.1.

7.3. **Deferral or Leave of Absence:** Recipients who will not enroll continuously for Fall and Spring/Winter at an eligible institution a student shall apply for a deferral or leave of absence with their institution.

7.3.1. Deferrals may be granted at the discretion of the scholarship review committee. Leaves of absence may be granted, at the discretion of the institution. Deferrals and leaves of absence may be granted for military service, humanitarian/religious service, documented medical reasons, and other exigent reasons.

7.3.2. An approved deferral or leave of absence will not extend the time limits of the scholarship. The scholarship may only be used for academic terms that begin within five years after the recipient’s high school graduation date.

R609-8 Transfers

8.1. Recipients may transfer to another eligible institution and retain the scholarship award. Recipients are responsible to inform the Office of the Commissioner of their intent to transfer. The Office of the Commissioner shall coordinate the transfer of scholarship funds and information.

R609-9 Scholarship Determinations and Appeals

9.1. **Scholarship Determinations:** Submission of a scholarship application does not guarantee a scholarship award. The Scholarship Staff shall review individual scholarship applications and determine eligibility. Awards are based on available funding, applicant pool, and applicants’ completion of scholarship criteria by the specified deadline.

9.2. **Appeals:** An applicant has the right to appeal the Scholarship Staff’s adverse decision by filing an appeal with the Scholarship Appeals Committee subject to the following conditions:

9.2.1. Applicants may submit a written appeal through either the U.S. Mail or their Regents Scholarship Student Account. Appeals must be postmarked (if mailed) or submitted online within 30 days of the date on which the scholarship notification was issued.

9.2.2. In the appeal, the applicant must provide his or her full name, mailing address, the high school he or she last attended, a statement of the reason for the appeal, and all information or evidence that supports the appeal. The failure of an applicant to provide the information in this subsection shall not preclude the acceptance of an appeal.

9.2.3. An appeal filed before the applicant receives official notification from the Scholarship Staff of its decision may not be considered.
If an applicant failed to file his or her appeal on time, the Scholarship Appeals Committee shall notify the applicant of the late filing and give him or her an opportunity to explain the reasons for failing to file the appeal by the deadline. The Scholarship Appeals Committee shall not have jurisdiction to consider the merits of an appeal that is filed beyond the deadline unless it determines the applicant established excusable neglect.

The Scholarship Appeals Committee shall review the appeal to determine if the award decision was made in error, or if the applicant demonstrated substantial compliance with the scholarship application requirements but failed to meet one or more requirements for good cause.

If the Scholarship Appeals Committee determines the applicant has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the initial decision was made in error, it shall either reverse the initial decision or remand it back to the Scholarship Staff for further review in accordance with the Appeals Committee’s instructions.

If the Scholarship Appeals Committee determines the applicant has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she demonstrated substantial compliance with the application process requirements and good cause for failing to meet one or more of the requirements, the Appeals Committee shall grant the applicant a reasonable period of time to complete the remaining requirements and to resubmit the completed application to the Scholarship Staff for a redetermination. In such a case, the applicant shall have the right to appeal an adverse decision according to this rule.

The Scholarship Appeals Committee’s decision shall be in writing and contain its findings of facts, reasoning and conclusions of law and notice of the right to judicial review.

The Scholarship Appeals Committee’s decision represents the final agency action. An applicant who disagrees with the Scholarship Appeal Committee’s Decision may seek judicial review in accordance with Utah Code Ann. 63G-4-402.

R609-10 Reporting

10.1. As directed by Commissioner’s staff, eligible institutions shall report to the Board the following:

10.1.1. The names of students the institutions awarded Regents’ Scholarship funds.

10.1.2. Enrollment information such as the current GPA, the number of credits completed, and deferment or leave of absence information.

10.1.3. Other information deemed necessary to evaluate eligibility or the effectiveness of the program.

10.2. The Board may, at any time, request additional documentation or data related to the Regents Scholarship and may review or formally audit an eligible institution’s compliance with this policy.
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Project Overview
**Dixie Name Study Research Methodology & Objectives**

### Methodology

#### Project Timeline
Cicero Group’s initial kick-off with Dixie State University began in September and concluded in November with a comprehensive research report.

#### Focus Groups
Eight sessions were conducted across three populations. Sessions were held via Zoom and were approximately one hour each.

#### In-Depth Interviews
102 one-on-one interviews were conducted across twenty-two stakeholder groups. Sessions were held via Zoom and were approximately 25 minutes each.

#### Survey
3,225 individuals completed the questionnaire across five discrete populations. Eleven more granular sub-populations were later defined and analyzed.

### Study Objectives

#### Understand | Interpretations of ‘Dixie’
Go beyond the simple capture of common perspectives and include specific key populations across a variety of demographics and stakeholder groups that are pertinent to Dixie State University’s future success.

#### Quantify | Reception of Perspectives
Introduce even-handed, objective perspectives both visually and verbally to all stakeholders. Quantify the before and after perspective shifts, and contextualize results by stakeholders and their sub-groups.

#### Measure | Impacts & Implications
Project critical implications of both retaining and removing the word ‘Dixie’ from the university’s name. Specifically define the impacts regarding donations, support, branding, recruitment, reputation and other specialty topics.

### Project Items At-A-Glance

- **Methodology**
  - **Study Objectives**
    - Understand | Interpretations of ‘Dixie’
    - Quantify | Reception of Perspectives
    - Measure | Impacts & Implications
- **Project Timeline**
  - Cicero Group’s initial kick-off with Dixie State University began in September and concluded in November with a comprehensive research report.
- **Focus Groups**
  - Eight sessions were conducted across three populations. Sessions were held via Zoom and were approximately one hour each.
- **In-Depth Interviews**
  - 102 one-on-one interviews were conducted across twenty-two stakeholder groups. Sessions were held via Zoom and were approximately 25 minutes each.
- **Survey**
  - 3,225 individuals completed the questionnaire across five discrete populations. Eleven more granular sub-populations were later defined and analyzed.

---
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Survey Participants, Focus Groups, and In-Depth Interviews

**Survey Participants**
- Faculty & Staff
- Current Students
- Prospective Students
- General Population
- Alumni

**Focus Groups**
- Faculty & Staff
- Current Students
- Coalition Groups

**In-Depth Interviews**
- Community Leaders, National Advisory Council, Alumni
- Donors & Sponsors
- Gov. & Administration
- Affiliations
- Academia
- Recruitment

*Out-of-state populations specifically targeted Dixie State University ‘growth’ recruitment regions (e.g. San Bernardino, Clark County etc.) for both prospective students and general population*

Focus Groups Conducted, (Faculty & Staff, n=3 | Current Students, n=3 | Coalition Groups, n=2)

In-Depth Interviews Conducted, (Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739 | Gov. & Administration, n=29 | Affiliations, n=9 | Academia, n=17 | Recruitment, n=12)

Survey Populations, (Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739 | Prospective Students In-State, n=164 | Prospective Students Out-of-State, n=157 | Southwestern Utah, n=313 | Greater Utah, n=297 | Out-of-State, n=791 | Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376)
Executive Summary
Quantitative Findings
SUPPORT FOR AND ISSUES WITH THE TERM ‘DIXIE’
While support for the term ‘Dixie’ remains greater than opposition to its continued use across some populations, particularly in Southwestern Utah and among all current students, concerns with the term as registered by meaningful portions of virtually all populations considered warrant careful and clear-eyed deliberation relative to its impact on the institution’s capacity to both grow and fulfil its mission.

PROBLEMATIC AND CONFUSING ASSUMPTIONS AROUND ‘DIXIE’
The term ‘Dixie’ not only carries negative connotations of southern slavery for some, but from a branding, marketing, and recruiting perspective, many who are unfamiliar with the institution incorrectly assume it is located somewhere in the southern states. Confusion around the school’s location and identity adds a problematic element that may also inhibit growth and reputational aspirations.

REAL IMPACTS ON KEY OUTCOMES
The use of ‘Dixie’ in the name is hurting employment prospects for some alums, some faculty and staff see impacts to their ability to obtain grants/funding, recruitment and retention of faculty and staff is made more challenging, and student recruitment – especially outside of Utah – is negatively impacted. However, if the term is removed from the name, some alums and locals have indicated they will reduce or eliminate support.
Executive Summary | Key Insights

**Reputation**
Academic reputation is, according to survey respondents, the most important factor for the future success of the University. The ‘Dixie’ name impacts the University’s reputation most positively among locals. The name impacts the institution’s reputation more negatively among populations outside the state of Utah, as well as among some key stakeholder populations, affiliates, and groups.

**Recruitment and Marketing**
Key questions of origins and meaning of the name aside, the ‘Dixie’ name is confusing to people from outside of Utah, many of whom assume it is located in the Southern United States. The name has a positive effect on willingness to attend the institution in Southwestern Utah, and a relatively negative effect outside of Utah.

**Brand**
Keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have minimal bearing on brand acceptance within Utah, but will have a negative effect with the out-of-state general population, where, for example, a majority would not feel comfortable wearing apparel which included the word ‘Dixie’.

**Support**
Based on stated intentions, removing Dixie from the institution’s name may lead to decreased alumni support. On the other hand, based on stated perceptions, keeping Dixie in the name may be increasingly problematic for some key populations, inhibit growth, hinder the ability to receive grants and donations, or form partnerships.

**Name Change**
Most in Utah think the name should be unchanged, but outside of Utah and among various populations, there is a stronger inclination to change the name. After being presented with various perspectives, most groups become more in favor of changing the name; those who say the University should ‘absolutely keep’ ‘Dixie’ are rarely swayed.

**Perspectives**
Perspectives in support of the ‘Dixie’ name are most resonant with Southwestern Utah’s population, while perspectives taking issue with the ‘Dixie’ name resonate most with recent out-of-state alumni, African Americans*, faculty and staff, and peer institutions/partners.

---

*Survey response option reads ‘Black or African American’ but is denoted more simply throughout the presentation as ‘African American’
The ‘Dixie’ name seems to have a clear, negative impact on the school’s reputation with certain stakeholder groups, although the opposite is true for the local community and older alumni.

**Executive Summary | Key Data Points**

**Reputation**

1. **The ‘Dixie’ name negatively impacts the school’s reputation outside of Utah:** 56% of Out-of-State General Population say that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will negatively impact the University’s reputation while this figure is only 25% for Southwestern Utah General Population, and 44% for Greater Utah.

2. **The ‘Dixie’ name negatively impacts the school’s reputation for African Americans:** 48% of African Americans believe that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will negatively impact the University’s reputation. Those who identify as white are slightly more likely to say the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact than a positive impact (33% vs 29%).

3. **Faculty & Staff more commonly view the ‘Dixie’ name as a negative:** Unlike Southwestern Utah’s general population, 49% of Faculty & Staff say that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will negatively impact the University’s reputation.

4. **At least a quarter of nearly every population in every geography tested view ‘Dixie’ as having a negative impact on reputation:** Even in Southwestern Utah, concerns that the name ‘Dixie’ has a negative impact on the school’s reputation exist in meaningful numbers across populations.
The ‘Dixie’ name creates particular challenges for out-of-state recruitment but is perceived to have more positive effects on recruiting within Utah, and especially within Southwestern Utah.

Executive Summary | Key Data Points

Recruitment and Marketing

1. **The ‘Dixie’ name is confusing to those who are less familiar with the University**: Faculty and Staff report that in academic circles, colleagues generally assume Dixie State University is located in the Southern United States.

2. **Nearly half of recent graduates are concerned that the inclusion of ‘Dixie’ on their resume has caused or may cause an issue(s)**: Recent Out-of-State Alumni and Faculty & Staff are most likely to see it as a possibility for potential employers to view the word ‘Dixie’ on their resume negatively.

3. **The ‘Dixie’ name has the most positive effect on willingness to attend or encourage others to attend in Southwestern Utah**: The ‘Dixie’ name has minimal impact on willingness to attend or recommend for Greater Utah, and the most negative effect for individuals living outside the state of Utah.

4. **More than one third of Prospective Students believe that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact on out-of-state recruitment**: But while the impact outside the state is pronounced, just over one in ten say it will have a negative impact on in-state recruitment.
The ‘Dixie’ brand is strong in Southwestern Utah, and somewhat strong throughout the rest of the state, but is largely problematic outside of Utah

Executive Summary | Key Data Points

1. **Keeping the ‘Dixie’ name has a negative impact on brand recognition outside of Utah**: Just over half of those outside the state of Utah believe that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact on brand recognition.

2. **More than a third of current students say keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will negatively impact brand recognition**: 36% of students and 54% of Faculty & Staff say keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact on brand recognition.

3. **In Southwestern Utah, keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will positively impact brand appeal**: The Southwestern Utah General Population is especially bullish on the ‘Dixie’ name with 62% saying it will positively impact brand appeal and only 8% saying it will negatively impact brand appeal.

4. **Outside of Utah, 52% of people are uncomfortable wearing apparel which includes ‘Dixie’**: 27% of Current Students, 35% of Prospective Out-of-State Students, and 26% of Prospective In-State Students say they are uncomfortable wearing apparel which includes the word ‘Dixie’
A name change would likely result in decreased alumni donations, whereas keeping the ‘Dixie’ name could mean trouble for grant seeking, corporate donations, and partnerships.

**Executive Summary | Key Data Points**

**Support**

1. **DSU Alumni will consider reducing their support if ‘Dixie’ is removed from the name:** Two-thirds of alumni who graduated prior to 2009, and nearly half who graduated after 2009 say they will consider reducing support to the University.

2. **Faculty & Staff believe that grants, corporate donations, and partnerships will be negatively impacted by keeping the ‘Dixie’ name:** 48% of Faculty & Staff believe that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact on these efforts, while just 23% believe it will have a positive impact.

3. **Southwestern Utah residents say that removing ‘Dixie’ from the name will have a negative impact on local and statewide support:** 71% of Southwestern Utah General Population, and 40% of Greater Utah say that a name change will negatively impact local and statewide support.

4. **Faculty & Staff who donate to scholarship funds say a name change would have almost no effect on their donations:** Unlike alumni, few Faculty & Staff say they would donate more (15%), or less (19%).
Those who strongly oppose a name change are not swayed by other perspectives, but those who begin neutral in the debate can be persuaded to favor or oppose the University’s ‘Dixie’ name

Executive Summary | Key Data Points

1. **Those who are at first ‘indifferent’ generally become more likely to support a name change after hearing all perspectives:** For example, 21% of Greater Utah residents indicated that they believed the University should drop the ‘Dixie’ name, then, after learning more about perspectives on both sides of the question, that figure doubled, increasing to 42%. In the case of Out-of-State General Population, this figure moved from 36% to 51%.

2. **Most African Americans say the University should remove ‘Dixie’ from its name:** While African Americans were initially most inclined to believe the name should be changed, after learning about perspectives from both sides of the question, this figure increases substantially.

3. **Southwestern Utah’s General Population clearly favors keeping the ‘Dixie’ name:** Before reading all perspectives, 79% think the name should remain, and after reading all perspectives, 75% believe that the ‘Dixie’ name should remain.

4. **Current students favor keeping the ‘Dixie’ name:** Before reading all perspectives, 64% think the name should remain, and after reading all perspectives this figure drops slightly to 62%.
For locals and older alumni, the ‘Dixie Pride’ perspective is most resonant, and of the opposing perspectives, the ‘Cannot Hide From The Past’ argument is slightly more resonant than others.

Executive Summary | Key Data Points

1. Perspectives in support of the ‘Dixie’ name are most resonant with Southwestern Utah General Population and Older Alumni: These groups find the ‘support’ perspectives to be more resonant than any other stakeholder groups.

2. Perspectives taking issue with the ‘Dixie’ name are most resonant with African Americans and Recent Out-of-State Graduates: These groups find the ‘issue’ perspectives to be more resonant than any other stakeholder groups.

3. For local residents, the ‘Dixie Pride’ perspective resonates most: This perspective resonates with 80% of Southwestern Utah General Population compared to 53% for Greater Utah and 41% for Out-of-State General Population.

4. For Greater Utah, the ‘Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken’ perspective resonates most: This perspective resonates with 55% of Greater Utah, a group which also values the ‘Dixie Pride’ perspective (53%), and ‘Cannot Hide From The Past’ perspective (49%).

5. Outside of Utah, the ‘Cannot Hide From The Past’ perspective resonates most: This perspective resonates with 54% of Out-of-State General Population, compared to only 26% of Southwestern Utah General Population.
Executive Summary
Qualitative Findings
Those who oppose the ‘Dixie’ name believe it presents challenges that cannot be overcome while supporters of the name doubt the validity and impact of these challenges.

### Executive Summary | Key Focus Group Takeaways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Focus Group</th>
<th>Takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Issues with ‘Dixie’ Name** | Keeping ‘Dixie’ name implies racism  
There is a sense that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name now shows agreement, whether tacit or explicit, with Confederate ideals of racism, oppression, and exclusion. |
| **‘Dixie’ name holds the University back** |  
The Dixie name no longer serves the institution as it deters students, employees, and funding. Racist or not, the name is not aligned with the institution or its mission going forward. |
| **Local support may wane if name changes** |  
This group concedes that changing the ‘Dixie’ name may harm the University’s brand amongst locals and the ‘pastoral community’ who are fond of the name and its ties to the region’s early history. |
| **Group 2**     |           |
| **Support for ‘Dixie’ Name** | ‘Dixie’ name is not a significant deterrent  
Many are skeptical that the ‘Dixie’ name deters a material number of prospective students, employees, or funding dollars. |
| **DSU needs to educate people about its history** |  
If only the institution would more effectively educate students and others about its history, there would be fewer detractors and hence, little need to change its name. |
| **Perceived Confederate ties present a challenge** |  
This group recognizes that the school’s ‘flagrant past’ of Confederate flags, slave auctions, and black face present a challenge to the University, and to its ‘Dixie’ name, but argue that it’s in the past and the community has moved forward |

These two focus groups were conducted by the research team not only to understand the nuance and depth of competing perspectives on this topic, but also to serve as a sounding board and to refine the various perspectives that would be presented in other focus groups, and to the 100+ interviewees from various stakeholder groups who participated in this research. These focus groups helped the researchers to ensure that they represented as accurately and fairly as possible the many opinions, arguments, and perspectives that were subsequently tested throughout this process.

Other focus groups were conducted with current DSU students and faculty/staff. These discussions helped to understand the unique perspectives of those stakeholder groups, and to inform subsequent phases of the research i.e. topics for research interviews and questions for the quantitative survey.
Community voices are divided, opinions of government officials largely diverge along local/state lines, and donations may be difficult to predict in the event of a name change for DSU

Executive Summary | Key In-depth Interview Takeaways

**Community**

- National Advisory Council
- Alumni
- Major Employers
- Community Leaders

‘Dixie’ will impede growth

NAC and Major Employers are largely aligned in their belief that the ‘Dixie’ name is at odds with the University’s mission, and that it will likely impede growth going forward.

Don’t cave to political pressure

Community Leaders and Alumni have mixed views, but many (especially alumni) feel that ‘caving to political pressure’ with a name change is ill advised and will result in reduced support.

Employers support a name change

Major employers consistently support a name change, citing the need to attract/support a diverse workforce as well as voicing concern about graduates applying for out-of-state jobs where ‘Dixie’ is a problematic term.

**Gov. & Administration**

- DSU Board of Trustees
- Utah Government Officials
- DSU Cabinet Members

Paradigm shift in 2020

Several Trustees and statewide government officials observe a paradigm shift in 2020 regarding racial justice – one that makes the University’s ‘Dixie’ name untenable, now, and in the foreseeable future.

The problem is only growing

Cabinet members almost unanimously support a name change, citing lost funding, faculty departures, and ongoing turmoil if the ‘Dixie’ name remains. Changing the name is viewed as less risky than keeping it.

Feeling compelled by ‘outsiders’

Local government officials mostly agree that the local population will not support calls for a name change that seem to come almost exclusively from ‘outsiders’ i.e. those not of the community.

**Donors & Sponsors**

- Athletic Sponsors
- Individual Donors
- Corporate Donors
- Foundation Donors
- Prospective Donors

Some donors will stop supporting

Few donors say they will discontinue their support because of a name change, but some say they’ve heard of others that will do precisely this.

Focus is on students, not the institution

Many donors cite a focus and priority on helping students i.e. they may not support a name change, but a name change will not affect their desire to support the students.

Donations are not for re-branding

If the name does change, some donors may require a guarantee that their donations not go toward the name change, preferring that there be a complete separation of funds for this.
The ‘Dixie’ name is viewed as ill-suited to the University’s polytechnic or STEM-focused mission and negatively affects recruiting efforts of faculty and students alike outside the region

Executive Summary | Key In-depth Interview Key Takeaways

Academia
- USHE Diversity Officers
- Utah Board of Higher Education
- Polytechnic Peers
- WAC ADs & SWAs

DSU must directly reconcile racist past
The vast majority of these voices view the school’s past as being highly problematic – something that must be addressed and reconciled

‘Dixie’ name not fitting for polytechnic
The ‘Dixie’ name is regarded as antithetical to the nature of a polytechnic, or STEM-focused university and will deter many people from working there, attending, or sending their children there

Name change will diminish history
All institutional voices unanimously favor a name change, except for BOHE members, some of whom lament the removal of the ‘Dixie’ name because of a feeling that it essentially attempts to erase the region’s history

Recruitment
- Prospective Faculty
- High School Counselors
- Dixie State University Recruiters

‘Dixie’ deters prospective faculty
Prospective faculty members are turned off by the ‘Dixie’ name, citing personal values and potential difficulty including ‘Dixie’ on their resume in the field of academia

Inclusivity is key
High school counselors not from Southern Utah believe the ‘Dixie’ name is at odds with inclusivity and some steer students of color away from Dixie for fear they will not feel accepted there

‘Dixie’ name harms recruiting efforts
Student recruiters report that while they love Dixie State, they feel uncomfortable using the ‘Dixie’ name amongst diverse populations, and that out-of-state prospects are perpetually confused about the school’s location

Affiliations
- NWCCU Accrediting Body
- University Licensing Partner
- NCAA and WAC

No immediate threat to accreditation
While the accrediting body may have concerns about the ‘Dixie’ name, this will not affect the school’s accreditation at this time

Licensing issues may worsen
It is unknown whether additional retailers will follow Dicks Sporting Goods in refusing to carry DSU merchandise, however, DSU’s licensing partner does not believe this issue will subside any time soon

WAC/NCAA action not likely
Governing officials from the WAC and NCAA strongly oppose the school’s inclusion of ‘Dixie’ in its name, but say their organizations will not likely consider punitive action on the matter
Reputation
Academic reputation is viewed as the most important factor for the future success of the university, followed by making it a welcoming and inclusive place, and jobs for graduates.

Executive Summary | Which factors are most important to the future success of the university?

- Academic reputation of the university: 55%
- Making the university a welcoming/inclusive place for all who wish to enroll or work there: 48%
- Enabling students to obtain jobs after graduation: 45%
- Growing its reputation as a STEM-focused polytechnic institution: 34%
- Ability to recruit students: 31%
- Honoring the history and heritage of the local community: 27%
- Ability for students to be accepted into graduate programs at other universities: 25%
- Ability to recruit faculty and staff: 24%
- Ability to recruit student athletes and coaches: 9%

Q38: For you, which factors are most important to the future success of the university?

*Results were filtered by the frequency of top three results only

Overall, N=3,255

Executive Summary

- "I don’t feel comfortable putting up a banner that says ‘Dixie’ State University’ at high-schools with a diverse or large African American population.”
  - Student Recruiter

- "We don’t have a name that reflects our mission or our identity. I think there is a wonderful future ahead and I don’t think we have to be anchored in the past to have a good future.”
  - Board of Trustees Member

- "Our name is embarrassing and unlikely to suggest credibility, gravitas, or intellectual/scholarly ability in the circles where we’d like it to.”
  - Current Faculty
While concerns exist across populations, if DSU keeps ‘Dixie’ in its name those more distant from Southwestern Utah are most likely to perceive negative impacts to the institution’s reputation.

**Question** | Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name by Geography

**REPUTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Utah</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Utah</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the “Dixie” name to have on the following factors in the future?

By General Population (SW Utah, n=313 | Greater Utah, n=297 | Out-of-State, n=791)
When examining perception by race/ethnicity, the impact of the term ‘Dixie’ on the University’s reputation is most negatively pronounced among African Americans

**Question | Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name by Race/Ethnicity**

**REPUTATION**

---

"Those photos put in my head what I already assumed when I heard the name of the school.”

-Governing Body Official, NCAA

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>NON-WHITE*</th>
<th>AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

By Race/Ethnicity (White n=2,841  |  Non-White, n=526  |  African American Only, n=56)

*Non-White accounts for all who did not select ‘White’, including those who selected ‘Black or African American’
In-state prospective students are more inclined to believe that keeping the name will have a positive impact on reputation; faculty and staff feel otherwise, while current students are split.

**Question** | Impact on Dixie State’s **Reputation** if ‘Dixie’ is **Kept** in the Name Among Prospective Students and On-Campus Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Specific Populations</th>
<th>Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=157</th>
<th>In-State Prospective Students, n=164</th>
<th>Current Students, n=739</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff, n=298</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective Students and On-Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPUTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prospective Students**
- **Out-of-State**
  - Positive Impact: 32%
  - No Impact: 44%
  - Negative Impact: 24%
- **In-State**
  - Positive Impact: 42%
  - No Impact: 29%
  - Negative Impact: 29%

**On-Campus**
- **Current Students**
  - Positive Impact: 36%
  - No Impact: 32%
  - Negative Impact: 32%
- **Faculty & Staff**
  - Positive Impact: 21%
  - No Impact: 30%
  - Negative Impact: 49%
Recent alums are more likely to believe that the name may hold DSU back, while older, in-state alums are more likely to see the name helping the university’s reputation.

**Question** | Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Alumni

**REPUTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Recent Graduates (2010 and Beyond)</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th>Older Graduates (Before 2010)</th>
<th>In-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q35:** If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits’ students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

**By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376)**
Faculty and Staff indicate that in the higher education field, colleagues often assume that Dixie State University is in the Southern United States

Question | Faculty and Staff Experiences at Academic Conferences and within Academic Circles

“Driving by St. George one time on a road trip, I saw Dixie State University and I immediately looked at the Wikipedia page because I was confused why a school in Utah had a tie to the confederacy.”
- Prospective Faculty

“I believe the questions are good and bring awareness about Dixie in a positive light. It has given me the opportunity to explain where we are, what we do, and what a great institution Dixie is. I believe it has actually opened the door for discussion and the opportunity to invite others to Southern Utah.”
- Current Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People assume DSU is in the South</th>
<th>Others are accepting of 'Dixie'</th>
<th>Others already know the history</th>
<th>Others are generally not accepting of 'Dixie'</th>
<th>I've never received judgement, but I fear it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data excludes faculty & staff respondents who indicated they do not participate in academic conferences
Q48: Within academic circles and conferences specifically, select the passage that most closely aligns to your experience.
Faculty & Staff, n=230
About half of recent, out-of-state graduates and a third of recent in-state graduates at least see the possibility of concern or unvoiced judgment about the term ‘Dixie’ on their resume.

**Question**: Select all that apply regarding the inclusion of the Word ‘Dixie’ on Your Resume and/or Transcript.

**Alumni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recent Graduates</th>
<th>Older Graduates</th>
<th>Recent Graduates</th>
<th>Older Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Dixie’ has precluded me from an interview and/or offer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An employer has expressed concern</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An employer will likely express concern</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be unvoiced judgement or concern</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can see the possibility of concern being expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely that an employer will ever express concern about the word ‘Dixie’</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Q44: Please select all that apply regarding the inclusion of the word ‘Dixie’ on your resume and/or transcript.

*By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376)*

"I can’t imagine these discussions will just go away and with all those images out there, I’m afraid this will be a problem for my sons who are attending Dixie.”

-High School Counselor, NV
Like alumni, some faculty/staff and current students see potential issues down the road with the term ‘Dixie’ on their resume or transcript, possibly making it more difficult to obtain employment.

Question | Select all that Apply Regarding the Inclusion of the Word ‘Dixie’ on Your Resume and/or Transcript

**On-Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Dixie’ has precluded me from an interview and/or offer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An employer has expressed concern</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An employer will likely express concern</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be unvoiced judgement or concern</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can see the possibility of concern being expressed</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely that an employer will ever express concern about the word ‘Dixie’</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"At conferences I would get shocked looks and comments like ‘why would you work for a school like that’. My response would be that I love the people and how the institution operates.”

-Current Faculty

"As a STEM major who wants to be a PhD, I’m concerned that people will assume I’m from a racist organization because of the connotation that ‘Dixie’ holds.”

-Current Student

Q44: Please select all that apply regarding the inclusion of the word ‘Dixie’ on your resume and/or transcript.

By Specific Population (Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739)
Interviewees consistently noted that for those living outside the region, and for some within the region, the word ‘Dixie’ is not synonymous with Southwestern Utah

**Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews) | Impacts on Reputation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah Board of Higher Education Members</th>
<th>Board members tended to focus more on attracting students from outside of the region and how to successfully enter regional and national stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Accreditor</td>
<td>The inclusion of ‘Dixie’ in the university's name has no bearing on accreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The bigger question for me is how can you reach students beyond the borders of the state. Anything that would tend to impact us beyond our borders should be kept in mind.”

“I think it’s a bit anachronistic. I appreciate history and community connection with that, but I think of it as an odd name. Primarily because of its geographical location, but also because it’s impacting their ability to attract students.”
Employers and academic peers recognize the probability of a perception issue when leaving the region of Southwestern Utah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews)</th>
<th>Impacts on Transcripts &amp; Resume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSU Major Employers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local employers agreed that having the word ‘Dixie’ on a resume does not cause concern about job candidates in their hiring process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polytechnic Peers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic peers unanimously agreed that the university should consider changing its name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I haven’t heard of specific negative resume stories, but I’m imagining someone going outside of this region and having to explain that. Why put this burden on alumni to have to explain?”

“I think their name is not indicative of their identity. Does ‘Dixie State University’ convey their polytechnic identity in a 30 second elevator pitch?”
Recruitment and Marketing
The ‘Dixie’ name has a positive influence on willingness to attend in Southwestern Utah, is mostly neutral across greater Utah, and is relatively negative among those outside of Utah.

**Question** | Impact on Willingness to Attend or Encouragement of Attendance by Geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
<th>Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22/41: All else equal (i.e. location, quality of education, size, programs offered, etc.), does the inclusion of ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name negatively, or positively impact your willingness to attend, or encourage others to attend Dixie State University?

By General Population (Southwestern Utah, n=313  |  Greater Utah, n=297  |  Out-of-State, n=791)
While largely unimpactful across most races/ethnicities, having the term ‘Dixie’ in the school’s name has a relatively strong negative impact among African Americans.

**Question | Impact on Willingness to Attend or Encouragement of Attendance by Race/Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
<th>Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Positive Impact: 25%</td>
<td>Positive Impact: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact: 54%</td>
<td>No Impact: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Impact: 21%</td>
<td>Negative Impact: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>Positive Impact: 27%</td>
<td>Positive Impact: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact: 51%</td>
<td>No Impact: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Impact: 22%</td>
<td>Negative Impact: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Positive Impact: 27%</td>
<td>Positive Impact: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact: 44%</td>
<td>No Impact: 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Impact: 24%</td>
<td>Negative Impact: 43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22/41: All else equal (i.e. location, quality of education, size, programs offered, etc.), does the inclusion of ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name negatively, or positively impact your willingness to attend, or encourage others to attend Dixie State University?

By Race/Ethnicity (White n=2,841 | Non-White, n=526 | African American Only, n=56)
Out-of-State, recent alumni have reservations about the name, but in-state, older alumni see a strong positive impact from the term on their willingness to encourage others to attend DSU.

**Question | Impact on Willingness to Attend or Encouragement of Attendance by Alumni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
<th>Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent (n=58)</td>
<td>Recent (n=316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent (n=93)</td>
<td>Recent (n=376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Specific Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58</td>
<td>Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent In-State Alumni, n=316</td>
<td>Older In-State Alumni, n=376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q22/41: All else equal (i.e. location, quality of education, size, programs offered, etc.), does the inclusion of ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name negatively, or positively impact your willingness to attend, or encourage others to attend Dixie State University?
Those outside of Utah associate ‘Dixie’ with the South and recognize Utah’s ‘Dixie’ far less often, particularly when compared to those within Utah.

**Question | What Does ‘Dixie’ Mean to You by Geography**

- **Hard Work & Friendliness**
  - Southwestern Utah: 13%
  - Greater Utah: 2%
  - Out-of-State: 0%

- **Pioneer Heritage**
  - Southwestern Utah: 28%
  - Greater Utah: 2%
  - Out-of-State: 2%

- **Utah’s Dixie**
  - Southwestern Utah: 51%
  - Greater Utah: 36%
  - Out-of-State: 1%

- **Cotton Production**
  - Southwestern Utah: 23%
  - Greater Utah: 5%
  - Out-of-State: 8%

- **A Geographic Term**
  - Southwestern Utah: 17%
  - Greater Utah: 16%
  - Out-of-State: 12%

- **Negative History**
  - (e.g. racism, slavery, etc.)
  - Southwestern Utah: 8%
  - Greater Utah: 9%
  - Out-of-State: 6%

- **The South / Confederacy**
  - Southwestern Utah: 33%
  - Greater Utah: 41%
  - Out-of-State: 64%

*Responses that mentioned multiple aspects were counted for all categories to which they applied.

**Out of State responses that did not fall under the above seven categories were not included.**

Therefore the population’s data intentionally does not sum to 100%.

Q20: The word ‘Dixie’ holds a range of meanings. To some, ‘Dixie’ is associated with different regions in the United States. ‘Dixie’ may also symbolize a specific time in history, a set of values, certain practices, or one’s heritage. To start, please tell us - what does the word ‘Dixie’ mean to you?

- Southwestern Utah Resident: “Dixie is the colloquial term for the South. For me, it means hard working people who came to this area to make a new life.”
- DSU Cabinet Member: “In St. George, ‘Dixie’ has a great connotation. Outside of St George it’s confusing, offensive, like the ‘n’ word to some.”
A similar dispersion occurs with race/ethnicity, but with a pronounced trend toward the negative history of the South instead of the geographic location.

**Question | What Does ‘Dixie’ Mean to You by Geography by Race/Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work &amp; Friendliness</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Heritage</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah’s Dixie</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Production</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Geographic Term</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative History (e.g. racism, slavery, etc.)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South / Confederacy</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses that mentioned multiple aspects were counted for all categories to which they applied. Only responses that applied to the above categories were included and therefore certain population groups do not sum to 100%.

Q20. The word ‘Dixie’ holds a range of meanings. To some, ‘Dixie’ is associated with different regions in the United States. ‘Dixie’ may also symbolize a specific time in history, a set of values, certain practices, or one’s heritage. To start, please tell us - what does the word ‘Dixie’ mean to you?

By Race/Ethnicity (White n=2,841 | Non-White, n=526 | African American Only, n=56)
Almost half of current staff and faculty believe that the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact on future staff recruitment

**Question** | Impact on Faculty & Staff Recruitment if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Faculty & Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I wouldn’t consider working at 'Dixie' because I'm a marketer. It would be a constant uphill battle for me.”  
- Academic Peer

“The location surprised me. However, the imagery of the confederate flags etc. was exactly what I expected.”  
- Academic Peer

“When I tell those peers and colleagues the name of the university where I work, they openly question the validity and integrity of an institution that still carries such a name, and even my acceptance of this new position.”  
- Prospective Faculty

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the 'Dixie' name to have on the following factors in the future?  
Faculty & Staff, n=298
Faculty and Staff with 10+ years at the institution are most likely to say that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have a positive impact on their desire to continue working there.

**Question**: If the word ‘Dixie’ is kept in the university’s name, how will it impact your desire to continue to be employed by the university?

**CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Tenure at Dixie State</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2 Years</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 10 Years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Years</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*I might not be able to work here going into the future and many of my colleagues feel this way.*”

- Current Faculty

Q45: If the word ‘Dixie’ is kept in the university’s name, how will it impact your desire to continue to be employed by the university?

Q12: How long have you worked at Dixie State University?

By Tenure of Faculty & Staff (0-2 Years, n=107 | 3-10 Years, n=108 | 10+ Years, n=83)
41% of prospective students believe that keeping the ‘Dixie’ name will have a negative impact on out-of-state recruitment and 54% say it will have a positive impact on in-state recruitment.

**Question | Impact on In and Out-of-State Student Recruitment if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Prospective Students**

**STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

**Prospective Students**

- **Out-of-State Recruitment**
  - Negative Impact: 41%
  - No Impact: 30%
  - Positive Impact: 29%

  **Q35:** If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

  **By Specific Populations (Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=157 | In State Prospective Students, n=164)**

  - **Out-of-State Prospective Students**
    - Negative Impact: 41%
    - No Impact: 30%
    - Positive Impact: 29%

    **“I have had numerous potential students from out-of-state be hesitant to join the University because of the negative connotations associated with the name ‘Dixie.’ I believe this has negatively impacted our recruiting efforts.”**
    - Current Faculty

    **“Recruiting in California, the first thing people think is the South and specifically, Alabama.”**
    - Student Recruiter

  - **In-State Prospective Students**
    - Negative Impact: 13%
    - No Impact: 34%
    - Positive Impact: 53%

    **“A lot of the college students and faculty members the University may want to recruit would be hesitant to even look into it; to even consider coming to that school because it’s called ‘Dixie.’”**
    - Community Leader

    **“I don’t really think of a college being defined by the name. I like to look at the programs and other opportunities that the university can provide.”**
    - Prospective Student, In-State
Some on campus suggest the name is having a negative impact on athlete recruitment, in particular nearly half of faulty and staff see a negative impact on student athlete recruitment.

**Question** | Impact on **Student Athlete Recruitment** if ‘Dixie’ is **Kept** in the Name Among On-Campus Populations

**STUDENT ATHLETE RECRUITMENT**

**On-Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"If I had a student athlete asking me about Dixie State’s history, it’d be hard for me not to take that very seriously.”

-WAC Athletic Director

"I don’t envision ‘Dixie’ causing an issue for their inclusion in our conference. I fear what may happen to them if they’re on national TV and the sports anchor brings up this history...”

-Athletic Governing Body

"To me, it’s all about the fact that people are taking exception to the name and it’s prohibiting them from coming - student athletes, faculty, staff etc.”

-Community Leader

"I don’t think the word ‘Dixie’ will ever influence an athlete’s willingness to come here, but I do think that having ‘Dixie’ on our uniforms as we go into new regions is a compelling consideration.”

-Current Student Athlete
Many prospective students do not raise issue with the word ‘Dixie’, but both recruiters and counselors can see this being a topic in the future

**Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews) | Recruiting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Counselors</th>
<th>Generally in-state counselors do not think students will take exception to the word ‘Dixie’. There is a shift of perception when speaking to some out-of-state counselors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University Recruiters</td>
<td>The college recruiters interviewed have not had negative experiences but envision that changing in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My high school students are not negatively influenced by ‘Dixie’ because they’re enveloped in other things.” <em>(In-State)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Kids here have never had an issue with the name. Schools in East Las Vegas with more diverse student bodies would likely have an issue with this name though.” <em>(Out-of-State)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’d say that at the end of the day prospective students don’t care about ‘Dixie’, but their parents do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Nobody really knows about ‘Dixie’ and the negative connotations around it. If all the students knew what I knew, then I think we would be in trouble and that would be very hard to defend.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both diversity officers and athletic governing body representatives agreed that ‘Dixie’ either
does exclude or may exclude prospective students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews)</th>
<th>Welcoming Nature &amp; Inclusivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USHE Diversity Officers</td>
<td>Diversity officers who were interviewed unanimously agree that ‘Dixie’ is not inclusive and welcoming of all groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Dixie’ currently has no bearing on the university’s inclusion in athletic conferences, but there is relatable precedence within higher education and athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Governing Body</td>
<td>“I’m an alum too and I want a school that is inclusive. Maintaining the name ‘Dixie’ isolates and sends a message of exclusiveness.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;By not changing the name, that speaks to the university trying to uphold some of their history whether consciously or unconsciously, which will dictate who decides to attend or work there.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brand
Looking at general brand recognition alone, the populations outside of Southwestern Utah see a relatively strong negative impact from the inclusion of the word ‘Dixie’

**Question** | Impact on General Brand Recognition if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name by Geography

### GENERAL BRAND RECOGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Geography</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Utah</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Utah</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

By General Population (SW Utah, n=313  | Greater Utah, n=297  | Out-of-State, n=791)
Non-white and African Americans see the most downside for brand recognition in keeping ‘Dixie’ in the name, but there is still a relatively large group that sees no impact or a positive impact.

**Question** | Impact on General Brand Recognition if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name by Race/Ethnicity

### GENERAL BRAND RECOGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I can’t imagine people of color being willing to consider the university after seeing those photos.”

- Prospective Faculty
As seen with other factors, out-of-state, recent alums see the greatest potential for negative impact on brand recognition, whereas older, in-state alums see the largest upside on recognition.

**Question** | Impact on **General Brand Recognition** if ‘Dixie’ is **kept** in the Name Among Alumni

**GENERAL BRAND RECOGNITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th><strong>Out-of-State</strong></th>
<th><strong>In-State</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a 27% difference between recent out-of-state alumni and older in-state alumni.

**Q35:** If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

*By Specific Populations (Recent: Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376 | Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739)
Current students are split on the impact of ‘Dixie’ on brand recognition, while faculty and staff feel strongly that keeping ‘Dixie’ will have a more negative impact on brand recognition.

**Question** | Impact on General Brand Recognition if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among On-Campus Populations

**GENERAL BRAND RECOGNITION**

**On-Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54% Negative Impact</td>
<td>36% Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Positive Impact</td>
<td>38% Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% No Impact</td>
<td>26% No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“**I have been asked if DSU was all white. I have been asked why we would name ourselves after a name connected with the confederacy and slavery.**”

- Current Faculty

“**I don’t put a negative connotation on the word Dixie. To me Dixie symbolizes freedom, perseverance, hard work, and overcoming.**”

- Current Student

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376 | Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739)
The majority of those in Southwestern Utah see positive impact on in-state brand appeal if ‘Dixie’ is kept, and those in greater Utah feel similarly, albeit with more tempered expectations.

**Question | Impact on In-State Brand Appeal if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name by Geography**

**IN-STATE BRAND APPEAL**

“We want our school to be representative of our region, and not to be rebranded to meet another person’s needs.”

-Government Official (Southwestern Utah)
Alumni and staff living in Utah see limited downside to keeping ‘Dixie’ in the school’s name on in-state brand appeal, with most actually seeing a positive impact on brand appeal within Utah.

**Question** | Impact on In-State Brand Appeal if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Alumni and On-Campus Populations

**IN-STATE BRAND APPEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recent</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Only</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

*By Specific Populations (Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376 | Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739)*
On the other hand, there are strong concerns about the long-term brand appeal outside of Utah if ‘Dixie’ is retained, particularly among recent graduates who are living outside of Utah.

**Question** | Impact on Out-of-State Brand Appeal if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Alumni and by Geography

**Out-of-State BRAND APPEAL**

- **Alumni**
  - Recent
    - Negative Impact: 9%
    - No Impact: 24%
    - Positive Impact: 67%
  - Out-of-State Only
    - Negative Impact: 20%
    - No Impact: 33%
    - Positive Impact: 47%
  - Older
    - Negative Impact: 15%
    - No Impact: 19%
    - Positive Impact: 66%

“A lot of the college students and faculty members the University may want to recruit would be hesitant to even look into it; to even consider coming to that school because it’s called ‘Dixie’.”

- Community Leader

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?  
By Specific Population & Geography (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Out-of-State, n=791)
The general population outside the state of Utah is relatively uncomfortable wearing ‘Dixie’ branded apparel, while those in Southwestern Utah are more comfortable.

**Question | Comfortability Wearing ‘Dixie’ Branded Apparel by Geography**

- **Southwestern Utah**: 71% Uncomfortable, 12% Neutral, 17% Comfortable
- **Greater Utah**: 44% Uncomfortable, 18% Neutral, 38% Comfortable
- **Out-of-State**: 29% Uncomfortable, 19% Neutral, 52% Comfortable

Moving from Southwestern Utah to Out-of-State responses there is a 35% difference.

“I wouldn’t wear the word ‘Dixie’ outside of the region because I want avoid negative perceptions of who I am and what I represent. Also, it would just be insensitive to others in my opinion.”

- Major Employer

**QA43: How comfortable would you feel wearing clothing and other items (bags, hats, etc.) with the term ‘Dixie’ embroidered or printed on them when you are outside of Utah?**

By General Population (Southwestern Utah, n=313 | Greater Utah, n=297 | Out-of-State, n=791)
About half of white people and a third of African Americans are comfortable wearing clothing with the term ‘Dixie’ on it when they are outside of Utah.

**Question** | Comfortability Wearing ‘Dixie’ Branded Apparel by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Only</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*My children are people of color. They currently attend Dixie because this is where they can afford to attend. They enjoy much of the academics here, but they definitely refer to the school as DSU and not as Dixie.*”

-Current Faculty
In-state, older alums are the most comfortable wearing ‘Dixie’ items, while faculty and staff are less comfortable wearing ‘Dixie’ clothing when outside of Utah.

**Question** | Comfortability Wearing ‘Dixie’ Branded Apparel Among Alumni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recent</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older</strong></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty &amp; Staff</strong></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Students</strong></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific Populations:**  
- Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58  
- Recent In-State Alumni, n=316  
- Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93  
- Older In-State Alumni, n=376  
- In-State Prospective Students, n=164  
- Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=157  
- Faculty & Staff, n=298  
- Current Student, n=739
About a third of out-of-state prospective students and a quarter of in-state prospective students would be uncomfortable wearing ‘Dixie’ branded apparel.

**Question** | Comfortability Wearing ‘Dixie’ Branded Apparel Among Prospective Students, and On-Campus Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective Students</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-State</strong></td>
<td><strong>In-State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45% Uncomfortable</td>
<td>59% Comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Neutral</td>
<td>15% Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% Comfortable</td>
<td>26% Comfortable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q43: How comfortable would you feel wearing clothing and other items (bags, hats, etc.) with the term ‘Dixie’ embroidered or printed on them when you are outside of Utah?

By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376 | In-State Prospective Students, n=165 | Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=157 | Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Student, n=739)
Confusion about the university’s location due to the name ‘Dixie’ were commonplace remarks from all stakeholder groups that were not previously familiar with the university.

Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews) | Brand

**WAC Athletic Competitors**

The perceptions are nuanced among athletic directors and SWAs, but all agreed the name is not ideal from an athletic branding and recognition perspective.

Currently ‘Dixie’ has not been excluded from many retailers. The licensing partner called-out this could change quickly change with one single event.

“As a branding piece I’m imagining Dixie State going out-of-state and their competitors being confused about the university’s location. Personally, I think that in specific areas people will not like this name.”

**DSU Licensing Partner**

“The largest risk is if an event occurs and tarnishes the word ‘Dixie’ on a national level. They’ll most likely lose support from more retail locations.”
Support
Nearly 50% of faculty and staff believe keeping ‘Dixie’ in the institution’s name will have a negative impact on the school’s ability to obtain grants, donations, and partnerships.

**Question** | Impact on Seeking Grants, Corporate Donations, and Partnerships if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Faculty & Staff

SEEKING GRANTS, CORPORATE DONATIONS, AND PARTNERSHIPS

Nearly 50% of faculty and staff believe keeping ‘Dixie’ in the institution’s name will have a negative impact on the school’s ability to obtain grants, donations, and partnerships.

**Faculty & Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Seeking Grants, Corporate Donations, and Partnerships</th>
<th>if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“For me, one of our biggest risks with this name is our ability to acquire resources – grants from foundations and other sources.”

- Current Faculty

“In the national market, the ‘Dixie’ name hurts. In 2016 we went out for a bond for student housing and several large investment banks dropped out because they didn’t want the name as part of their investments.”

- Current Faculty
Among those who donate to scholarships funds, if ‘Dixie’ is removed, older alumni are most likely to consider reducing donations while faculty/staff say it would have no impact.

**Question** | Impact on Individual Donation to Scholarship Funds if ‘Dixie’ is Removed from the Name Among Faculty & Staff and Alumni

### Alumni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Recent</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Will Do Less of This</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Will Do More of This</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“I hate to say that I would stop helping the university. I’d stop going to theater and sporting events.”**

-Alumni

**“The locals were mad when they removed the Confederate flag, but they got over it and moved on, which I think would also happen with a name change.”**

-Alumni

**“I’m a current donor in both time and money – if they change the name, it will not affect my contributions(s).”**

-Board of Trustees

---

Q40: If the word ‘Dixie’ is removed from the university’s name, in what ways would that impact how you interact with the university?

By Specific Populations (Recent Alumni, n=38 | Older Alumni, n=63 | Faculty & Staff, n=73)
The majority of residents in Southwestern Utah see the potential for reduced local and statewide support if ‘Dixie’ is removed from the name, while residents in greater Utah are less sure.

**Question** | Impact on Local & Statewide Support if ‘Dixie’ is Removed from the Name by Geography

**LOCAL AND STATE SUPPORT**

Southwestern Utah

- Negative Impact: 71%
- No Impact: 18%
- Positive Impact: 11%

Greater Utah

- Negative Impact: 40%
- No Impact: 31%
- Positive Impact: 29%
All Southwestern Utah interviewees stated a loss of community support is possible if ‘Dixie’ is removed from the university’s name; often this was cited as the largest risk to a change

**Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews) | Community Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Leaders</th>
<th>Government Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local leaders are split in their opinions, but all recognize there may be a large loss of community support if the name is changed.</td>
<td>“As a business leader who needs a lot of donorship I recognize how fickle it is and I see a large issue with making a name change. Currently you still have a lot of donors who connect with the name strongly. I don’t think it’s time to make the name change now for that reason.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All regional officials cited the local community as a key element to their decision-making process.</td>
<td>“There needs to be a lot of community inclusion. It’s about getting community leaders and trustees leading this push instead of the university itself.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “Here’s what I’ll be asking if this hits the floor. Where’s the community on this issue? Is the USBHE going to be a player in this? This isn’t going anywhere unless there is community support.” | }
Generally, donor interviewees place student achievement and well-being in front of their feelings about the name. Foundation donors took greater pause to the retention of ‘Dixie’

Key Learnings From Qualitative Research (interviews)  |  Financial Support

**Corporates Donors & Athletic Sponsors**

Among donor interviewees the majority stated the name does not personally affect their donor status. Common reasons being that students come first, and the community’s response are what matters.

There is a common thread that the university’s history is at odds with the mission & vision of many Utah based foundations.

“*The decision to keep or change the name doesn’t have any bearing on our donation status. The only possibility of a shift is if people speak out against the name in masses.*”

“Our contributions are more about filling the stands so that people will actually see our advertising. But if the name changes, and the community is negative about that, I’m not sure we would want to participate.”

**Foundation Donors**

“The decision to keep or change the name doesn’t have any bearing on our donation status. The only possibility of a shift is if people speak out against the name in masses.”

“Our contributions are more about filling the stands so that people will actually see our advertising. But if the name changes, and the community is negative about that, I’m not sure we would want to participate.”

“As a foundation that is trying to desperately help communities regarding diversity and belonging, keeping this name would be a critical stumbling block to us considering a gift.”
Name Recommendation
Amongst locals, the general population mostly prefers that DSU should retain its ‘Dixie’ name, but nearly half of Faculty and Staff think the University should remove ‘Dixie’ from its name.

**Question** | Should DSU Keep or Remove the Word ‘Dixie’ in its Name Among Local Populations

---

**General Population Southwestern Utah**

- Absolutely Change: 5% (Pre) / 7% (Post)
- Probably Change: 6% (Pre) / 9% (Post)
- Indifferent: 10% (Pre) / 9% (Post)
- Probably Keep: 18% (Pre) / 14% (Post)
- Absolutely Keep: 61% (Pre) / 61% (Post)

**Current Students**

- Absolutely Change: 11% (Pre) / 17% (Post)
- Probably Change: 12% (Pre) / 12% (Post)
- Indifferent: 13% (Pre) / 9% (Post)
- Probably Keep: 14% (Pre) / 12% (Post)
- Absolutely Keep: 50% (Pre) / 50% (Post)

**Faculty & Staff**

- Absolutely Change: 27% (Pre) / 31% (Post)
- Probably Change: 20% (Pre) / 17% (Post)
- Indifferent: 13% (Pre) / 11% (Post)
- Probably Keep: 13% (Pre) / 11% (Post)
- Absolutely Keep: 27% (Pre) / 30% (Post)

---

"The pioneer heritage is near and dear to our hearts here, and that’s what the Dixie name represents."
- Major Employer

“I do not go to schools because of their old history, I go because it’s cheap and it can get me my degree.”
- Current Student

“Dixie State University’s name has to be consistent with the messaging of its offerings. It’s growing and opening itself out into the world and the word ‘Dixie’ is anachronistic for the university.”
- Government Official (Southwestern Utah)
Amongst Utah residents, recent DSU graduates are most likely to believe the University should remove ‘Dixie’ from its name.

**Question** | Should DSU Keep or Remove the Word ‘Dixie’ in its Name Among Additional In-State Populations

---

“In my daughter was uncomfortable being affiliated with ‘Dixie’ when she went out for graduate school interviews - they assumed it was in the South and asked if it was an ‘all white’ school.”

- National Advisory Council Member

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
<th>Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State Older Alumni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Change</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Change</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Keep</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| In-State Recent Alumni                   |                                           |
| Absolutely Change                        | 12%                                       |
| Probably Change                          | 12%                                       |
| Indifferent                              | 10%                                       |
| Absolutely Keep                          | 14%                                       |

| In-State Prospective Students            |                                           |
| Absolutely Change                        | 8%                                        |
| Probably Change                          | 12%                                       |
| Indifferent                              | 20%                                       |
| Absolutely Keep                          | 12%                                       |

| Greater Utah                             |                                           |
| Absolutely Change                        | 7%                                        |
| Probably Change                          | 14%                                       |
| Indifferent                              | 7%                                        |
| Absolutely Keep                          | 14%                                       |

---

Q26/37: Do you think the Utah State Legislature should vote to keep the word ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name, or remove the word ‘Dixie’ from its name and consider a different name for the university? By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376)
Amongst out-of-state alumni, recent graduates are far more likely to believe the University should remove ‘Dixie’ from its name than those who graduated more than ten years ago

**Question** | Should DSU Keep or Remove the Word ‘Dixie’ in its Name Among Additional Out-of-State Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-State Older Alumni</th>
<th>Out-of-State Recent Alumni</th>
<th>Out-of-State Prospective Students</th>
<th>Out-of-State General Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Change</td>
<td>15% 16%</td>
<td>29% 31%</td>
<td>8% 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Change</td>
<td>2% 9%</td>
<td>9% 9%</td>
<td>9% 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>9% 6%</td>
<td>13% 10%</td>
<td>27% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably Keep</td>
<td>14% 8%</td>
<td>16% 19%</td>
<td>18% 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Keep</td>
<td>Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</td>
<td>Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question 26/37: Do you think the Utah State Legislature should vote to keep the word ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name, or remove the word ‘Dixie’ from its name and consider a different name for the university?*

By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=157 | Out-of-State, n=791)
African Americans stand apart as being the most in favor of removing ‘Dixie’ from the University’s name.

**Question | Should DSU Keep or Remove the Word ‘Dixie’ in its Name by Race/Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Absolutely Change</th>
<th>Probably Change</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Probably Keep</th>
<th>Absolutely Keep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-White</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African American</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

“Considering my background, Dixie state just does not sound like a school that would be a relatable place for me.”
-Prospective Student, In-State

“There is nothing wrong with the word Dixie.”
-Current Student

Q26/37: Do you think the Utah State Legislature should vote to keep the word ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name, or remove the word ‘Dixie’ from its name and consider a different name for the university?

By Race/Ethnicity (White, n=2,841 | Non-White, n=526 | African American Only, n=56)
Those outside of Utah who have low familiarity with DSU start largely indifferent, but become relatively more compelled to change the name after evaluating various perspectives on the topic.

**Question** | Should DSU Keep or Remove the Word ‘Dixie’ in its Name Among Specialty Low Familiarity Populations

**Out-of-State (Low Familiarity*)**

Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

- Absolutely Keep: 16%
- Probably Keep: 38%
- Indifferent: 15%
- Probably Change: 21%
- Absolutely Change: 27%

Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

- Absolutely Keep: 16%
- Probably Keep: 38%
- Indifferent: 15%
- Probably Change: 21%
- Absolutely Change: 27%

+6% in favor of keeping the name after seeing various perspectives on the name

+17% in favor of changing the name after seeing various perspectives on the name

**Out-of-State Prospective Students (Low Familiarity*)**

Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

- Absolutely Keep: 15%
- Probably Keep: 24%
- Indifferent: 24%
- Probably Change: 26%
- Absolutely Change: 13%

Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

- Absolutely Keep: 15%
- Probably Keep: 24%
- Indifferent: 24%
- Probably Change: 26%
- Absolutely Change: 13%

+7% in favor of keeping the name after seeing various perspectives on the name

+21% in favor of changing the name after seeing various perspectives on the name

---

*Low Familiarity* is defined as the respondents who selected “I have never heard of this university (1)” or “I have heard of the university, but I do not know anything about it (2)”

Q26/37: Do you think the Utah State Legislature should vote to keep the word ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name, or remove the word ‘Dixie’ from its name and consider a different name for the university?

Low Familiarity, (Gen Pop Greater United States, n=670 | Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=46)
Perspectives
Within the survey, populations were exposed to several perspectives both supporting the use of the term ‘Dixie’ and raising potential issues with the term

Legend Level-Setting | Perspectives At-A-Glance

Perspectives of Support

**Dixie Spirit & Pride**
“The definition of the word ‘Dixie’ is different in Southwestern Utah than the rest of the United States. The term ‘Dixie’ is connected to the region’s original pioneering cotton mission in 1857. Today, the word ‘Dixie’ commemorates and remembers the rich past of sacrifice, determination, and generosity cultivated by those pioneers who settled the land. Those who take offense to the use of the word ‘Dixie’ in this region simply do not understand its unique history and once educated, they will come to understand how important this term is to the region.”

**Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect**
“If the University considers removing the word ‘Dixie’ from its name, it would be bending to the political trends and social pressure coming from outside the region. Some fear that if ‘Dixie’ is removed from the University’s name the effects may ripple into the greater community by signaling that the entire region should be compelled to change its name and identity, private businesses should change their names, and the historic ‘D’ on the hill should be removed, among other changes to the heritage of the region.”

**Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken**
“Over the last decade Dixie State University has undergone tremendous growth. In 2013 the institution achieved University status. Since 2015, enrollment has increased from 8,500 to over 12,000 students, representing substantial growth. The University has entered the national stage in intercollegiate athletics by transitioning to Division I status and joining the Western Athletic Conference. The University is flourishing and is now more diverse than it has been at any other point in its 100+ year history. All these successes indicate that the ‘Dixie’ name may not be a significant deterrent to growth and progress, and therefore, the word ‘Dixie’ need not be removed from the name of the University.”

Perspectives of Issue

**Not Regional Anymore**
“As Dixie State University steps onto the national stage and commits to fulfill its mission as an open-education, inclusive, STEM-focused institution that has joined Division I athletics for the first time in its history, the university should consider its national audience for whom the word ‘Dixie’ has a range of meanings and connotations. The word ‘Dixie’ is problematic and will limit the institution’s ability to attract and retain faculty, staff, students, student-athletes, grants, donations, and partnerships from outside regions where the university’s name and its origins are not well known.”

**Cannot Hide From The Past**
“It is documented that the University’s ‘Dixie’ name was associated with the Confederate South because of the University’s history in naming its yearbook ‘The Confederate’, having a mascot named ‘Rodney The Rebel’, designating the Confederate flag as the official flag of the college, hosting an annual ‘mock’ slave auction and slave day, among other examples. While these examples took place at various times between 1952-2009, they are still easily referenced and found on the internet. Keeping the name not only invites searches for this information, it has in the past, and may in the future turn away prospective students, faculty, staff, and donors who may perceive that by keeping the name ‘Dixie’, the institution does not renounce those past actions and associations.”

**Obstacles Are Increasing**
“Regardless of what ‘Dixie’ may mean in the historical context of Southwest Utah where the University is located, the word ‘Dixie’ is often associated with slavery and racism in other places. Additionally, it is not feasible to educate prospective students, faculty, staff, potential employers, and many others across the United States about the region’s local interpretation of the word ‘Dixie’. Problematic trends will likely grow over time, such as recent alumni not receiving equal job consideration when entering the workforce for having ‘Dixie’ on their resume, third-party organizations declining to bid on work for the University due to the ‘Dixie’ name, retailers refusing to carry Dixie State University branded apparel, among other issues.”
In Southwestern Utah, the idea of pride and support for the history of the region resonates strongly, while people outside of Utah are most likely to have concerns around DSU’s past.

**Question | To What Degree Do These Perspectives Resonate with You by Geography**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Perspectives</th>
<th>Issue Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Spirit &amp; Pride</td>
<td>Not Regional Anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect</td>
<td>Cannot Hide From The Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken</td>
<td>Obstacles Are Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"This rugged pioneer spirit with these genuine hearts. I’ve talked to my constituents a lot and it’s about the ethos of the pioneer spirit.”

- Government Official

"Even if the university was not founded on the beliefs of the Southern Confederacy, they still built their image using pictures of men in chains and Civil War scenes in the past. Therefore, they to me represent, a throwback to the meaning of the word ‘Dixie’ and it should be removed from their name.”

- Out-of-State General Population

*The percentage of those with whom is resonates was determined by those who selected “Agree (4)” or “Strongly Agree (5)”

Q26_1-Q31_r1: The above perspective resonates with me

By General Population (SW Utah, n=313 | Greater Utah, n=297 | Out-of-State, n=791)
African Americans align much more with the ‘issue’ perspectives, white people see more merit in the ‘support’ perspectives, and non-white people see merit on both sides.

**Question | To What Degree Do These Perspectives Resonate with You by Race/Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Perspectives</th>
<th>Issue Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Spirit &amp; Pride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“*The percentage of those with whom resonates was determined by those who selected “Agree (4)” or “Strongly Agree (5)”*

Q26.1-Q31.1: The above perspective resonates with me

By Race/Ethnicity (White n=2,841 | Non-White, n=526 | African American Only, n=56)

---

**Support Perspectives**

- **Dixie Spirit & Pride**
  - 27% African American
  - 46% Non-White
  - 57% White

- **Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect**
  - 34% African American
  - 45% Non-White
  - 53% White

- **Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken**
  - 32% African American
  - 50% Non-White
  - 59% White

**Issue Perspectives**

- **Not Regional Anymore**
  - 55% African American
  - 42% Non-White
  - 36% White

- **Cannot Hide From The Past**
  - 61% African American
  - 47% Non-White
  - 42% White

- **Obstacles Are Increasing**
  - 63% African American
  - 43% Non-White
  - 37% White

---

- “If the legislature removes Dixie from the University’s name, it will be in a leadership position and may encourage local businesses to make the same change.”
  - Southwestern Utah Resident

- “Those photos - ‘tasteless’ is not even the right word. Those photos put in my head what I already assumed when I heard the name of the school.”
  - Athletic Governing Body
In-state prospective students are more concerned with a ‘snowball’ effect and more in favor of other support perspectives; out-of-state prospects recognize future obstacles.

**Question** | To What Degree Do These Perspectives Resonate with You Among Prospective Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Perspectives</th>
<th>Issue Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Spirit &amp; Pride</td>
<td>Not Regional Anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect</td>
<td>Cannot Hide From The Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken</td>
<td>Obstacles Are Increasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage of those with whom it resonates was determined by those who selected “Agree (4)” or “Strongly Agree (5)”

Q26_1-Q31_r1: The above perspective resonates with me

By Specific Populations (Out-of-State Prospective Students, n=157 | In State Prospective Students, n=164)

---

"The name has not been a problem, but moving forward, I think it will be. The Seniors are very in-tune with the things they are hearing, especially with social media, and sometimes they pick up things about Dixie on social media."

- High School Counselor, UT

"It might make me think that the university is insensitive to the history of this country and the association of the word Dixie."

- Prospective Student Out-of-State

---

*Confidential: 71*
Current students and faculty/staff see merit in both sets of perspectives, but faculty and staff are more concerned with expansion outside of the region and future obstacles.

**Question | To What Degree Do These Perspectives Resonate with You Among On-Campus Populations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Perspectives</th>
<th>Issue Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Spirit &amp; Pride</td>
<td>Not Regional Anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect</td>
<td>Cannot Hide From The Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken</td>
<td>Obstacles Are Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken” is resonating with 60% of the current student population, while “Dixie Spirit & Pride” resonates with 55% of the faculty and staff. However, “Obstacles Are Increasing” is resonating with 35% of the current student population, while “Not Regional Anymore” resonates with 32% of the faculty and staff.

*The percentage of those with whom is resonates was determined by those who selected “Agree (4)” or “Strongly Agree (5)”.*

Q26_1-Q31_r1: The above perspective resonates with me

**By Specific Population (Faculty & Staff, n=298 | Current Students, n=739)**

“*The word ‘Dixie’ is at odds with the word ‘polytechnic’. Dixie connotes that it’s non-technical university rooted in the past and that’s powerful to me.”* - Academic Peer

“The conversation will never stop. You either address it or continue to deal with the ramifications of having the Dixie name. I think the fallout will only get worse - at some point you have to bite the bullet.” - WAC Athletic Director
Whether in Utah or outside of Utah, older alumni see merit in the perspectives for keeping the name, but out-of-state are much more likely to see reasons for concern.

**Question** | To What Degree Do These Perspectives Resonate with You Among Alumni*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Perspectives</th>
<th>Issue Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Spirit &amp; Pride</td>
<td>Not Regional Anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fear of a ‘Snowball’ Effect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cannot Hide From The Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Don’t Fix What Isn’t Broken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obstacles Are Increasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage of those with whom it resonates was determined by those who selected “Agree (4)” or “Strongly Agree (5)”

Q26_1-Q31_r1: The above perspective resonates with me

By Specific Populations (Recent Out-of-State Alumni, n=58 | Recent In-State Alumni, n=316 | Older Out-of-State Alumni, n=93 | Older In-State Alumni, n=376)

“I’m currently in the South and do not tell people that I have graduated from DSU because of the implications that Dixie has. I grew up in St. George so it’s not like I am unfamiliar with the people or the stories surrounding the name.”

- Alumni, Out-of-State
Thank You
Appendix: Supplementary Data
The ‘Dixie’ name has sizeable, positive and negative effects on all brand equity contributors – the name of a brand rarely has significant effect in either direction.

Executive Summary | Brand Equity and the ‘Dixie’ Name

**Brand Loyalty**
Does the brand reduce marketing spend? Does the brand attract new customers?

**Brand Awareness**
When visible does the brand create positive awareness? Are consumers attracted to the brand when familiar?

**Brand Associations**
Is the brand positively associated with other things? How do associations with the brand position it?

**Perceived Quality**
How does the brand influence reputation? How does the brand impact perceived quality?

The ‘Dixie’ name can contribute positively to brand equity, most notably in Southwestern Utah i.e. ‘Dixie’ is strongly associated with the region, brings positive awareness, and is generally attractive to those who are familiar with the school, or with Southwestern Utah.

The ‘Dixie’ name contributes negatively to brand equity for many, especially outside of Southwestern Utah where ‘Dixie’ is associated with the American South and the Confederacy, can bring very negative awareness, and is unappealing or distasteful to many.

Content borrows from David Aaker’s work on branding and the Aaker Brand Vision Model
Out-of-State alumni believe the word ‘Dixie’ harbors negative connotations and will negatively affect the university’s reputation at a higher rate than in-state alumni.

**Question** | Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Alumni

**REPUTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Alumni</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th>In-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits’ students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

By Specific Populations (Out-of-State Alumni, n=161 | In-State Alumni, n=692)
A more pronounced trend occurs regarding brand recognition if the word ‘Dixie’ is retained in the university’s name.

**Question** | Impact on Dixie State’s **Brand Recognition** if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name Among Alumni

**GENERAL BRAND RECOGNITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th>In-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-State Alumni, n=161</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-State Alumni, n=692</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

By Specific Populations (Out-of-State Alumni, n=161 | In-State Alumni, n=692)
Out-of-State alumni are more likely to feel uncomfortable wearing ‘Dixie’ branded apparel than in-state alumni

Question | Comfortability Wearing ‘Dixie’ Branded Apparel Among Alumni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRAND COMFORT</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42: How comfortable would you feel wearing clothing and other items (bags, hats, etc.) with the term ‘Dixie’ embroidered or printed on them when you are outside of Utah?

By Specific Populations (Out-of-State Alumni, n=161 | In-State Alumni, n=692)
Removing the word ‘Dixie’ from the university’s name will negatively impact in-state parents’ willingness to pay tuition

**Question | Impact on Tuition Payment if ‘Dixie’ is Removed in the Name Among In-State Parents**

**TUITION**

Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prospective In-State*</th>
<th>Current In-State*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Will Do Less of This</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Will Do More of This</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out-of-State Parents were not included within the scope of work.

Q40: If the word ‘Dixie’ is removed from the university’s name, in what ways would that impact how you interact with the university?

By Specific Populations (Prospective In-State Parents, n=84 Current In-State Parents, n=102)
Methodology Deep Dive

‘Dixie’ Name Perceptions Survey

Faculty & Staff, Current Students, Prospective Students, and Alumni
The above populations were all provided directly by Dixie State University in late September 2020. Invitations to complete the survey were randomly distributed to each population until sufficient sample sizes were reached allowing for sub-population analyses of results. Responses recorded for each population were as follows: faculty & staff n=298, current students n=791, prospective students, n=321, and alumni, n=843. Within the presentation’s results these populations are segmented into more granular sub-sections for a nuanced understanding of the impacts and implications surrounding the continued use of the word ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name. Prospective students were specifically targeted within the university’s growth regions (e.g. Clark County, NV, Maricopa County, AZ, San Bernardino County, CA etc.). Additionally, prospective students were defined as those who had previously expressed interest in post-secondary education.

General Population (Southwestern Utah, Greater Utah, Out-of-State)
The three above populations’ perspectives were collected through a partnership with a global online market research firm. In total, there were 1,402 ‘general population’ responses included within the final report. These responses are segmented by geographic location (Southwestern Utah, Greater Utah, out-of-state) throughout the final report. Southwestern Utah is defined as respondents who live within the Utah counties of Washington, Kane, Iron and Garfield. Out-of-State responses followed a similar methodology as prospective out-of-state students by specifically targeting university growth regions (e.g. Clark County, NV, Maricopa County, AZ, San Bernardino County, CA etc.)

Survey Perceptions Section and Randomization
Within the survey there are a total of six commonplace perceptions; ‘For’ (3) and ‘Against’ (3) changing the university’s name. Each of these were presented in random order for all survey participants to ensure one perception does not influence the overall outcome of results. Moreover, these perceptions were formulated after one-hundred and two in-depth interviews and eight focus groups were conducted to ensure that the correct perspectives were being shared.

Focus Groups & In-Depth Interviews

Focus Groups | Faculty & Staff, Current Students, and Coalition Groups
Coalition participants were selected by each advocacy groups’ leadership. On-campus population participants were randomly selected through an internally provided list by Dixie State University’s Cabinet. Invitees for both faculty and staff and current students were intentionally invited by both department and gender to best provide parity when possible. In total there were eight focus groups conducted: faculty and staff, n=3, current students, n=3, and coalition groups, n=2.

In-Depth Interviews | Community, Donors & Sponsors, Gov. & Administration, Affiliations, Academia, and Recruitment
In total there were twenty-two discrete stakeholder groups interviewed. Lists of stakeholder groups were provided by Dixie State University. Invitees in every group were invited with the intention of parity by gender and age when possible (e.g. Alumni were invited by their respective graduation decade to provide a wide range of perspectives amongst this sub-population). In total there were 102 in-depth interviews conducted: community n=25, donors & sponsors n=10, government & administration n=29, affiliations n=9, academia n=17, recruitment n=12.

In-Depth Interview & Focus Groups | Perspective and Risk Alternating
In preparation for interviews, Cicero Group created a script to ensure objectivity and a consistent presentation across all interviewee and focus group participants. As a part of the interview, common perspectives for and against a name change and photos associated with those argument were shared among all participants. The order of these common perspectives were switched between interviews to introduce information and concepts in a randomized manner. Moreover, interviewees were asked about common risks to consider, which was also alternated between interviews.
Q35: If Dixie State University keeps the word ‘Dixie’ in its name as it continues to grow, recruits’ students from within and outside the region, competes in Division I athletics, and works to attract and retain top faculty and staff, what impact do you expect the ‘Dixie’ name to have on the following factors in the future?

**Question** | Impact on Dixie State’s Reputation if ‘Dixie’ is Kept in the Name by Age

**REPUTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 Years Old</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 Years Old</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 Years Old</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Years Old</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When combining all survey populations, compared with geographic location, age is less correlated with perceived impact on reputation.
All age categories are slightly more persuaded by the ‘change the name’ perspectives than the ‘keep the name’ perspectives

**Question | Should Keep or Remove the Word ‘Dixie’ from its’ Name by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Absolutely Change</th>
<th>Probably Change</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Probably Keep</th>
<th>Absolutely Keep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 Years Old</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 Years Old</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 Years Old</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Years Old</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Absolutely Change</th>
<th>Probably Change</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Probably Keep</th>
<th>Absolutely Keep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 Years Old</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 Years Old</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 Years Old</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Years Old</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Exposure to ‘Dixie’ Term Perspectives

---

Q26/37: Do you think the Utah State Legislature should vote to keep the word ‘Dixie’ in the university’s name, or remove the word ‘Dixie’ from its name and consider a different name for the university?

By Age (15-24, n=914 | 25-44, n=823 | 45-64, n=656 | 65+, n=843)
Among all research participants, age 65+ are the most likely to be ‘uncomfortable’ wearing apparel which includes the word ‘Dixie’

**Question** | Comfortability Wearing ‘Dixie’ Branded Apparel by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24 Years Old</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 Years Old</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 Years Old</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Years Old</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42: How comfortable would you feel wearing clothing and other items (bags, hats, etc.) with the term ‘Dixie’ embroidered or printed on them when you are outside of Utah?
By Age (15-24, n=914  |  25-44, n=823  |  45-64, n=656  |  65+, n=843)
Campus Safety Baseline Report

S.B. 80, Campus Safety Amendments, requires the Utah Board of Higher Education to study and make recommendations for providing public safety services on college and university campuses. The study and any recommendations are due on or before the November 2021 Education Interim Legislative Committee meeting. The Office of the Commissioner commissioned an outside consulting firm, Cicero Group, to begin a baseline analysis of the public safety organization, policies, relationships, and processes at all sixteen Utah System of Higher Education institutions. Institutions individually participated in interview sessions from August–October. Over the past two months, Cicero Group met with the campus safety team at each of the 16 higher education institutions. While each campus safety team looks different at each institution, common roles include Director of Campus Safety/Security, Campus Chief of Police, Director of Emergency Management, Title IX Coordinator, and Vice President of Student Services. Additionally, specialists interviewed the Chief Diversity Officers at USHE institutions as well as students from several institutions.

The objectives of this analysis are:

1. Document and contextualize the campus security structure for each USHE institution.
2. Identify key points of transition and coordination for each campus, including incident response and dispatch procedures.
3. Identify the benefits of an institution employing campus law enforcement, and examine best practices/current priorities at other institutions.

In each interview, the campus safety teams were asked to detail their policies and procedures relating to campus safety. The four key areas of discussion included:

- Operating and communication structures
- Law enforcement and security presence
- Incident reporting and response
- Hiring, onboarding, and training

Attached is a summary and expanded analysis of the key findings. In addition, information regarding each institution’s organization, processes, and information flow are included.
**Commissioner’s Recommendation**

The Commissioner recommends that the Student Affairs Committee, together with his staff and other student affairs and diversity leadership at USHE institutions, review the Campus Safety Baseline Report with institution public safety chiefs and officers to identify the major policies and strategies to address the findings in this report in relation to S.B. 80, *Campus Safety Amendments*. In the near term, the Commissioner recommends public safety chiefs and officers begin meeting regularly under the direction of the Chief Public Safety Officer of the University of Utah, Marlon Lynch, to undergo this review.
Utah System of Higher Education
Campus Safety Baseline Assessment
November 2020
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Study Overview

Background

The Utah Board of Higher Education has been tasked with studying and providing recommendations for public safety services on colleges and university campuses through S.B. 80. To begin this task, USHE collaborated with Cicero Group to conduct a baseline assessment and cataloguing of campus law enforcement policies and procedures.

Objectives

1. Document and contextualize the campus security structure for each of the institutions
2. Identify key points of transition and coordination for each campus, including incident response and dispatch procedures
3. Identify the benefits of an institution employing campus law enforcement, and examine best practices / current priorities at other institutions

Methodology

Over the past two months, Cicero met with the campus safety team at each of the 16 higher education institutions. While the team looks different at each institution, common roles include:

- Director of Campus Safety/Security
- Campus Chief of Police
- Director of Emergency Management
- Title IX Coordinator
- VP of Student Services

In each interview, we asked the campus safety team to detail their policies and procedures relating to campus safety. Our four key areas of discussion included:

- Operating and Communication Structures
- Law Enforcement and Security Presence
- Incident Reporting and Response
- Hiring, Onboarding, and Training
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Key Learnings | Within this baseline report, there are several key insights that need to be kept at the forefront as stakeholders consider future actions

**RESOURCES**
Campus police at each institution support bolder plans and want to do more, but resources are limited and often overburdened

**CONTINGENT DESIRE FOR SYSTEM-WIDE STANDARDS**
Many institutions would appreciate standardization across the system but caveted that those standards need to be supported with funding (e.g. standardized police officer pay, officers per 1000 students).

**FEELING OVERBURDENED AND UNDERSTAFFED**
Most institutions with campus police feel that they are understaffed and overburdened, and have difficulty recruiting officers due to the low pay. Adding more training, reporting requirements, or other requirements will result in less time interacting with and supporting students.

**TRAINING**
Campus police meet training requirements, but completion does not necessarily equate to effectiveness and discretion lends itself to inconsistencies

**ROOM FOR TRAINING COORDINATION / PRIORITIZATION**
While campus police officers are mandated to have 40 hours of training, the type of training provided is up to the discretion of the police chief. The quality and frequency of training can vary greatly.

**D.E.I. A PRIORITY BUT A STRONGER, MORE UNIFIED VISION IS NEEDED**
Most institutions are prioritizing diversity, equity, and inclusion, though each institution is going about it in a different way and campus safety is not always involved.

**STUDENTS**
Improving campus safety will require stakeholders to look beyond campus policing and understand the unique needs of students

**STRONG NETWORKS REQUIRED ACROSS CAMPUS**
In addition to campus policing, campus safety incorporates emergency management, mental and emotional health, victim advocacy, and equity and inclusion, which are all often managed in disparate departments.

**PUTTING STUDENTS FIRST WITH VICTIM ADVOCACY**
Campuses with internal victim advocates are better equipped to meet the unique needs of students – students face a wider array of challenges and more complexity than the general population when incidents occur, lending the need for resources to support victim advocacy.
Campus safety organizations have an appetite for some level of standardization from USHE to create more consistency in terms of resources and funding.

"USHE and the state have no guidance and requirements at the state level for campus safety and security...it’s left up to the institution to decide what the priorities are and what the funding is."
Campus police at each institution support bolder plans and want to do more, but resources are limited and often overburdened.

"We all have a desire to improve... The issue is how do we obtain the funding that we need? We try to keep our campus safe, but we are underfunded."
Campus police meet training requirements, but completion does not necessarily equate to effectiveness and discretion lends itself to inconsistencies.

“The state requires a minimum of 40 hours, but I have complete flexibility [as the Chief of Police] to train how I want. Implicit bias [training] is my personal ethos, for example.”
D.E.I is a priority across institutions, but a stronger, more unified vision is needed.

"With the civil unrest that we are dealing with, our team is working on building relationships and helping students to know that we are listening and supporting the student mission."
Improving campus safety will require stakeholders to look beyond campus policing and understand the unique needs of students.

“Yes, policing is the most impactful part of the public safety…but we can’t use police to fix every problem. We want a mobile team with social workers and emergency medical response that can respond to a number of issues.”
Campuses derive value from in-house victim advocacy solutions as a way to provide better experiences for students.

“"We have an advocate in our office...our advocate has a better understanding of law enforcement, which helps create more trust and continuity across organizations.""
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## Key Learnings | System-wide Vision and Requirements

### Learnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINGENT DESIRE FOR SYSTEM-WIDE STANDARDS</th>
<th>FEELING OVERBURDENED AND UNDERSTAFFED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Institutions with campus police express frustration that the level of funding and support varies so widely across the different institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smaller technical colleges as well as rural universities express the desire for more professional development at the state level. Some leaders are still unsure of their specific responsibilities when it comes to Clery and Title IX.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a desire for some system-wide standards, but others are wary of unfunded mandates from the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many institutions see hiring additional officers or increasing pay as top priorities for campus safety. A major concern for many police chiefs is turnover and the potential need to staff inexperienced officers on a college campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus police often feel overburdened, especially when it comes to juggling law enforcement with administrative responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Even if they have the funding to hire additional officers, the low pay makes it very difficult to recruit high-quality officers, and, again, with the unique student needs, chiefs are hesitant to hire ‘fresh’ recruits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quotes

- “There is no guidance on the state level; it’s left to the institution to define the funding. We need to create uniform USHE-wide standards. We have 0.3 officers per 1,000 students and the U has 1.5. We need a standard here.”

- “Another idea is having a USHE-wide police department. Then you have deputy chiefs on each campus that report up. I see where that could be viable but may not be the preference. If it results in more experience and quality, that is a good thing. Otherwise we just sit and battle to see who can pay the most.”

- “A standardized pay scale [for campus police] across the state would help.”

- “It would be nice if there were some professional development opportunities statewide.”

- “I hope the message comes through that we value good officers who create safe environments...in order to preserve that we need to pay our officers more.”

- “We are severely understaffed. When it comes to safety...everyone wants safety, but nobody is willing to fund it. We try to keep our campus safe, but we are underfunded.”

- “[Recruiting officers] is a nightmare. I would like to see more uniformity in pay. We spend a lot of time recruiting. I don’t even get applications...it is either people I recruit or people that are fired.”
**Key Learnings | Training Variety and Prioritization**

### Learnings

- Police officers are mandated to have 40 hours of training, but the types of training provided are decided by the chief of police.
- Budgetary constraints also affect the types of training provided, especially for rural institutions that need to travel to Salt Lake City or out of state.
- While some training is common across all institutions (e.g., firearms), more specialized training (e.g., racism and bias) is desired, but with the recognition that more training time equates to less time in the field with students.
- Across most institutions, diversity and inclusion is being reviewed and discussed. Many even recognize that it is a priority and additional work needs to be done.
- However, the level of coordination with public safety varies widely across the institutions. In some cases the department of public safety is an integral part of the diversity and inclusion committee, in other cases they have no involvement, and police officer training around racism and bias varies significantly.
- Given the discussions, there is a need for a clearer, more established vision for what success looks like across the system.

### Quotes

“Training is dependent on budget, which is small. We try to get as much specialized training as possible, but I think, for us, we would love to have money to send people to specialized trainings. Racism and bias would be fantastic. Having those trainings would be helpful.”

“Caliber Press is a leading trainer; we had them come to campus several weeks ago to help us with implicit bias and community integration training.”

“40 hours is the bare minimum. I want them to get close to 100 to 200 hours in a year.”

“Financial burden is high; we use online resources to meet needs. Specific training for officers is minimal and it costs a lot of money.”

“We cover diversity and equity [in our training] a lot. We met with the Black Lives Matter group on campus and everything that was asked was already being done. We just focused on showing students what we train on.”

“Our officers get some [racism and bias] training as a part of that 40 hours. There is a video training. We can and/or will get this.”

“I was just made the Diversity Coordinator...it’s brand new for me and for the college. No training or initiatives have been set up for that until now.”

“We have one diversity and inclusion coordinator. She reports to the VP of student services. We have an annual diversity training.”
## Key Learnings | Strong Networks and Victim Advocacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG NETWORKS REQUIRED ACROSS CAMPUS</th>
<th>PUTTING STUDENTS FIRST WITH VICTIM ADVOCACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learnings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quotes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On campuses, it is recognized that campus safety is more than law enforcement; it encompasses emergency and risk management, security, mental and emotional wellbeing, diversity and inclusion, and general community-building.</td>
<td>“Yes, policing is the most impactful part of public safety. But there is also emergency management, security, and community work that all supports the larger puzzle. We can’t use police to fix every problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In order to facilitate this coordination, many institutions have a committee (often called BIT or CARE team) with various stakeholders across the institution, and any potential improvements or recommendations for campus security need to incorporate the fact that each function is in a disparate departments.</td>
<td>“I think it is important that culturally we create a sense of safety. We need to create a culture where if there is something going on, our community knows where to report.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quotes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We have victim advocates stay with the person through different parts of the journey, no matter where they go department wise….Having a victim advocate in house is very helpful; she knows people and helps us stay connected.”</td>
<td>“We provide crisis response and victim advocacy 24/7. We are mobile victim advocates; we go where they are.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “We’re looking to get an office manager hired that can help with victim advocacy. Right now we get them in touch with victim advocates in the community, but we’re not sure what happens after that. I want [a victim advocate] in my office for that reason.” | }
### Key Learnings | External Perspectives | Students and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Leaders

#### Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Perceptions of Campus Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Quotes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus police is preferred to municipal police; negative feelings towards law enforcement are towards police in general, not necessarily the campus police specifically</td>
<td>“Students understanding that they might be responded to by municipal police instead of campus police may effect how likely they are to call in.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is always a need for more personalized relationships with police officers and increased feelings of trust</td>
<td>“Majority of international students like campus police because they help to explain US law and that is helpful”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Desire for more community integration from the police (as civilians, instead of as officers)</td>
<td>“I do have concerns about city police more than campus police. Feel like there is some racial profiling of athletes”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Campus Safety Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Quotes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student leaders are relatively aware of resources and relevant departments, but the average student likely is not aware of resources on campus, how to contact the police, etc.</td>
<td>“Especially lately with the discussion on race; students don’t know where to go and how to fix it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Feelings of Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Quotes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Certain student groups (BIPOC, women, LGBTQ+) may feel less safe on campus</td>
<td>“We have gathered a bunch of stories from women or students of color...there are concerns about not being taken seriously or things getting done”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feelings of safety seem to differ by institution, with unique challenges being faced on different campuses with different geographical layouts</td>
<td>“I would say that when students need help and need to go to police...but they are entering into a police office and see a blue lives matter flag...it’s difficult to even approach the officer for help”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are different levels of safety worth considering based on relationships: student vs. institution, student vs. students, student vs. staff, staff vs. leadership, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Being Heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Quotes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students struggle to feel heard when desired actions are not taken – leadership may “listen” but doesn’t take action</td>
<td>“Sometimes there is a disconnect between being heard and having the action that you want”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Barriers exist to students being heard such as communication fall off in middle management, trust issues, experiences of hate or profiling, etc.</td>
<td>“Sometimes middle level management is the barrier...stuff gets stuck there and not filtered up.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The above content is based off of two focus groups: one with student leaders and one with Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion leadership – additional research needs to be completed to validate each finding and add additional voices*
ELEVATING DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY TO THE CABINET
Many campus safety departments report through business affairs rather than directly to the president; how deep within the organization the department lives can be indicative of its relative importance.

MOVING CLERY ACT OUT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
As long as the Clery Act lives in the department of public safety, it will be treated like a police issue; in reality, the Clery Act requires involvement from a number of different departments.

UNIQUE LEADERSHIP REQUIREMENTS FOR HEAD OF PUBLIC SAFETY
Leaders must be able to navigate complex organizations and build relationships with stakeholders across multiple departments; the traditional skillset of a Chief of Police may not be fit for this role.

STANDARDIZING CAMPUS SAFETY ACROSS THE SYSTEM
Many university systems (e.g., UT System) have system-wide leadership, policies, trainings, reporting procedures, meetings, etc.
Key Learnings | Immediate Next Steps (1 of 2)

1. Improve Collaboration Across USHE Institutions

   • **Outcome:** Elevate the ongoing coordination of public safety activities and resources across all sixteen institutions similar to other system affiliate groups. Utilize this group as a primary voice in addressing campus safety policy issues

   • **Potential Approach:** Commissioner’s Office can leverage resources and expertise systemwide on behalf of the Board under the leadership of the state’s flagship institution by formalizing a shared contract with its Chief Safety Office similar to the Chief Information Officer who commits a percentage of time to the Board

2. Conduct System-wide, Comprehensive Evaluation of Student Perceptions

   • **Outcome:** Clear understanding of student perceptions of campus safety at each institution, including awareness of campus security resources, accessibility of resources, and perceived effectiveness of resources (including resources for mental/emotional safety), to ensure student voices are incorporated into any future campus security initiatives

   • **Potential Approach:** Qualitative and/or quantitative research with students at each institution, emphasizing key student populations such as BIPOC, LGBTQ, DREAMers, and others, and utilizing this report as a foundation and testing what is perceived as happening vs. what is described as happening
Key Learnings | Immediate Next Steps (2 of 2)

Develop USHE Unifying Vision and Mission of Campus Security & Safety

- **Outcome**: A substantive vision for all that should be incorporated into “Campus Safety” that will be used as a foundation to improve consistency across each institution, expand the definition of campus safety and security to more appropriately reflect the broader needs of students, and provide a guiding light for future training priorities, resource allocation, and other strategic initiatives

- **Potential Approach**: USHE and its Board of Higher Education leverage internal resources and work with institution leadership to draft, revise, and finalize a vision and mission statement, as well as a set of standardized priorities

Incorporate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the System-wide Vision

- **Outcome**: The ability to lead out on key diversity, equity, and inclusion topics that are prevalent across today’s college campuses and be known for strongly prioritizing and allocating resources to issues that deeply matter some of the most vulnerable students at each campus

- **Potential Approach**: Utilize the committee of diversity, equity, and inclusion experts from each institution to not only listen but take action on the needs of vulnerable student populations, and by clearly incorporating the needs of these students into the Campus Security Unifying Vision and Mission
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## Secondary Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University / College</th>
<th>Officers per 1,000</th>
<th>Police Force Type</th>
<th>Dispatch</th>
<th>Head of Campus Safety</th>
<th>Title IX Responsibility</th>
<th>Clery Responsibility</th>
<th>Victim Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Chief Safety Officer</td>
<td>Director OEO</td>
<td>Director of Campus Security</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Campus + Municipal</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Director OEO</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber Valley University</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Director OEO</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Director of Public Safety</td>
<td>Director OEO</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Title IX Director</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Valley University</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Utah Highway Patrol + Municipal</td>
<td>Local / UHP</td>
<td>Director of Public Safety</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Director of Public Safety</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Technical College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – Off Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Security &amp; Risk Coordinator</td>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>Security &amp; Risk Coordinator</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgerland Technical College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – Off Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden-Weber Technical College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – Off Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Security Manager</td>
<td>Student Counselor</td>
<td>Security Manager</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – Off Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele Technical College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – Off Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Technical College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – Off Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>VP Student Services</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah Basin Technical College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Municipal – On Campus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Head of Financial Aid</td>
<td>Head of Financial Aid / Facilities Manager</td>
<td>Head of Financial Aid / Facilities Manager</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description

**Police Chief over Public Safety**

The same individual that oversees the police force also wears the administrative campus safety hat for the university / college.

**Other Role over Public Safety**

The administrative responsibility for public safety falls under an individual that is not an acting police officer.

### Key Characteristics

#### Police Chief over Public Safety

- **Broad Police Chief Focus**: Chief of Police has additional administrative responsibilities, such as Clery compliance, creating the annual safety report, training, etc.
- **Emergency/Risk Management**: In some cases, the police chief is also responsible for emergency and risk management.
- **Reporting Structure**: In this case, the Chief of Police often reports to the VP of Finance or Operations, while other aspects of campus safety such as community services, compliance, or Title IX report to other VPs.

#### Other Role over Public Safety

- **Narrower Police Chief Focus**: At Weber State and the University of Utah, The Chief of Police is primarily responsible for the police force, while others may take on responsibility for Clery compliance, emergency management, etc.
- **Reporting Structure**: The Chief of Police reports to the Director of Public Safety/Chief Safety Officer, who, in some instances, reports to the President.
- **Varied Roles**: At institutions without campus police, some have a dedicated director of campus safety (e.g., SLCC), whereas others rely on the Facilities Manager or the VP of Student Services.

### Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities / Colleges</th>
<th>Technical Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Valley University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Baseline Assessment | Organizational Structure | Clery Compliance

### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separate From Title IX</th>
<th>Combined with Title IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The individual or department responsible for Clery Act at the university / college is separate from the individual responsible for Clery Act</td>
<td>The individual or department responsible for Clery Act at the university / college is also responsible for Title IX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separate Reporting Lines:</th>
<th>Size of School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title IX is typically housed in a separate department with completely different reporting lines from Clery</td>
<td>smaller colleges have faculty that wear many hats, and as a result, individuals often handle overlapping responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clery Responsibility Varies:</th>
<th>Student Services Roles:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in some instances, the responsibility for Clery falls on the Police Chief, making their role more administrative; in other instances, dedicated members of the campus safety department handle Clery compliance</td>
<td>when combined, typically leadership over student services is responsible for overseeing Clery and Title IX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges with Confidentiality:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>combining these two responsibilities can create challenges in keeping student incidents confidential from law enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities / Colleges</th>
<th>Technical Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td>Bridgerland Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Davis Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Dixie Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Valley University</td>
<td>Southwest Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow College</td>
<td>Toodle Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>Weber State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>Ogden-Weber Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>Mountainland Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidential / 23
## Dedicated Campus Police

The university / college has a dedicated, certified, and full-time police force that provides law enforcement support within the campus geographical jurisdiction.

### Key Characteristics

- **Specialization:** Campus police are typically trained on university-specific topics such as Clery and Title IX
- **Lower Pay:** Campus police officers make less than municipal police officers, making hiring and retention challenging
- **Student Relationships:** Many institutions appreciate a local police presence for the student relationships; students are often perceived to have better relationships with campus over municipal police

### Colleges and Universities

- Dixie State University
- University of Utah
- Utah State University
- Utah Valley University
- Snow College
- Southern Utah University
- Weber State University

## Contract with Municipal Police

The university / college contracts policing services to the local municipality; police officers are employed by the local police force and provide services according to negotiated agreement with the university.

### Key Characteristics

- **Level of Support:** The institution relationship with municipal police ranges from dedicated officer(s) staffed on the campus to support being provided as needed
- **Agency Type:** In most cases, institutions partner with the local, county police force; SLCC, however, contracts out the Utah Highway Patrol (UHP)

### Colleges and Universities

- Tech Colleges
- SLCC
- Utah State University (at certain campuses)
## Baseline Assessment | Law Enforcement | Dispatch

### Campus Dispatch

*The university / college has a dedicated dispatch team with full-time staff to field emergency calls*

### Local Dispatch

*The university / college relies on the local country dispatch system for fielding emergency calls*

### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Dispatch</th>
<th>Local Dispatch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university / college has a dedicated dispatch team with full-time staff to field emergency calls.</td>
<td>The university / college relies on the local country dispatch system for fielding emergency calls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Characteristics

**Campus Dispatch**

- **Local Dispatch First**: even with a campus dispatch system in place, 911 calls always go to the local county dispatch first.
- **Geographic Jurisdiction**: typically geographic jurisdiction determines if calls are re-routed to campus dispatch and who will respond between campus and municipal police.
- **Staffing constraints**: at some colleges / universities, staffing constraints often lead dispatch to rely on a “whoever is closest” protocol in determining if campus or municipal police will respond.

**Local Dispatch**

- **County Level**: local dispatch centers are determined by county boundaries.
- **University / College Size**: most institutions rely on local dispatch; having a campus dispatch system is primarily reserved to USHE’s largest institutions.
- **Response Time**: municipal police are typically busier and more likely to deprioritize incidents that campus police would prioritize.

### Colleges and Universities

**Campus Dispatch**

- University of Utah
- Utah State University
- Utah Valley University
- Weber State University

**Local Dispatch**

- Snow College
- Southern Utah University
- Dixie State University
- SLCC
- Tech Colleges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Available on Campus</th>
<th>Provided by External Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The university / college employs victim advocacy resources and support within the organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student are referred to external organization for victim advocacy support and resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong>: Some universities / colleges have a victim’s advocate within the Department of Public Safety, while others house these services within other departments</td>
<td><strong>SafeUT App</strong>: while utilized across the board, smaller tech colleges often cited the SafeUT app as a primary resource for victim advocacy resources and assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Dedication</strong>: Most victim advocates are dedicated full-time to their role, while at Dixie state, the victim advocate provides services on top of other responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges and Universities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dixie State University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Snow College</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Utah</strong></td>
<td><strong>SLCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah State University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tech Colleges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah Valley University</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Valley University</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow College</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Technical College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgerland Technical College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden-Weber Technical College</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainland Technical College</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Technical College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele Technical College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Technical College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah Basin Technical College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: DPS presence indicates whether the Department of Public Safety is represented on the committee.
Across the board, **campus police officer wage ranges are lower than municipal police officers** in the surrounding area; although the size of the discrepancy varies from locale to locale.

Data is based on information provided by campus police and local municipalities. *Pending feedback from campus police; current estimates are based on a January 2019 multi-university study by Dixie State.*

**University of Utah**
- Campus Police: $19.7
- Municipal Police: $26.4

**Utah State University**
- Campus Police: $21.0
- Municipal Police: $31.3

**Utah Valley University**
- Campus Police: $18.8
- Municipal Police: $31.0

**Weber State University**
- Campus Police: $18.0
- Municipal Police: $27.4

**Dixie State University**
- Campus Police: $20.6
- Municipal Police: $29.8

**Southern Utah University**
- Campus Police: $18.5
- Municipal Police: $22.8

**Snow College**
- Campus Police: $31.0
- Municipal Police: $33.3
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## Secondary Research
## Executive Summary

### AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head of Campus Safety</strong></td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispatch</strong></td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clergy and Title IX Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFFING

- **47** police officers
- **21** full-time security officers
- **8** full-time dispatchers
- **1.4** officers per 1,000 students

### KEY INITIATIVES

- **Community Engagement:** department-wide focus on engaging with students and the broader community
- **Officer Training:** developing robust and pertinent training using internal and external experts on topics such as implicit bias
- **Racism and Bias Incidents:** hiring a special assistant to focus on these issues
- **Diversity:** focusing hiring efforts on candidates with diverse backgrounds

### LEADERSHIP

- **Marlon Lynch** – Chief Safety Officer
- **Rodney Chatman** – Chief of Police
- **Jamie Justice** – Director of Community Services
- **Jeff Graviet** – Director of Emergency Management
- **Aerin Washington** – Director of Campus Security
- **Glenn Smith** – Director of U Health Security
NEWLY FORMED DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
With the hiring of a chief security officer, the U flattened its org structure into different operational verticals including campus police, campus security, compliance, emergency management, and community services; many of these operational divisions are led by brand new leadership.

CLERY AND TITLE IX ARE SEPARATED
The Clery Act and Title IX live in different departments; the Clery Act lives under the director of campus security while Title IX lives in the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO).

INTENTIONAL FOCUS ON STUDENT AND UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT
A variety of different committees at the University of Utah have been created to cover topics from title IX to incident review; these provides opportunities for a variety of university departments and student voices to be heard.

NARROWER POLICE ORG FOCUS
Campus police is now part of a larger ecosystem instead of the primary operational authority, which enables this operational division to put increased effort into community relations, officer training, etc.
### Relevant Committees and Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team/Committee Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meeting Cadence</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>OEO</th>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Review Committee</td>
<td>The IRC reviews complaints brought against University police related directly or indirectly to issues of excessive force, violation of rights, abusive language, or dereliction of duty.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery Act Committee</td>
<td>Involves Clery reporting, review of timely warnings, roles and training for Campus Security Authorities, and other topics related to Clery compliance and reporting.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Review Committee</td>
<td>Group of individuals tasked with helping to research, write, and review different campus safety policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Receives direct input on how to receive safety services by sharing strategic plan, soliciting ideas, hearing concerns, and using the group as a conduit to other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism, Bias, and Incidence Response Team</td>
<td>Team directly responsible for investigating and reviewing incidents related to issues of racism and bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Process Group</td>
<td>A neutral fact-finding group that talks to witnesses and gathers documents before filing a written report.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Security Authority</td>
<td>Individuals who are required to report if they are made aware of a Clery incident; have 300 people who are Considered CSA.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Crisis Outreach Team</td>
<td>Mobile team out of the University's psychiatric institute that responds to mental health related incidents and is available 24/7/365.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance System Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Universities clearing house for all things related to security systems such as video, access control, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Clery vs. Title IX**

### Org Structure

**Department of Public Safety**
- **Chief Safety Officer**
  - Marlon Lynch
- **Director of Campus Security**
  - Aerin Washington

**Office of Equal Opportunity**
- **General Counsel VP**
  - Phyllis Vetter
- **Director and Title IX Coordinator**
  - Sharie Hayashi
- **6 Investigators**
- **Administrative Roles**

### Other Support

**Clery Act Committee**
**Policy Review Committee**

**Racism, Bias, and Incidence Response Team**
**Title IX Process Group**

### Role and Responsibilities

- **Department of Public Safety**
  - Educate students/faculty on policy changes and how to be safe
  - Actively collect data throughout the year for reporting purposes
  - Oversee CSA designation and CSA training

- **Office of Equal Opportunity**
  - Compliance office for handling issues of discrimination and sexual misconduct
  - Ensure all policies are in compliance with Title IX
  - Take action to investigate and hold individuals accountable for violations
GEOGRAPHIC JURISDICTION IS FIRST LENS OF RESPONSE
All 911 calls are directed to the SLCPD dispatch center. If the incident is within the jurisdiction of campus police, the call is then routed to the University of Utah dispatch center. Campus police, campus security, and/or municipal police will then respond to the incident based on the level of threat and emergency.

CAMPUS POLICE SUPPORTS MUNICIPAL POLICE
Even when a crime is committed outside of their geographic jurisdiction but involves students, campus police may respond instead of or alongside municipal police if appropriate. This is primarily because non-emergency situations may be a low priority for municipal police, whereas campus police can respond promptly.

INTEGRATED SYSTEM OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
The Office of Emergency Management manages the University dispatch center, a coordination center, operations, finance, and coordinate timely warnings. They are constantly at a Level 3 state of emergency, which consists of constant monitoring, but no need for additional resources.

OFFICE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY INVESTIGATES TITLE IX CRIMES
Under university policy, most University employees are required to report situations involving sexual misconduct and discrimination to the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO). OEO will conduct its own investigation, while the victim can decide whether they want to pursue criminal justice through the campus police.
**Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map**

**Incident Reported**

- **911 Call**
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through SLCPD Dispatch.
- **Direct Call to Campus Police**
- **Incident During Patrol**

**Dispatch**

- **SLCPD Dispatch**
- **University Dispatch**
  - If the incident occurred on campus, the call is then sent to University Dispatch.

**Law Enforcement Response**

- **SLCPD responds**
  - **No**
  - **Yes**
    - **Involves university students?**
      - **No**
      - **Yes**
        - **SLCPD has less capacity to handle non-emergency calls. Campus Police may be better equipped to handle incidents such as parties on Greek Row, although they are technically off campus.**
      - **SLCPD has more capacity to handle non-emergency calls. Campus Police may respond.**
    - **Related to Law Enforcement?**
      - **No**
        - **SLCPD has less capacity to handle non-emergency calls. Campus Police may be better equipped to handle incidents such as parties on Greek Row, although they are technically off campus.**
      - **Yes**
        - **Campus Police responds**
          - **If an incident occurs on campus and involves law enforcement, campus police will respond. However, they may call for backup from campus security and/or SLCPD if it’s a life-threatening emergency situation.**

**Reporting**

- **Crime Log**
  - Campus Police keeps a 60-day crime log that is publicly available. This includes Clery crimes that will then be published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.

- **Timely Warnings**
  - If a sexual misconduct incident occurs that poses a threat to the rest of campus, the Clery Act requires campuses to give timely warnings to students. This is done through the Office of Emergency Management.

- **Title IX Crimes**
  - All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equal Opportunity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.

---

*CThis also includes emergency phones on campus and elevator calls.*
## Office of Emergency Management

**Overarching Objective:** resources, coordination, managing the oversight of crisis

### Communications Center
- Taking a current police dispatch center and growing it into a communications center; campus and hospital will be merging into one
- Realigning campus radio system from several disparate radio platforms to one single platform to improve communication across campus
- Technology developments are underway with next gen 911 and computerized dispatch and record management systems
- Have dedicated coordination center (housed in school of Law) that monitors social media, national news, global feeds, etc.

### Emergency Management
- Have 3 levels of activation (Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3) that are used when responding to all types of emergencies
- Operationalize responses with Level 1 and level 2 situations by bringing in additional assistance through specialized units and coordinated strike teams
- Individuals across many departments (law enforcement, housing, facilities, etc.) are involved with emergency management efforts
- Regularly report back to president on how missions are operationalizing

### Travel Safety
- Currently developing strategy and vision for this part of department, but an official plan still needs to be written up
- Give resources to individuals that are traveling in times of crisis with natural disaster or terrorist related (e.g., returning home during COVID pandemic)
- Work regularly with Global Travel department as a strike team and a partner
Reporting & Incidence Response – Title IX Crimes

When a Title IX crime is committed, the victim has the opportunity to pursue three primary areas for support: (1) Campus Police, (2) Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, (3) Victim-Survivor Advocates. The victim decides who they want to talk to, what they would like to discuss, and what actions they would like to take.

**Campus Police**
- If the victim decides to press charges, campus police will work with the local authorities to conduct a criminal investigation.
- As a part of that investigation, campus police is required to share all pertinent information with the Title IX office.
- However, Title IX is not required to share information they gather with campus police. For this reason, campus police may need to conduct separate interviews.

**Office of Equal Opportunity**
- The Office of Equal Opportunity employs 6 investigators who investigate discrimination complaints from students.
- OEO investigations determine whether a student needs to be disciplined from the university perspective (e.g. suspended, expelled, given a warning).
- OEO is a neutral, fact-finding office that conducts its own investigation, even if a criminal investigation is also being conducted.

** Victim-Survivor Advocates**
- Whether or not the victim decides to press charges or pursue disciplinary action, support services are provided by the Center for Student Wellness.
- The Center for Student Wellness staffs 5 Victim-Survivor Advocates that provide free, confidential and trauma-informed support services to student, faculty, and staff who have experienced interpersonal violence.
- These advocates provide support for the victim, allowing OEO to remain a neutral role.
REVAMPED AND TARGETED TRAINING
The University has focused efforts and money on an updated training curriculum that utilizes external experts, focuses on scenario-based training, and covers topics such as implicit bias and community integration.

FLEXIBILITY AND AUTONOMY OVER CONTENT
A high degree of flexibility and autonomy exists in determining the training schedule for police officers and the topics to be covered; as a result, the U is taking a proactive approach to developing its training.

INCREASED EFFORTS TO HIRE DIVERSITY
The U has focused on, and seen success in, hiring diverse candidates; efforts include targeting organizations such as the National Association of Woman Law Enforcement Executives, the Hispanic Association of Police Command Officers, and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement.

HIGH LEVEL OF TURNOVER
Over 50% of police officers have turned over in the 18 months; similar turnover is happening with campus security, but hiring efforts have been challenged by perceptions towards policing in general and low pay.
Utah State University
Executive Summary

Collaboration with Other Institutions: USU actively coordinates with other Utah institutions to learn about their campus safety initiatives, and frequently incorporates their learnings into their day-to-day practice.

Title IX Compliance: Due to internal and external reviews, USU began a series of sweeping changes to improve prevention of and response to sexual misconduct, including required student and employee training, as well as a revision to sexual misconduct policy and procedures.

KEY INITIATIVES

**STAFFING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEADERSHIP**

- Earl Morris – Director of Public Safety / Chief of Police
- Kent Harris – Police Captain
- Alison Adams-Perlac – Director of Office of Equity
- Mica McKinney – VP General Affairs, Legal Counsel
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY DOES NOT REPORT DIRECTLY TO THE PRESIDENT
USU’s head of department safety reports through the VP of Business and Finance, who then reports to the University president.

OTHER CAMPUSES REGULARLY INTERACT WITH LEADERSHIP
USU is a multi-campus university and all campus safety personnel at each campus reports up through the police captain in Logan.

THE MAJORITY OF CROSS-ORGANIZATION INTERACTION IS INFORMAL
While a few official committees exist (e.g., Behavior Intervention Team) the majority of cross-organizational interaction takes place on ad hoc basis as needs arise.

POLICE STAFFING CONSTRAINTS EXIST
Limited police resources leaves the organization very reliant on municipal police for support when needed, which can include multiple local agencies per campus.
Campus Police Organization

Directory of Public Safety
Earl Morris

Captain
Kent Harris

Eastern Campus
- 2 Full-time Officers
- 9 part-time Officers

Main Campus
- 1 Lieutenant
- 3 Sergeants
- 6 Officers
- 2 Investigators
- 1 Victim Advocate (SAAVI)

Blanding Campus
- 2 Security Officers

Other Campuses
Local Police Departments

Local Police Departments

VP for Business and Finance
David Cowley
Clery vs. Title IX

**Clery Act**

**Department of Public Safety**
- **Org Structure**
- **Other Support**
- **Role and Responsibilities**
  - Actively collect data throughout the year for reporting purposes and produce Annual Safety Report
  - Distribute timely warnings when necessary
  - Oversee CSA designation and CSA training

**Title IX**

**Office of Equity**
- **Academic Provost**
  - Frank Galey
- **Director of Office of Equity**
  - Alison Adams-Perlac

- **3 Investigators**
- **1 Title IX Coordinator**
- **3 Prevention Specialists**
- **Safety Risk Panels** (as needed)
- **Representatives on each campus** (not Title IX deputies)

**Other Support**
- **Clery Act Committee**
- **Timely Warning Committee**

**Role and Responsibilities**
- Compliance office for handling issues of discrimination and sexual misconduct
- Information about reporting options
- Prevention education for students and employees
- Provide supportive measures (these do not require reporting, but include changes to living situations, no contact order, referrals to other resources)
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

**VICTIM ADVOCATE SUPPORT COMES FROM SAAVI AND THE DPS**
The Sexual Assault and Anti-Violence Information Team has a number of victim advocates who provide 24/7 response; one of these victim advocates sits within the Department of Public Safety and bridges these two organizations.

**DEEP AND ACTIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH MUNICIPAL POLICE**
Larger incidents typically require expertise and staffing outside of USU’s capacity; multiple departments regularly work together to help each other regardless of jurisdiction.

**CONSISTENT REPORTING SYSTEM ACROSS USU AND LOCAL AGENCIES**
Reporting system that shows cases and jurisdiction is consistent and shared across local police departments as well; this aids in transparency and communication as different agencies work together to respond to incidents.

**USU MUST BE PROACTIVE WITH EXPERTISE SURROUNDING TITLE IX AND CLERY**
Local police department lack awareness and training surrounding Title IX and Clery; as a result, USU takes additional time talking and communicating with victims to build relationships of trust and share campus resources (e.g., SAAVI).
**Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map**

**Incident Reported**
- **911 Call**
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through Cache County Dispatch.
- **Direct Call to Campus Police**
- **Incident During Patrol**

**Dispatch**
- **Cache County Dispatch**
  - Within University geographic jurisdiction?
    - No: Incident Reported
    - Yes: **University Dispatch**
      - If the incident occurred on campus, the call is then sent to University Dispatch.

**Law Enforcement Response**
- **Logan Police responds**
  - Involves university students?
    - Yes: Related to Law Enforcement?
      - No: Campus police or security officer responds (e.g. safety escort, motor vehicle assistance)
      - Yes: Often both campus police and municipal police will respond to incidents involving students, regardless of geographical jurisdiction. There are several reasons for this:
        - USU is responsible for a large student body within a large geographical area and often doesn’t have the resources to manage all incidents alone.
        - Students often have a better relationship with campus police, as campus police officers are required to do 1 hr of foot patrol a day and have frequent interactions with students. They are often more willing to cooperate with campus police over municipal police.
        - When both campus police and municipal police respond, it promotes officer safety and facilitates collaboration.

**Reporting**
- **Crime Log**
  - Campus Police keeps a 60-day crime log that is publicly available. This includes Clery crimes that will then be published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.

**Timely Warnings**
- If a sexual misconduct incident occurs that poses a threat to the rest of campus, the Clery Act requires campuses to give timely warnings to students.

**Title IX Crimes**
- All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.
REQUIRED SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION TRAINING FOR STUDENTS
As a part of a resolution agreement from an investigation conducted by the DOJ, USU has committed to provide mandatory in-person training regarding sexual misconduct prevention for all incoming students attending a residential campus, as well as required annual online training for all undergraduate and graduate students.

MONTHLY DEPARTMENT-WIDE TRAINING
DPS includes training as a part of their monthly staff meetings. This training covers a wide variety of topics, including lethality assessments, stop-the-bleed training, reviewing the state database system, etc.

ANNUAL CAMPUS SECURITY AUTHORITY (CSA) TRAINING
DPS conducts an annual broadcast for CSA’s at all USU centers to explain their role and responsibilities. They have also made a goal to do visit each center to provide individual training as well.

SECURITY OFFICERS ARE PRIMARILY STUDENTS
As the majority of security officers are students who are looking to enter law enforcement, DPS has developed a specific security officer training. However, they also attend the monthly trainings at staff meetings.
Executive Summary

**AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY INITIATIVES**

- **In-house Victim Advocate**: UVU recently hired a victim advocate within the police department, which has provided very valuable support.
- **Hiring of Police Officers**: UVU faces significant staffing challenges within the police department due to low wages relative to other departments.
- **New Complaint Software**: A new software for fielding student complaints is creating a more seamless solution to field and distribute complaints to their appropriate department.

**STAFFING**

- **13** full-time police officers
- **0** full-time security officers
- **4** full-time dispatchers
- **0.3** officers per 1,000 students

**LEADERSHIP**

- **Matthew Pedersen** – Chief of Police and Director of Public Safety
- **Ashley Larsen** – Associate Dean of Students
- **Robin Ebmeyer** – Director of Emergency Management
- **Laura Carlson** – Title IX Coordinator
IN-HOUSE CAMPUS POLICE AND DISPATCH SERVICES
UVU has a dedicated campus police force and dispatch to serve students across campus; there is no on-campus security officer presence, so police serve this role as well.

CLERY AND TITLE IX LIVE IN SEPARATE DEPARTMENTS
Title IX responsibility lives in the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action while Clery lives in the Department of Public Safety under the chief of police; both departments have separate reporting lines to the president.

BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT TEAM (BAT)
14-member team meets weekly for 90 minutes to discuss and coordinate resources to support, prevent, and intervene with situations involving student distress or other harmful/disruptive behaviors.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT IS SEPARATE FROM THE DPS
Emergency management responsibilities have a distinct office that falls outside of the campus police chief’s responsibilities and reports directly to the VP of Facilities Management.
**Clery vs. Title IX**

### Org Structure

- **Department of Public Safety**
  - **Director Public Safety**
    - Matthew Pedersen
  - **Associate VP of Facilities and Planning**
    - Frank Young

- **Title IX Coordinator**
  - Laura Carlson

- **2 Full-Time Investigators**
- **4 Full-time Admin**
- **2 Part-Time Trainers**

- **Clery Committee**
- **Title IX Marketing Committee**
- **Title IX Coordinating Committee**

### Other Support

- **Office of Equity**
  - **VP of Planning and HR**
    - Linda Makin

### Role and Responsibilities

- **Department of Public Safety**
  - The Director of Public Safety serves as the Clery officer for the college.
  - This position handles statistics collection, report creation, and the delivery of timely warnings as needed.

- **Office of Equity**
  - Compliance office for handling issues of discrimination and sexual misconduct.
  - 2 full-time investigators provide investigative support for evaluating all cases.
FULL-TIME VICTIM ADVOCATE WITHIN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT
UVU recently hired a full-time victim advocate within the police department who provides 24/7 services and meets regularly with other victim advocates within the university; UVU has seen immense value in having this resource internally.

HAVE TEAM OF CRISIS THERAPISTS FOR IMMEDIATE MENTAL HEALTH ASSISTANCE
UVU’s crisis services is a specific branch of the Student Health Services that provides 24/7 assistance to students experiencing a mental health crisis; police, Title IX, and victim advocacy work with this group when needed.

DISPATCH IS VIRTUALLY CONSOLIDATED WITH OREM POLICE DEPARTMENT
UVU works closely with the local municipal police authority, Orem Police Department, and shares dispatch software, screens, radio, etc. with the agency to provide increased transparency and ease of communication when handling different cases.

NEW ANONYMOUS REPORTING SOFTWARE
UVU is shifting to a new anonymous reporting system for student complaints/reports that seamlessly connects the student to the relevant department.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

Incident Reported
- 911 Call
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through Orem Dispatch.
- Direct Call to Campus Police
- Incident During Patrol

Dispatch
- Orem Dispatch
  - Within University geographic jurisdiction?
    - Yes: University Dispatch
      - If the incident occurred on campus, the call is then sent to University Dispatch.
    - No: Orem Police responds

Law Enforcement Response
- Orem Police responds
  - Involves university students?
    - Yes: Campus Police and/or Orem Police may respond
      - Orem Police and UVU campus police use the same system, training, and technology. UVU is typically the first to respond, but with larger cases UVU will often ask for support due to staffing constraints
    - No: Related to Parking Vehicle Assistance?
      - Yes: Campus Parking responds
        - Vehicle assistance and/or issues with parking are typically handled by UVU campus parking services. This office falls outside of campus police, although campus police can and will handle these situations as well
      - No: Campus Parking responds

Reporting
- Crime Log
  - Campus Police keeps a 60-day crime log that is publicly available. This includes Clery crimes that will then be published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.
- Timely Warnings
  - Timely warnings are most likely to come from the police department since they have the most information, however, the office of emergency management may also help push the warnings to students depending on the incident type
- Title IX Crimes
  - All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equal Opportunity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.
FOCUS ON HIRING EXPERIENCED POLICE OFFICERS WITH CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS

Over the past 3 years, hiring focus has shifted from hiring new officers from the academy to hiring more experienced police officers who have children attending UVU and have retirement money coming in; this has drastically improved the relationship between students and officers.

DIFFICULT TO HIRE NEW POLICE OFFICERS GIVEN WAGE DISPARITY

UVU police officers make significantly less than other municipal positions, making it difficult to hire and retain talent. Generally only more seasoned officers with children attending UVU are willing to accept the position.

POLICE TRAINING INCLUDES A WIDE VARIETY OF IN-DEMAND TOPICS

Police officers have pre-determined trainings covering topics that have been vetted with the university’s diversity and inclusion office. After meeting with groups on campus, university police found that they were already providing requested trainings surrounding racism and bias.

POLICE DEPARTMENT PROVIDE PRESENTATIONS TO STUDENT CLASSES

Several times per year, the police department provides in-class visits across campus, and where invited, to present to students and build relationships.
Weber State University
Executive Summary

**AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFFING**

- 11 full-time police officers
- 0 full-time security officers
- 2 full-time dispatchers
- 0.4 officers per 1,000 students

**KEY INITIATIVES**

**New Department of Public Safety Org Structure:** Weber State created a new Director of Public Safety role to separate certain responsibilities from the Chief of Police.

**Updated Sexual Assault Training:** The Department of Public Safety helps fund a victim advocacy position at the women’s center that will be responsible for creating new sexual assault training for students and staff.

**Lobbying for Additional Funding:** Weber State would like additional funding for a dedicated Clery officer, emergency management support, recruiting efforts, etc.

**LEADERSHIP**

- **Dane LeBlanc** – Director of Public Safety
- **Seth Cawley** – Chief of Police
- **Michael Davies** – Emergency Management
- **Barry Gomberg** – Title IX Coordinator
Weber State recently reorganized its Department of Public Safety by making its Chief of Police the new Director of Public Safety; the reorganization was inspired by the University of Utah and gives the Chief of Police a more dedicated focus on policing.

Weber State’s Chief of Police is a certified Clery Compliance Officer and handles Clery responsibilities for the university; a Clery committee exists to provide support and coordination across campus.

Weber State has a STAR team to handle emergent situations where a threat is posed and a SAIT team to handle less emergent behavioral situations that still call for preventative measures.

Weber State’s police department has 2 employees who provide dispatch services 5 days a week between 7am and 5pm; outside of these hours, a contract is in place with Weber’s local dispatch to provide support.
Victim Advocacy Provided Through the Women’s Center
Weber State has two victim advocates within the women’s center on campus; this organization is outside of the Department of Public Safety, but the two organizations work closely together (with one women’s center employee being partially funded by the Department of Public Safety).

MOUs in Place with Local Jurisdictions for Assistance as Needed
Given staffing constraints, Weber State has MOUs in place with local jurisdictions in which both departments are willing to provide support and assistance to the other as needed.

Share Dispatch Line with Ogden Police Department
Weber State works closely with the local municipal police authority, the Ogden Police Department, and shares a dispatch line with the agency to provide increased transparency and ease of communication when handling different cases.

Rely on Staff Members for Assistance with Incident Reporting
Designated staff members, such as CSAs, are responsible to field reports / complaints from students and report as they become aware; online reporting also exists for CSAs and students to submit reports.
911 Call

All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through Weber County Dispatch.

Direct Call to Campus Police

Incident During Patrol

Weber County Dispatch

Within University geographic jurisdiction?

No

Ogden Police responds

Geographic jurisdiction will determine who responds first, even with off-campus university students, but with larger cases Weber State will often ask for support due to staffing constraints.

Yes

University Dispatch

Campus Police responds

MOUs are in place with local municipalities to guide the nature of these relationships and expectations of mutual aid.

Law Enforcement Response

Crime Log

Campus Police keeps a 60-day crime log that is publicly available in the office (but not online). This includes Clery crimes that will then be published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.

Timely Warnings

Weber State’s Department of Public Safety team will issue one of two levels of warning depending on the severity, either an immediate emergency alert or a slower safety alert.

Title IX Crimes

All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equal Opportunity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.

University Dispatch provides dispatch services Monday-Friday from 7am-5pm; calls outside of hours of operation are sent to Weber.

Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map
**Hiring / Onboarding / Training – Key Learnings**

**Police Training Plan Determined Jointly with Local Jurisdictions**
Weber State’s Police Chief develops 2-year training plans jointly with local jurisdictions to cover required basic trainings as well as topics that may be more relevant in the current climate.

**Difficult to Hire New Police Officers Given Wage Disparity**
Weber State University’s police force was down 5 officers last year due in large part to wage disparities with other local agencies; $5,000 signing bonuses and marginally increased pay helped attract more officers.

**Community Liaison Officer Responsible for Training to Faculty / Students**
A particular Weber State Police Officer is tasked with the additional responsibility of training faculty, students, and other staff members through student / staff orientations, meetings with Residence Assistants, and other campus events.

**Sexual Assault Training Will Be Updated**
Weber State currently uses Haven online training platform to provide sexual assault training, but there is a high price to renew the contract. Instead, the new position at the women’s center will be responsible for creating sexual assault training for students and staff.
Executive Summary

AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INITIATIVES

Clery Compliance: Responsibility for Clery has recently been transferred back (from General Counsel’s Equity Compliance Office) to the Department of Public Safety under the Police Chief. With this move, the department has put forth extensive effort to expand Clery compliance and reporting (increasing the length of the Clery Report by over 5x)

Community and Student Engagement: Over the past two years, university police has placed increased emphasis on building relationships of trust with students through active involvement in student events and activities

Safety and Security App: New app will be operational by December 2020

LEADERSHIP

- Del Beatty – Dean of Students
- Chief Blair Barfuss – Director of Public Safety / Chief of Police
- Josh Thayn – Director of Event Services & Risk Management
- Hazel Sainsbury – Title IX Director

STAFFING

- 7 full-time police officers
- 0 full-time security officers
- 0 full-time dispatchers
- 0.4 officers per 1,000 students
RECENTLY REPLACED TITLE IX COORDINATOR
Replaced Title IX Director has been hired within the last 2 months; this role works collaboratively with the Department of Public Safety to support students with issues of discrimination and sexual misconduct.

CARE TEAM FOR BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION
The CARE team meets weekly for 90 minutes to discuss students and situations that pose a risk to campus safety; athletics, housing, general counsel, wellness center, admissions, etc. are all represented in these meetings in addition to campus safety team (police, Title IX coordinator, student affairs, facilities).

VICTIM ADVOCATE SITS WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
The Department of Public Safety’s Police Records and Security Supervisor also functions as the university’s primary resource for victim advocacy; other external organizations provide support as needed.

POLICE STAFFING CONSTRAINTS EXIST
The campus police force feels understaffed; 2 out of the 7 officers (Chief of Police and Captain) are dedicated entirely to administrative duties given the demands of Clery Act, training, etc. The other five officers handle patrol, with the assistance of hired hourly (reserve) police officers to provide 24/7 coverage.
Clery vs. Title IX

Org Structure

Clery Act
- Police Department
  - VP of Administrative Affairs: Paul Morris
  - Director of Public Safety: Blair Barfuss
  - 1 Captain

Title IX
- Office of Equity
  - General Counsel
  - Title IX Director: Hazel Sainsbury
  - Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Other Support

Clery Safety Committee

Group of National Consultants

4 Other Trained Title IX Coordinators

Representatives on each campus (not Title IX deputies)

Role and Responsibilities

Clery Act
- The Police Chief and his Captain oversee the development of the Clery program and report
- Worked with national consultants to help develop, implement, and approve current Clery practices and policy
- Meet with Clery Safety Committee quarterly or as needed

Title IX
- Compliance office for handling issues of discrimination and sexual misconduct
- Quarterly meetings with all coordinators and additional meetings / communication as needed
PROXIMITY OF AVAILABLE SUPPORT OFTEN OVERIDES GEOGRAPHIC JURISDICTION
While DSU does have spelled out geographic jurisdictions that guide the county dispatch team, the geographic proximity of available officers often determines who responds first; DSU's relationship with the municipal police is such that both sides are capable and willing to respond on each other's “turf” (DSU officers often handle police calls for service just outside of DSU property when students in off campus student housing are involved).

STUDENT REPORTING FOR NON-EMERGENCIES PRIMARILY COMES VIA PHONE
Students and parents often report non-emergencies to the office of student affairs over the phone. DSU is working to develop a more robust reporting system and webpage that will automatically refer the student to the correct department / resource; this will be a part of the new security app (will be available December 2020).

POLICE OFFICERS ALSO FULFILL SECURITY ROLE
As Dixie State does not have any student security officers, university police responds to all incidents that involve a suspicious person or any kind of security escort. However, facilities personnel that manage parking can help with motor vehicle assistance.

STUDENTS OFTEN PREFER CAMPUS POLICE OVER MUNICIPAL POLICE
Due to relationships of trust, students often prefer to have campus police involved and used as a resource over municipal police; this is particularly true for minority students.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

Incident Reported

- 911 Call
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through Washington County Dispatch.
- Direct Call to Campus Police
- Incident During Patrol

Dispatch

- Washington County Dispatch
- Within University geographic jurisdiction?
  - Yes: DSU Campus Police responds
  - No: Geographic proximity of available officers often overrides official jurisdiction; the investigation is often handed off following the initial response

Law Enforcement Response

- St. George Police responds
- Often both campus police and municipal police will respond to incidents involving students, regardless of geographical jurisdiction. There are several reasons for this:
  - DSU is responsible for a large student body with a small officer to student ratio and often doesn’t have the resources to manage all incidents alone.
  - Students often have a better relationship with campus police given the campus police’s extensive focus on student engagement. Students are often more willing to cooperate with campus police over municipal police.
  - DSU and the municipal police have an agreement that the local police will send officers until DSU can assume command.

Crime Log
- Campus Police keeps a crime log that is publicly available on their website. This includes Clery crimes that will then be published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.

Timely Warnings
- DSU has a 10-person committee that dictates the relevant policies and pushes notifications as needed through their timely alert system.

Title IX Crimes
- All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.
Hiring / Onboarding / Training – Key Learnings

FUNDING CONSTRAINTS LIMIT TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES
University police primarily relies on online training given the cost of training in-person; as a result, not much training happens beyond the required 40 hours.

TITLE IX TRAINING HAPPENS ON INVITATION BASIS
Many departments and organizations within DSU reach out for specific training to better understand updated regulations, policy, where to go, etc.

POLICE FORCE PROVIDES TRAINING ON TOP OF THEIR FULL-TIME RESPONSIBILITIES
Police officers provide training to the campus community in many ways such as assisting Campus Security Authorities, providing Clery training, etc.

LOOK FOR UNIQUE CAMPUS-SPECIFIC SKILLS WHEN HIRING WITHIN POLICE FORCE
The Department of Public Safety sees a particular need for communication and community skills, which limits the number of police officers that could adequately serve in a campus setting.
Executive Summary

**Hiring Police Officers:** Hiring additional police officers has been difficult due to budgetary constraints. SUU would like to have at least 1 officer per 1,000 students.

**Clery Act Committee:** A coalition to support Clery related cases is currently being formed and is expected to be active in the coming months.

**Title IX:** Four deputy coordinators and eleven investigators provide voluntary support to the Title IX coordinator; goals include eventually having at least one deputy as an intake officer and two full-time investigators.

---

### AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFFING

- **5** full-time police officers
- **0** full-time security officers*
- **1** full-time dispatchers
- **0.4** officers per 1,000 students

*5-7 student officers serve on part-time basis

### KEY INITIATIVES

**Hiring Police Officers:** Hiring additional police officers has been difficult due to budgetary constraints. SUU would like to have at least 1 officer per 1,000 students.

**Clery Act Committee:** A coalition to support Clery related cases is currently being formed and is expected to be active in the coming months.

**Title IX:** Four deputy coordinators and eleven investigators provide voluntary support to the Title IX coordinator; goals include eventually having at least one deputy as an intake officer and two full-time investigators.

### LEADERSHIP

- **Rick Brown** – Chief of Police
- **Carlos Medina** – Interim Lieutenant
- **Hollie Buhrman** – Police Officer and Clery Coordinator
- **Lucia Maloy** – Title IX Coordinator and Legal Counsel
- **Dr. Jared Tippets** – VP of Student Affairs
Org Structure – Key Learnings

POLICE CHIEF IS HEAD OF CAMPUS SAFETY
The police chief is responsible for law enforcement, emergency management, student security officers, and general campus safety. He reports to the VP of Student Affairs who then reports to the President.

CLERY AND TITLE IX RESPONSIBILITIES ARE SEPARATE
A campus police officer is responsible for Clery Act compliance and training, while an attorney within the legal department is Title IX coordinator and is supported by four deputy coordinators.

SAIT AND TITLE IX COMMITTEES MEET WEEKLY
SAIT (Student Assessment and Intervention Team) gathers various stakeholders across the university, including police, student services, CAPS, and diversity and inclusion, to review topics related to student safety. This is separate from the Title IX committee which meets every week to review all Title IX matters.

STUDENT OFFICERS ASSIST WITH SAFETY
Approximately six volunteer student officers handle non-law enforcement responsibilities (e.g. escorting students, open and closing buildings, and assisting with phone calls). These individuals are commonly interested in law enforcement as a career.
Campus Safety – Organizational Structure

President
Scott Wyatt

VP of Student Affairs
Jared Tippets

Diversity & Inclusion
Health & Wellness
Student Government
Housing & Residential Life

Police Department

Chief of Police
Rick Brown

Interim Lieutenant
Carlos Medina

Police / Dispatch
Security
Emergency Management

Officer
Hollie Vuhrman

Clergy Act Compliance

Legal Office

Title IX Coordinator
Lucia Maloy

Title IX Complaints

Relevant External Organization
Canyon Creek Services
Domestic Violence Coalition

Relevant Committees / Teams
Student Executive Council
LEA Task Force
Student Assessment and Intervention Team (SAIT)

Chiefs of Police Committee
Risk Management Committee

Housing Committee

Direct Report
Relevant Roles
Key Responsibilities
External Involvement

Primary Responsibility for Clergy Act
Primary Responsibility for Title IX
**Clery vs. Title IX**

### Org Structure

**Police Department**
- **Police Chief**
  - Rick Brown
- **Officer**
  - Hollie Buhrman

**Legal Office**
- **President**
  - Scott Wyatt
- **Title IX Coordinator**
  - Lucia Maloy

### Other Support

**Clery Act Committee**
- Hollie Buhrman leads Clery Act reporting on top of regular officer duties like patrol
- All officers receive Clery Act training upon onboarding
- A Clery Act Committee is in its inception to act as a board of advisors for the team

**Student Executive Council**

**Title IX Committee**
- Title IX is housed in the legal department and reports directly to the president’s office
- All investigators and deputy Title IX coordinators are volunteers and not dedicated staff
- The Title IX Committee serves as the primary group to discuss updates and cases

**4 Deputy Title IX Coordinators**

**11 Volunteer Investigators**

---

*The Clery Act Committee is currently being formed*
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

NO FORMAL MOUs EXIST BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND LOCAL POLICE FORCES
Cedar City PD and SUU have a strong relationship and assist one another on an ad-hoc basis; however, SUU plans to formalize this relationship in the near future.

VICTIM ADVOCACY IS PROVIDED BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATION AND TITLE IX
While the Title IX department offers some victim advocacy, SUU also partners with Canyon Creek Services, a community resource, to provide additional support that is available 24/7.

CEDAR CITY DISPATCH RECEIVES ALL INCIDENTS AND COMMUNICATES WITH CAMPUS
Local police departments have a map of the campus police jurisdiction and will loop in campus authorities by locating calls from the area. The university does have an internal number that is contacted sparingly.

TITLE IX REPORTING IS COLLABORATIVE BETWEEN CAMPUS AND CEDAR CITY POLICE
Victims are consistently ushered through the process and provided all of their rights and options; while local authorities and the campus have differing timelines and responsibilities, the two work with one-another.
**Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map**

**Incident Reported**
- 911 Call
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through Cedar City Dispatch.
  - All calls after 5pm at directed to Cedar City dispatch.
- Direct Call to Campus
  - SUU and Cedar City PD share access to dispatch.
- Incident During Patrol

**Dispatch**
- Within University geographic jurisdiction?
  - Yes: Cedar City Police officer responds
  - No: Related to law enforcement?
    - Yes: SUU campus police officer responds
    - No: Campus police or student security officer responds (e.g. safety escort, motor vehicle assistance)

**Law Enforcement Response**
- While no official MOU is in place, there is a general understanding that agencies will help each other as needed, and, therefore, both municipal and campus police provide support for each other as needed.

**Reporting**
- Crime Log
  - The log is internally housed and made available on request. These data are shared amongst other law enforcement agencies.
- Timely Warnings
  - All officers are trained on standard procedures and protocols. The norm is the secretary notifying the chief of police. Text messages are sent to all students and there is an opt-in option for emails as well.
- Title IX Crimes
  - Students have an option to be interviewed, file a report, are given victim advocacy resources, and Canyon Creek offers temporary housing.
CONSISTENTLY ATTRACTING COMPETITIVE APPLICANTS IS A PAIN POINT
The low pay scale makes it difficult to recruit for officer positions within SUU’s staff; the applicants generally have very little experience and need to be trained by SUU after joining (at an additional cost).

TRAINING PROVIDED IS CONTINGENT ON ANNUAL BUDGETARY RESTRICTIONS
Due to the constrained budget, officers are not trained on Clery and cannot receive specialized training. These specialized trainings usually require travel and other expenses not allotted for in the current budget.

AD-HOC DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION TRAININGS
Diversity and inclusion trainings are provided on an ad-hoc basis through the center for diversity and inclusion. There is an appetite for more racism and bias training for campus police and faculty, but budgetary constraints provide limitations on training.

FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS RECEIVE ANNUAL VIDEO TRAININGS
Active shooter, lockdown, and sexual assault trainings are required trainings for all university personnel and students. Safe campus and assault trainings are online while the active shooting training is in-person and will become a regular training (post-COVID).
Executive Summary

**Victim Advocacy Position:** Snow College is looking to hire an office manager position within the Department of Public Safety who can also provide in-house victim advocacy services / support.

**Staffing Support:** Many different responsibilities (e.g., Clery, emergency management, policing, etc.) fall on the Chief of Police; handling so many diverse roles can put a strain on effectiveness.

**4th Police Officer:** Specific to the police force, the Department of Public Safety is looking to hire another officer.

### AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFFING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full-time police officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time security officers*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time dispatchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers per 1,000 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Snow college employs 12 student security agents who provide security support (roughly 8 hours per week each)*

### KEY INITIATIVES

**Victim Advocacy Position:**

**Staffing Support:**

**4th Police Officer:**

### LEADERSHIP

- Derek Walk – Chief of Police and Director of Public Safety
- Staci Taylor – Title IX Coordinator
TITLE IX COORDINATOR OVERSEES TITLE IX AND RISK MANAGEMENT
Snow College’s Risk Manager is also responsible for Title IX Coordinator duties; she is supported by a full-time investigator as well as 7 volunteer employee Title IX deputies.

POLICE CHIEF WEARS MULTIPLE HATS
The Chief of Police functions as the head of public safety and bears responsibility for the police staff, security agents, Clery Act reporting, and emergency management.

CARE TEAM HANDLES BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION
Snow College has a CARE Team that meets once a week to discuss situations requiring support and/or intervention for at-risk students; this team includes different departments and can meet ad hoc as needed.

STUDENT-FOCUSED SECURITY AGENTS
Snow College employs 12 student security agents on campus who are primarily tasked with patrolling campus, carrying a phone, unlocking rooms, locking buildings, etc.
Campus Safety Team – Organizational Structure
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VICTIM ADVOCACY SUPPORT COMES FROM EXTERNAL RESOURCES
Snow College utilizes both the county attorney’s office and New Horizons to provide victim advocacy support for students as needed; the police chief owns the responsibility of connecting students to these resources.

MOU IN PLACE WITH MUNICIPAL POLICE
While incidents are directed to campus police first, Snow College has an MOU with the Ephraim police department for additional support and immediate response if campus police doesn’t have availability/capacity.

EMPHASIS TO STUDENTS IS TO GO DIRECTLY TO LOCAL DISPATCH
Snow College students are encouraged to call directly to the local county dispatch given the guaranteed quick response time and the ability of the dispatch team to connect students to campus contacts.

FOCUS ON INCREASED TITLE IX OFFICE AWARENESS TO IMPROVE REPORTING
Student awareness of Title IX reporting options and support was historically low, which led to a focus on improved messaging and communication efforts with students (ultimately increasing reporting frequency).
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

**Incident Reported**
- **911 Call**
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through the local County Dispatch.
- **Direct Call to Campus Police**
- **Incident During Patrol**

**Dispatch**
- **Local County Dispatch**

**Law Enforcement Response**
- **Is Snow College Campus Police available?**
  - **Yes**
    - **Ephraim Police responds**
      - Snow College is typically dispatched first, but geographic proximity of available officers sometimes overrides official jurisdiction; the investigation is often handed off following the initial response.
  - **No**
    - **Is it appropriate for a security agent to respond?**
      - **Yes**
        - **Snow College Security Agent responds / assists**
          - Security Agents primarily help with locking/unlocking doors and monitoring campus; as a result, they are rarely responding to incidents.
      - **No**

**Crime Log**
- Campus Police keeps a 60-day crime log that is publicly available. This includes Clery crimes that will then be published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.

**Timely Warnings**
- Use alert system for emergencies only (text, phone call, and email); have a team in charge of providing this communication when needed.

**Title IX Crimes**
- All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.

**Snow College**
- Typically dispatched first, but geographic proximity of available officers sometimes overrides official jurisdiction; the investigation is often handed off following the initial response.

**Ephraim Police**
- Responds to incidents.

**Security Agents**
- Primarily help with locking/unlocking doors and monitoring campus; as a result, they are rarely responding to incidents.
FOCUS ON HIRING A FOURTH OFFICER
Snow College currently has 3 police officers, including the police chief; given the challenges of covering the campus with only 3 officers, the college is looking to expand its force.

TRAINING OTHER OFFICERS IN CLERY
The police chief is responsible for Clery reporting, and will train his other officers in order to pass on some of that responsibility; this will allow for more focus on other administrative duties and will create redundancy for continuity of operations.

TITLE IX TRAINING FOR A VARIETY OF STUDENT TYPES
Snow College has Title IX training for all students, including training opportunities for student groups such as athletes, student leaders, and foreign students.

LOOK TO PROVIDE POLICE TRAINING WELL BEYOND THE REQUIRED 40 HOURS
While 40 hours of police officer training is mandated, Snow College looks to go well beyond that requirement through a mix of online trainings, in-person trainings, and traveling to trainings provided elsewhere.
Executive Summary

**Student Relationships:** SLCC is placing a heavy emphasis on building relationships with students based on trust and transparency, especially given the current environment.

**Restructured Title IX Office:** A new Title IX Coordinator was hired several months ago with this role now falling outside of the Dean of Students (where Title IX used to live). While it’s not currently in place, SLCC is hoping to have a deputy Title IX coordinator at each campus and then in each student organization.

**KEY INITIATIVES**

**LEADERSHIP**

- **Chuck Leper** – VP of Student Affairs & Enrollment Management
- **Shane Crabtree** – Executive Director of Public Safety
- **Ken Stonebrook** – Assistant VP and Dean of Students
- **Andy Campbell** – Deputy Director of Public Safety
- **David Jensen** – Director of EEO & Title IX

**AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Campus Safety</td>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFFING**

- On-site police officers
- Full-time security officers
- Municipal police agencies

- 4

---

Confidential
RESTRUCTURED TITLE IX OFFICE
SLCC recently filled a Title IX position (Title IX Coordinator) to provide students with a more consistent and dedicated resource; as part of this, Title IX moved from the Dean of Students to the office of People and Workplace Culture

DEDICATED DIRECTOR OF CAMPUS SAFETY
While policing is contracted out to the municipal police, SLCC still has an in-house executive director of public safety who is a sworn police officer and oversees the team of security officers as well as Clery Act compliance

BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION TEAM
The majority of the coordination that takes place with campus safety occurs during a bi-monthly meeting with the Behavioral Intervention Team. This team includes dean of students, public safety, health and counseling, legal, disability resource center, faculty, and other representatives across the college

CAMPUS POLICE CONTRACTED OUT TO UTAH HIGHWAY PATROL
The Utah Highway Patrol provides dedicated officers to the main SLCC campuses, while the local municipal police provides support for the remaining campuses. There is 24/7 police coverage at the 4 main campuses
Org Structure

Other Support

Role and Responsibilities

Clery Act

Department of Public Safety

VP of Finance and Admin
Jeffrey West

Director Public Safety
Shane Crabtree

Deputy Director

Clery Safety Committee

Title IX

Office of Equity

Associate VP People and Workplace Culture
Sara Reed

Title IX Director
David Jensen

10+ certified Title IX Investigators

- The Director of Public Safety serves as the Clery officer for the college
- The college reaches out to UHP, municipal police forces, UTA, etc. to get Clery statistics
- The Deputy Director of Public Safety supports with Clery reporting

- Compliance office for handling issues of discrimination and sexual misconduct
- 10 Title IX investigators who all have obtained level 1 certification
USE EXTERNAL VICTIM ADVOCACY RESOURCE
SLCC doesn’t employ any victim advocates, but rather works through an external partner who provides advocates (many of whom are available 24/7)

SECURITY OFFICERS ARE LIMITED PRIMARILY TO MINOR INCIDENTS
Security officers help with minor things like service calls (flat tires, locked cars, etc.) and security escorts; the college prefers to involve law enforcement for all other incidents since they are better trained

TRAINING STUDENTS TO REACH OUT TO THE RIGHT RESOURCE
Many students are accustomed to calling the director of Public Safety directly, but the college is working to train students to use 911 as the first line of contact

TWO DISPATCH CENTERS ARE USED
SLCC receives support from both the local county dispatch center and the UHP Dispatch center; the college advertises 911 as well as the UHP number
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

**Incident Reported**
- 911 Call
- Direct Call to Office of Public Safety
- Incident During Security Patrol

**Dispatch**
- UHP Dispatch

- Yes
  - Campus has dedicated UHP Officer?
    - Yes
      - Municipal Police responds
    - No
      - Related to Law Enforcement?
        - Yes
          - Dedicated UHP Officer responds
        - No
          - Campus security officer handles situation

- No
  - Yes
    - Municipal Police responds
  - No
    - Yes
      - At SLCC’s 4 main campuses, UHP provides 24/7 coverage
    - No
      - At SLCC’s 3 municipal agencies for support at smaller campuses (Sandy, Salt Lake City, and West Valley)

**Law Enforcement Response**
- Yes
  - Municipal Police responds
- No
  - Dedicated UHP Officer responds

**Crime Log**
- The Department of Public Safety compiles a Daily Crime Log that is available to the media, the public, and various campus offices upon request; Annual Campus Safety Report is put together to report on Clery crimes as well as non-Clery crimes like theft which SLCC includes to be extra thorough

**Timely Warnings**
- Once key criteria of incidents are identified, and if a Timely Warning is required, information is communicated via the emergency notification system (email/phone call/text); students can opt into these notifications

**Title IX Crimes**
- All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Office of Equity, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.

Students are encouraged to use 911 for all emergencies and the UHP Dispatch for non-emergencies.

SLCC works with 3 municipal agencies for support at smaller campuses (Sandy, Salt Lake City, and West Valley).

At SLCC’s 4 main campuses, UHP provides 24/7 coverage.

SLCC works with 3 municipal agencies for support at smaller campuses (Sandy, Salt Lake City, and West Valley).
SPECIALIZED TRAINING REQUIRED FOR POLICE OFFICERS
Given that UHP officers are coming from a highway setting, SLCC provide additional specialized training on topics like domestic violence, lethality assessment, Title IX, Clery, and Crisis Intervention.

PARTICULARLY STRONG FOCUS ON DEESCALATION TRAINING
Based in part on feedback from the governor, SLCC has placed particular focus on training officers with de-escalation skills.

PROVIDE REGULAR TITLE IX AND CLERY TRAINING TO STAFF MEMBERS
Clery trainings are provided to relevant individuals through online resources, while the Dean of Students and Title IX Director provide regular Title IX trainings.

TWO FORMER POLICE OFFICERS IN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY LEADERSHIP
SLCC has hired two former police officers to fill the Executive Director of Public Safety role and the Deputy Director of Public Safety role; this helps with managing relationships with contracted police forces.
Bridgerland Technical College
Executive Summary

**AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Security</td>
<td>Designated Role</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFFING**

- **1** On-site police officers*
- **0** full-time security officers
- **1** Municipal police agencies

*Shares time with two high schools

**KEY INITIATIVES**

**Additional Training:** Tech colleges have limited access to trainings by nature, and so the college is looking to make this a more proactive priority going forward

**Diversity Coordinator:** The VP of Student Services was recently made the Diversity Coordinator – a new role that is still being fleshed out. He is also responsible for Clery compliance and Title IX reporting

**LEADERSHIP**

- **Jim White** – VP of Student Services
- **Emily Hobbs** – Chief of Staff
Org Structure – Key Learnings

**TITLE IX AND CLERY FALL UNDER DIRECTOR OF STUDENT SERVICES**
Bridgerland’s VP of Student Services is responsible for Clery compliance and reporting as well serving as the college’s Title IX Director and Diversity Coordinator – a new role that was recently added to his responsibilities.

**STRONG POLICE PRESENCE THROUGH POLICE ACADEMY**
Bridgerland has its own police academy as well as a dedicated workout room for local police officers; together, this creates a strong police presence on campus in which students have regular interaction with law enforcement.

**RISK MANAGEMENT TEAM COORDINATES HEALTH RELATED ISSUES**
Bridgerland has a committee that meets quarterly and functions as an emergency response team to handle emergency related issues (e.g., safety, risk, OSHA) as they arise.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY**
The Chief of Staff handles protocol for lockdowns and electronic access, and the President is heavily involved in emergency management. A steering committee was pulled together to handle the COVID public health crisis.
Campus Safety Team – Organizational Structure
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Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

ONE PART-TIME, ON-SITE POLICE OFFICER
Bridgerland has a dedicated officer that splits time with two other high schools in the area; the officer has an office on Bridgerland’s campus and students are trained to bring reports directly to the officer.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT BOOKLET USED ACROSS CAMPUS
Standard emergency response information along with key contact information is contained in a booklet that is found in every classroom on campus.

DISPATCH DIRECTS CALLS DIRECTLY TO RESOURCE OFFICER
Both BTech campuses use the local county dispatch and the dispatch systems direct calls right to on-site officer based on geographical jurisdiction.

VICTIM ADVOCACY AND MENTAL HEALTH RESOURCES PROVIDED EXTERNALLY
Bridgerland has a list of resources available that are provided online or directly from Student Services; other faculty are trained to provide help as well.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

**Incident Reported**

- 911 Call
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through the local County Dispatch.
- Incident During Officer Patrol
- Direct Call to Student Services

**Dispatch**

- Local County Dispatch

**Law Enforcement Response**

- Incident within Campus Geography?
  - Yes: On-site Police Officer Responds
  - No: Off-Site Municipal Police Officers Respond

**On-site Police Officer Responds**

- On-Site Police Officer is not on campus full-time due to responsibilities at neighboring schools, but he does have a dedicated office that students are aware of.
- VP of Student Services will provide additional support if the Resource Officer is unavailable.

**Off-Site Municipal Police Officers Respond**

- Logan Police Department serves Bridgerland when needs fall outside of the institution's geography, or if the on-site officer needs additional support.

**Crime Log**

- The VP of Student Services works with the entire team to collect data on Clery crimes that are published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.

**Timely Warnings**

- Use a system called Rave Mobile Safety; the entire admin team has access to this system, but the Chief of Staff is typically responsible for sending the messages (using pre-written messages).

**Title IX Crimes**

- All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the VP of Student Services (Title IX Coordinator), who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action is needed.
CURRRENTLY IN PROCESS OF TRAINING TITLE IX INVESTIGATORS
Members of the campus community are being trained as Title IX investigators (on top of their other responsibilities); three individuals just recently received training from SUU

PROVIDE GENERAL TRAINING RESOURCES THROUGH EVERFI
Annual trainings are provided through an online tool called EverFi and provide opportunities for training across an array of different campus safety topics

ANNUAL FALL KICK-OFF MEETING COVERS SAFETY RELATED TOPICS
Bridgerland has a fall kick-off meeting every August and safety related topics such as risk management are woven into these meetings; other professional development is often provided on an ad hoc basis
Davis Tech
Executive Summary

**Title IX Training:** Davis Tech is currently working to revamp its training on Title IX for students and staff members; this training will be available virtually through Bridge.

**Hiring a Dedicated Police Officer:** Last year, Davis Tech requested a dedicated School Resource police officer as part of their legislative ask; this remains a high priority given staffing constraints and leadership’s concerns over student safety.

### AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Security</td>
<td>Designated Role</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFFING

- **0** On-site police officers
- **2** full-time security officers*
- **1** Municipal police agency

*Davis Tech has 1 additional part-time security officer

### KEY INITIATIVES

**LEADERSHIP**

- **Julie Blake** – VP of Student Affairs
- **Spencer Kimball** – Director of Student Services
- **Kristin Culley** – Security/Risk Coordinator
- **Alison Anderson** – Director of Instructional Systems
- **Bryce Fox** – Director of Facilities

---

Cicero
CAMPUS SAFETY RESPONSIBILITIES FALL IN DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS
Several different roles throughout the organization play a part in campus safety efforts; security and emergency management lives within the Department of Administrative Services while Title IX, Clery, and training efforts live within the Department of Student Affairs.

SAME INDIVIDUAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CLERY AND TITLE IX
Davis Tech’s Director of Student Services has responsibility as the school’s Title IX and Clery Coordinator; he works closely with the security coordinator for assistance with investigations and reporting.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FALLS UNDER THE SECURITY COORDINATOR
The school’s security coordinator, in addition to other responsibilities, oversees emergency management, which includes the development and refinement of the school’s emergency response plan.

DEMAND EXISTS FOR A DEDICATED POLICE RESOURCE
The college has petitioned multiple times for a dedicated police officer at Davis Tech to support the security team and help with staffing constraints.
Campus Safety Team – Organizational Structure
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VICTIM ADVOCATE SUPPORT COMES FROM EXTERNAL PARTNER
Davis Tech partners with Blomquist Hale as a resource for students in need of victim advocacy or mental health counseling; the Director of Student Services is responsible for communicating this resource to students.

DESIGNATED MUNICIPAL POLICE POINT OF CONTACT
Davis Tech does not have a School Resource Officer like other neighboring schools, but they do have a sergeant that serves unofficially as their point of contact when the municipal police needs to be involved with incidents.

FACILITIES AND STUDENT AFFAIRS BOTH HELP WITH TITLE IX CRIME INVESTIGATION
Davis Tech’s Director of Student Services is responsible for Title IX and is always involved, but the school’s security coordinator serves as the lead investigator and involves the police if requested by the student or required due to threat of safety.

ONE CROSS-FUNCTIONAL COMMITTEE EXISTS PERTAINING TO CAMPUS SAFETY
A 16-member emergency management committee meets quarterly to discuss campus safety issues and the operations plan; the goal is to have representation from every program.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

Incident Reported
- 911 Call
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through Davis County Dispatch.
- Direct Call to Campus Security
- Incident During Patrol

Dispatch
- Davis County Dispatch

Law Enforcement Response
- Involves university students?
  - Yes
  - Davis Police Responds
    - No official MOU is in place, but a local School Resource Officer (SRO) is viewed as the unofficial point of contact
  - No

- Related to Law Enforcement?
  - Yes
  - Campus security officer handles situation
    - Includes assistance such as safety escorts, motor vehicle assistance, as well as Title IX investigation
  - No

Reporting
- Crime Log
  - The Security Coordinator collects data on Clery crimes that are published as a part of the Annual Safety Report.
- Timely Warnings
  - Anytime an incident would affect the campus as a whole, the director of marketing is notified who then pushes out a notification to students via email, voicemail or text.
- Title IX Crimes
  - All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Title IX Coordinator; the Security Coordinator then conducts her own investigation to determine if disciplinary action is needed and/or if the police should be involved.
REQUIRED VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT (VAWA) TRAINING FOR STUDENTS
Training is required as part of annual required training for staff and students and is an important area of focus for the school.

USE BRIDGE TO DELIVER VIRTUAL TRAININGS
Virtual trainings for students and staff are offered through Bridge and cover topics such as VAWA, HIPPA, OSHA, and more.

TRAINING FOR SECURITY OFFICERS IS DONE ALONGSIDE THE LOCAL POLICE FORCE
Davis Tech relies on the local municipal police force as a source of training for security officers; each year typically has a particular focus with this past year focusing on active shooter training.

CURRENTLY DEVELOPING NEW TITLE IX TRAINING
Davis Tech’s current Title IX training is in need of being updated; the Director of Student Services is currently developing new training that will be available virtually through Bridge.
Dixie Technical College
Executive Summary

MOU and Clery Act: The university has experienced significant growth since its founding in 2001. Establishing an MOU with St. George municipal police and clarifying Clery Act responsibilities are two interrelated initiatives that are progressing in lock-step.

Victim Advocacy: Leadership has identified mental health services and victim advocacy as two areas with room to grow; plans to expand beyond the Safe UT app are in place.

Camera Monitors: Recently the campus installed approximately 100 security cameras. This satisfies a large share of monitoring needs.

LEADERSHIP

- **Sam Draper** – VP of Administrative Services
- **Camille Lyman** – Director of Student Services
- **Joe Brusati** – IT & Facilities Director
- **Gordon Bell** – Head of Security
TITLE IX AND CLERY RESPONSIBILITIES ARE SHARED AMONGST STAFF
Title IX Coordinator and Clery Act reporting roles incorporate a team effort involving multiple departments and personnel; Clery protocol is not clearly defined and is being reworked.

MOUs DO NOT EXIST WITH MUNICIPAL POLICE
Precise agreements between campus security and St. George PD do not exist; local law enforcement interact with campus security on an as-needed basis.

CAMPUS SECURITY PRIMARILY SERVES THE ROLE OF A DETERRENT
The three-person security team perform a variety of duties and leadership noted an intention to move the team away from filling administrative roles.

STAFF GENERALLY WORK TOGETHER ON A VARIETY OF ROLES AS GENERALISTS
By-in-large leadership collaborates with one another and fill a variety of roles; the college’s small size lend itself to inter-departmental sharing of information and teamwork as well individuals having multiple lines of report.
SAFE UTAH PROVIDES VICTIM ADVOCACY SERVICES
Leadership’s goal is to augment the Safe Utah App in the near future with additional services. Currently, all time-sensitive cases are reported back to Dixie Tech’s Director of Student Services.

TIMELY WARNINGS ARE CURRENTLY DISSEMINATED THROUGH THE LIVE SAFE APP
Mass email and text messaging are the two channels for timely warnings; the Live Safe app serves as conduit for text messaging, but there is a low opt-in rate and plans to replace are being discussed.

ST. GEORGE PD RECEIVES CAMPUS INCIDENTS ABOVE ‘OBSERVE & REPORT’ LEVELS
All incidents and reports above an administrative and non-consequential level are shared with St. George PD; additionally, law enforcement departments collaborate with Dixie Tech security on an ad-hoc basis.

TITLE IX IS STRUCTURALLY DEFINED BUT HAS NEVER HAD A REPORTED CASE
Roles and responsibilities are delineated within administrative roles and have yet to be tested in a real-world setting; the college has not had a Title IX case in its nineteen-year history.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

Incident Reported
- 911 Call
  - All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through the local Washington County Dispatch.
- Direct Call to Campus Security
- Incident During Patrol
  - All incoming students are given a campus security phone number

Dispatch
- Washington County Dispatch

Law Enforcement Response
- St. George Police responds
  - No MOU exists with the local police, so any officer on-duty and in the area could respond
- Dixie Tech Security Officer responds
  - Security officers provide support with building maintenance, medical support, and incident reporting, but they are not licensed to prosecute

Related to Law Enforcement?
- Yes
- No

Crime Log
- Campus security adheres to the ‘observe and report’ protocol. All cases above a level deemed non-consequential are shared with the local St. George Police Department

Timely Warnings
- Text message and email are the two channels of communication. Mass emails are sent via the Director of Student Services and text messages through the LiveSafe phone app. The college is planning on replacing the application with a new resource due to its low opt-in rate

Title IX Crimes
- Since the college’s inception in 2001 there has never been a Title IX case reported. Roles and responsibilities exist but have never been tested.
EVERFI TRAINING IS VOLUNTARY AND COVERS A VARIETY OF TOPICS
Online training presentations covering topics such as sexual assault, substance abuse, and racial discrimination are offered to students on a voluntary basis.

FACULTY AND STAFF RECEIVE IN-PERSON ALCOHOL TRAININGS BI-ANNUALLY
Special topics are selected every year but always contain modules on alcohol, illicit substance abuse, sexual abuse, and racial discrimination.

CAMPUS SECURITY FORCES EXCEED ENFORCEMENT TRAINING REQUIREMENTS
The three-person detail complies with state training standards despite not being required to do so. Firearms, CPR, bomb threats, terrorism, and forensic interviews are the primary components of their training.

A VARIETY OF INITIATIVES TO INCREASE TRAININGS ARE CURRENTLY BEING PLANNED
The security detail aspires to begin training for vulnerable populations in self-defense and awareness. Faculty and staff are planning to begin de-escalation techniques training in the coming months.
Mountainland Technical College
Executive Summary

AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Head of Security</th>
<th>Dispatch</th>
<th>Clery and Title IX</th>
<th>Victim Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Designated Role</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INITIATIVES

On-campus Security: Mountainland does not currently have a security guard on campus; this is a top priority for the college. The second priority is creating a cohesive campus security department.

Clergy Training: Upskilling data collectors and investigators are quick wins that are being planned in the coming months.

Mental Health Services: Provision of services outside of operating hours is a priority for leadership as enrollment grows.

STAFFING

- 0 On-site police officers
- 0 full-time security officers
- 4 Municipal police agencies

LEADERSHIP

- Joseph Demma – VP of College Relations
- Kirt Michaelis – VP of Administrative Services
- Blake Hendry – Facilities Director & Risk Manager
- Justin Browning – HR Director
Org Structure – Key Learnings

CAMPUS SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY IS SPLIT BETWEEN LEADERS
There is no role for Director of Campus Safety; leaders in Student Services, HR, Communications, and Facilities each have responsibilities related to campus safety.

BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION TEAM ENSURES COORDINATION ACROSS DEPTS
Student Services, HR, Facilities, counselors, and program directors meet together once a month to discuss any situation that could pose a threat to campus safety. This is separate from the Emergency Committee that meets once a quarter to discuss hazards (fire, active shooter, etc.).

STUDENT INCLUSION IS AN UPHILL CHALLENGE DUE TO AVERAGE PROGRAM LENGTH
The administration includes students in their committees whenever possible and notes it is difficult to include students when their average time at Mountainland is one-year.

CREATING A CAMPUS SECURITY ROLE IS A TOP PRIORITY
Crime logs, victim’s advocacy, and Clery Act are all areas of growth the college believes can be filled with the addition of a cohesive security office and a full-time security guard.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

**LEADERSHIP RELIES ON MUNICIPAL POLICE WITH AN MOU IN PLANNING STAGES**
There are no formal law enforcement agreements or on-campus crime logs at Mountainland; leadership notes this as a high priority for improvement.

**TIMELY WARNINGS ARE DISSEMINATED TO RELEVANT CAMPUSES**
Multiple campus locations deem that timely warnings should only be sent to select campuses for select instances. The head of the communications department leads decision making with the President’s office.

**VICTIM ADVOCACY IS OUTSOURCED VIA WASATCH MENTAL HEALTH**
On-campus counselors are staffed at the college, with additional support provided by Wasatch Mental Health. If a call comes in after hours, it is directed to the local police. The Safe UT app and campus hotlines are also available resources.

**CUSTODIANS HELP WITH SECURITY ESCORTS**
Without a staffed security guard, custodians are often asked to help with non-emergencies such as security escorts. However, motor vehicle assistance and car lock outs are directed to the police.
Mountainland does not have a police or security presence on any of their campuses and relies on municipal police departments for their law enforcement needs.

911 Call

Direct Call to Student Services

Incident Reported

Local County Dispatch

Law Enforcement Response

Off-Site Municipal Police Officers Respond

Yes

No MOUs are in place, but depending on the campus, Lehi, Orem, Spanish Fork, or Salt Lake City PD could all be asked to respond.

No

Mountainland does not have a security team, so all incidents related to law enforcement of any level are directed to the police.

Custodian May Respond

Custodians often help with security escorts, but car lock outs are directed to local PD.

Related to Law Enforcement?

The Communications Department connects directly with the President’s office and utilize the R.A.V.E system. Warnings are only sent to applicable impacted campuses.

Timely Warnings

No logging of crimes was indicated to be recorded by Mountainland’s leadership.

Crime Log

Title IX Crimes

Two investigators are assigned to every case and a decision committee of three individuals sit on the Behavioral Intervention Team.

Yes

No

No

Yes

No

Yes

No
HIRING A FULL-TIME SECURITY GUARD WOULD ENHANCE CAMPUS SECURITY
There is no law enforcement present on campus and leadership recognizes the need for at least one full-time officer or guard per campus during their hours of operation (7am-10pm)

ANNUAL ROLE-SPECIFIC TRAINING IS PROVIDED VIA BRIDGE
Students, faculty, and staff receive training on general topics (i.e. earthquake, active shooter etc.) while special training exist for specific roles and responsibilities

DIVERSITY & INCLUSION TRAINING THROUGH SPEAKERS FOR FACULTY AND STAFF
When scheduling gaps are available, speakers or administrator are invited to speak and share with faculty and staff. Student cases concerning D&I are channeled through the college’s HR department

SPECIALIZED TRAININGS EXIST FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND CAREER TRACKS
The college’s focus on trade skills requires relevant students to undergo industry specific, often OSHA related, trainings.
Ogden-Weber Technical College
Executive Summary

AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Security</td>
<td>Designated Role</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responisbility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INITIATIVES

**Live Safe:** This mobile app provides a wide array of services for students and staff ranging from campus liaison requests to mental health cases. Neighboring institutions experience a low opt-in rate with their service provider, but this has not been the case with Live Safe.

**Campus Dispatcher:** As the college continuously grows there is a pressing need for a dedicated dispatcher; guards currently are filling many roles and responsibilities.

**Safety & Security Training:** Security leadership stressed their dedication and continual messaging of ‘good customer service’

STAFFING

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-site police officers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time security officers*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal police agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*7 part-time officers

LEADERSHIP

- **Fred Frazier** – Campus Security Manager
- **Monica Schwenk** – VP of Student Services
- **Lisa Butler** – Student Services Director
- **KC Strong** – Counselor
**Org Structure – Key Learnings**

**TITLE IX RESPONSIBILITIES FALL WITHIN THE COUNSELING DEPT**
One of the campus counselors is designated as the campus compliance coordinator, which includes handling Title IX concerns. However, the security manager is responsible for Clery Act reporting.

**INFORMATION SHARING IS ‘FLAT’ AND ALLOWS FOR TIMELY COLLABORATION**
All department leads can inform the President of urgent matters without consulting their direct supervisor.

**SAIT AND SSEM TEAMS PROVIDE COLLABORATION ACROSS DEPARTMENTS**
SAIT (Student Assistance and Intervention Team) includes various stakeholders across the organization and meets monthly to discuss specific cases. The Safety and Security Management Team also meets to discuss specific security matters such as Clery Act compliance, etc.

**DIVERSITY & INCLUSION AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEES ARE BEING CREATED**
The institution has recently onboarded a Diversity & Inclusion officer; plans for a Diversity & Inclusion Committee and Compliance Committee are in their fledgling stages.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

**Almost All Incidents Are Directed to Ogden Municipal Police**
All cases above an inconsequential level are directed to Ogden PD dispatch, and low severity cases are internally reported within the crime log.

**The Live Safe App is Robust and Performs a Variety of Reporting Functions**
Live Safe is discrete from Safe UT and performs a variety of functions including but not limited to anonymous reporting, anonymous chatting, timely warnings, dispatch routing, and campus liaison requesting.

**Timely Warnings Are Disseminated Through Multiple Channels**
There are multiple levers campus staff can pull in order to inform their student base. Live Safe, text messaging, and phone calls are all opt-in options with a PA system as an emergency broadcasting tool.

**Leadership Desires a Full-Time Campus Dispatcher**
Leadership noted their efficiency of reporting and responding would increase if a full-time dispatcher was part of their organizational model.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

Incident Reported

- 911 Call
- Direct Call to Student Services
- Live Safe App

Dispatch

- Local County Dispatch

Law Enforcement Response

- Ogden Police responds

- Related to Law Enforcement?
  - Yes
    - Formal MOU is in place to guide expectations around the relationship
  - No
    - Ogden-Weber Tech Security Officer responds

Timely Warnings

- Live Safe, text message, phone call, and campus PA systems are utilized for emergency responses as necessary

Crime Log

- All incident reports are held within the campus security department; Clery Crimes are reported in the annual Campus Safety Report

Title IX Crimes

- The vast majority of campus cases do not rise to the criminal level. Campus compliance coordinates with Ogden PD on all logistical matters

Related to Law Enforcement?

- Yes
  - Formal MOU is in place to guide expectations around the relationship
- No
  - Ogden-Weber Tech Security Officer responds

Security officers provide support 24/7, but primarily help with minor issues not criminal in nature

Ogden-Weber Tech utilizes a unique application for campus crime reporting

Ogden - Weber Tech

Yes

No

Reporting

Ogden - Weber Tech

Security Officer responds

Crime Log

Timely Warnings

Title IX Crimes
**FACULTY AND STAFF UNDERGO ANNUAL TRAINING DEDICATED TO A SPECIAL TOPIC**
All faculty and staff meet for one week to discuss and upskill on a pertinent topic for the college. Previous trainings included topics such as Clery compliance, active shooter, and natural disaster emergency response.

**SKILLS USA PROVIDES MANDATORY TRAINING FOR INCOMING STUDENTS**
Topics are chosen annually and required by new students to complete. Alcohol and drug training is also a mandatory training outside of the Skills USA suite.

**RACISM, BIAS, AND EVERFI SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAININGS ARE OFFERED**
These voluntary trainings are offered to select populations on an annual basis online.

**CAMPUS SECURITY EMPHASIZES ‘GOOD CUSTOMER SERVICE’ AND ARE LICENSED**
All personnel receive structured unconscious bias, de-escalation training, and firearms trainings. Leadership has placed an intentional focus on serving students, faculty, and staff.
Southwest Technical College
Executive Summary

**AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Security</td>
<td>Designated Role</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY INITIATIVES**

**Clery & Title IX:** Recently the two mandates were combined under one individual who leads reporting. Data collectors and investigators are available on an ad-hoc basis.

**MOU Formulation:** A pressing priority for the administration is the signing of an MOU with both Cedar City and Kanab municipal police forces.

**Title IX Assistance:** Southern Utah University signed a formal agreement to provide assistance as needed for Title IX related cases.

**Security Technology Upgrade:** The college considered contracting a security presence, but opted to upgrade technology instead.

**LEADERSHIP**

- Mark Florence – Director of IT & Facilities
- James Mulleneaux – VP of Student Services
- Tessa Douglas – Director of Dual Enrollment and Placement Services

---

*No formal Head of Campus Safety position exists; responsibility is shared between departments.*
Org Structure – Key Learnings

**CLERY ACT AND TITLE IX LEAD ROLES ARE UNDER A SINGLE DEPARTMENT**
As of January 2020, leadership has shifted towards a combined Clery Act and Title IX structure that will soon become one role.

**AN MOU WITH MUNICIPAL DOES NOT EXIST AND IS A FOREFRONT PRIORITY**
Both Cedar City and Kanab campuses do not have a formal MOU with municipal police departments and rely on high school adjacent in case of an immediate emergency.

**THE SAFETY COMMITTEE IS ADAPTING TO GROWTH AND REASSESSING COMPOSITION**
Following COE protocol, the college surveys faculty, staff, and students annually. The Safety Committee meetings quarterly to review data and is planning to reorganize its team to include mid-level staff.

**THE INSTITUTION IS ORGANIZATIONALLY ‘FLAT’**
Due to its small size, the institution’s staff are able to fill a variety of roles and responsibilities on many staff members consequentially wear multiple hats.
Campus Safety Team – Organizational Structure

Office of Student Services
- VP of Student Services: James Mulleneaux
  - Academic Advising
  - Financial Aid
  - Enrollment
  - Director of Dual Enrollment & Placement: Tessa Douglas
    - Title IX Complaints

Facilities Department
- Director of Facilities: Mark Florence
  - Facilities
  - Infrastructure & IT Security

Relevant External Organizations
- Canyon Creek Services
- Municipal Police

Relevant Committees / Teams
- Safety Committee

College President
- Brennan Wood

Executive Assistant
- Christy Hugh

Primary Responsibility for Title IX
- Relevant Roles
- Key Responsibilities
- External Involvement
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

**IN LOW SEVERITY CASES, THE COLLEGE RELIES ON ADJACENT SCHOOL POLICE FORCES**
Both Kanab and Cedar City have high schools nearby with officers who are willing and able to help; there is no MOU in place, but there is a strong handshake relationship.

**TITLE IX PROCEDURES ARE FORMALIZED AND AN MOU EXISTS WITH SUU**
A recent title change has combined Clery Act and Title IX roles and responsibilities; in case of a conflict of interest or a staffing constraint an MOU was signed with Southern Utah University to provide support.

**VICTIM ADVOCACY IS PROVIDED VIA THE SAFE UT APP AND CANYON CREEK SERVICES**
Canyon Creek Services offers domestic violence and sexual assault services to SUU students; for mental health resources, students can use the SafeUT app or university curated list of mental health providers in the area.

**TIMELY WARNINGS VIA TEXT MESSAGE HAVE A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF OPT-IN**
Student information databases are inaccurate and do not provide contact information for a large majority of faculty, student, and staff. Nascent plans to opt-in more students are in the ideation stage.
Incident Reported

911 Call
Southwest does not have a police or security presence either campus and relies on municipal police departments for their law enforcement needs

Direct Call to Student Services
Students are encouraged to call Student Services with low severity cases

Dispatch

Local County Dispatch
Two different campuses are supported by either Cedar City or Kanab Dispatch

Law Enforcement Response

Municipal police responds
No MOU is in place, so local police treats response as they would with any other phone call (either Cedar City or Kanab PD)

Related to Law Enforcement?

Yes
Student Services will contact the local School Resource Officer as an unofficial point of contact

No
Student Services or Facilities handles situation
Only relevant for low severity cases

Crime Log
Southwest College does not currently track a log and has plans to include this when a law enforcement officer is added to their staff

Timely Warnings
Email and text messaging are the two conduits used for quickly disseminating information. Emails are automatically sent and text messages require students to opt-in through the ‘Remind’ app

Title IX Crimes
There are two investigators and hearings officers for incoming cases. The college has an MOU with Southern Utah University for conflict of interest and in case of needing assistance

Related to Law Enforcement?
Yes
Student Services will contact the local School Resource Officer as an unofficial point of contact

No
Student Services or Facilities handles situation
Only relevant for low severity cases

Yes
Municipal police responds
No MOU is in place, so local police treats response as they would with any other phone call (either Cedar City or Kanab PD)

No
Student Services or Facilities handles situation
Only relevant for low severity cases

Confidential / 137
Hiring / Onboarding / Training – Key Learnings

**STUDENTS, STAFF, AND FACULTY RECEIVE TRAINING VIA EVERFI**
Title IX, alcohol, and other trainings are provided through EverFI as an online mandatory training.

**ANNUALLY, FACULTY AND STAFF HOST A DIVERSITY & EQUITY MANDATORY TRAINING**
Every year during the summer months faculty and staff are invited to participated in a mandatory training on the topics of non-discrimination, diversity, and anti-harassment.

**ALL CAMPUS MEMBERS ARE INVITED ANNUALLY TO A SPECIAL TOPIC TRAINING**
Specialized professionals are invited to train a small number of participants on topics such as CPR and AED proficiency; topics covered rotates on a yearly basis and are selected based on perceived relevancy.

**EMERGENCY TRAININGS ARE PROVIDED QUARTERLY AND ROTATE APPROPRIATELY**
Fire, active shooter, and earthquake drills rotate and are practiced on an every 3-month basis.
Tooele Technical College
Executive Summary

**Behavioral Intervention Team**: Leadership plans to supplement committee package with a dedicated mental health services team promoting victim advocacy services.

**Creation of MOUs**: Defining relationships with Tooele municipal police and local high school security guards is a pressing priority for the college.

### AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Security</td>
<td>Designated Role</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFFING

- **0** On-site police officers
- **0** full-time security officers
- **1** Municipal police agency

### KEY INITIATIVES

**LEADERSHIP**

- **Ellen Lange-Christenson** – VP of Student Services
- **Kent Thygerson** – Head of Security & VP of Finance and Operations
- **Clint Bryant** – Director of Facilities
THE COLLEGE RELIES ON MUNICIPAL POLICE WITHOUT STAFFING A SECURITY OFFICER
Tooele PD and adjacent high schools provide law enforcement on an ad-hoc basis. If there is an emergency, the closest officer will handle the situation.

TITLE IX AND CLERY REPORTING ARE LED BY THE STUDENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
The college has never had a reported Clery or Title IX case. Overall compliance, data collection, and reporting systems are in place, but have yet to be tested.

A BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION TEAM IS CURRENTLY BEING IDEATED
Mental health services have yet to be formalized and the college is in the early stages of creating a BIT team. Currently select staff meet when an incident occurs and discuss next steps.
Campus Safety Team – Organizational Structure

College President
Paul Hacking

Office of Student Services

VP of Student Services
Ellen Lange-Christenson

Title IX and Clery Act reporting

Finance and Operations Department

VP of Finance and Ops
Kent Thygerson

Security

Facilities Department

Facilities Director
Clint Bryant

Emergency Preparedness

Clery Act and Title IX information gathering

Relevant Committees / Teams

Safety Committee

Emergency Preparedness Committee

Primary Responsibility for Clery Act
Primary Responsibility for Title IX
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

**INCIDENTS ARE REVIEWED WEEKLY DURING EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS MEETING**
Committee members review online, Safe UT, and in-person reports on a weekly basis. Often these discussion are had in the Safety Committee because the teams’ composition does not change.

**ALL STAKEHOLDERS ARE IN THE SAME BUILDING, FACILITATING EFFICIENT REPORTING**
Tooele Tech has a small campus and administrative responsibilities are all housed under one tightly-knit building. Leadership identifies this as an advantage for quick collaboration.

**INCIDENT REPORTING TO FACULTY IS ‘FLAT’ AND RECEIVES APPROPRIATE ATTENTION**
Students are encouraged to communicate incidents with faculty and staff. A response will be commensurate with the urgency and the President can be notified if the faculty deems it necessary or the student requests an integration.

**FOR URGENT INCIDENTS, ADJACENT SCHOOL POLICE ARE NOTIFIED IMMEDIATELY**
Tooele Tech does not have a trained officer on campus. Tooele PD and local high school law enforcement assist the college on an ad-hoc basis when a timely incident occurs.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Process Map

Incident Reported

911 Call
Tooele PD receives all dispatch calls as the technical college does not have a call-in phone number

Direct Call to Faculty / Staff

Safe UT App
Incidents are reported through the Safe UT app and directly to faculty and staff

Dispatch

Tooele County Dispatch

Law Enforcement Response

Tooele Police responds
No MOU is in place, so Tooele police treats response as they would with any other phone call

Yes

Related to Law Enforcement?

No

Timely Warnings

There are three primary channels of dissemination: Text messaging, email notification, and college website posting. All three do not require an opt-in by students, faculty, or staff

Crime Log
Incident reporting is housed under the facilities department and shared with all individuals who request a disclosure of information

Related to Law Enforcement?

- Yes
- No

Yes

Head of Campus Security handles situation

- Campus security reports all incidents, even if very minor
- Head of Campus Security Calls Adjacent High School Law Enforcement Department with time sensitive law enforcement needs

No

Head of Campus Security handles situation

- Incidents are reported through the Office of Student Services and the college has never had a Clery or Title IX case in its 11-year history
STUDENTS, STAFF, AND FACULTY RECEIVE SELECTED, ANNUAL TRAININGS
All relevant parties receive emergency response drilling; students are required to complete EverFi and specialty training contingent on industry of choice i.e. welding, construction etc.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ARE A RECOGNIZED AREA OF GROWTH
Currently the college does not have a counselor or a dedicated mental health professional on staff, which is an area of opportunity going forward

THE COLLEGE PREFERS TO HAVE A SECURITY PRESENCE ON CAMPUS IN THE FUTURE
Defining roles and providing services effectively to students has been a pain-point for faculty and staff; providing law enforcement services through a dedicated security guard would ease others’ burdens

THE COLLEGE’S SIZE ALLOWS LESS STRUCTURED ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
While the college aspires to grow, they recognize that currently there is not a necessity for a large staff to serve students effectively
Executive Summary

Racism and Bias: The college recently filled a new diversity officer position and school-wide diversity and inclusion training is a high priority; the college has also hired a 3rd party to conduct a racism/bias related assessment of the school.

Security Upgrades: All security cameras were recently updated and efforts are being made to develop key card access to all the doors.

AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Force</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Security</td>
<td>Dedicated Role</td>
<td>Shared Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>University Dispatch</td>
<td>Local Dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery and Title IX Responsibility</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>Outside Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INITIATIVES

LEADERSHIP

- Dean Wilson – VP of Student Services
- Cody Peterson – Facilities Manager
- Karen Secrest – Head of Financial Aid

STAFFING

- 2 On-site police officers*
- 0 full-time security officers
- 2 Municipal police agencies

*1 officer at each of the two campuses
Org Structure – Key Learnings

CAMPUS SAFETY FALLS UNDER VP OF STUDENT SERVICES
Anything on the student side of campus safety falls under student services (including managing the relationship with the municipal police) while physical safety (facilities, IT, security) falls under the VP of Fiscal Services under the Facilities Manager.

CLERY COLLABORATION ACROSS MULTIPLE DEPARTMENTS
The Facilities Manager handles the safety report creation, while the head of financial aid helps with data collection, compliance, and other coordination efforts.

HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE IS LED BY FACILITIES MANAGER
UB Tech’s facility manager and student success officer were recently made co-chairs of a health and safety committee that reviews the health and safety plan, does different drills, reviews incidents, discusses training topics, etc.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES FALL UNDER FACILITIES MANAGEMENT
The facilities manager oversees emergency management, with the direct input of the health and safety committee.
Reporting & Incidence Response – Key Learnings

**ASSIGNED, ON-SITE MUNICIPAL POLICE OFFICERS**
UB Tech contracts with local police agencies to provide a police officer on campus throughout the week from 7am – 4pm. An MOU is in place that describes the nature of the agreement and officers have dedicated office space at each school.

**COUNTY DISPATCH CONNECTS DIRECTLY TO ON-SITE OFFICERS**
Both UB Tech campuses use the local county dispatch; the dispatch systems direct calls right to on-site officers based on geographical jurisdiction.

**VICTIM ADVOCATE SUPPORT COMES FROM EXTERNAL PARTNER**
UB Tech uses external resources at the county level for victim advocacy and counseling support; the justice system provides additional help for students under 18 given that many minors are on campus.

**STUDENT SERVICES HANDLES ALL OTHER COMPLAINTS**
Any other safety-related calls that don’t go to the police go directly to the VP of Student Services. In the student handbook, students are directed to go to the VP of Student Services with any complaints.
911 Call

All 911 calls, even those from on campus, go through the local County Dispatch.

Incident During Patrol

Direct Call to Student Services

Students are encouraged to contact the VP of Student Services with any complaints.

Dispatch

Local County Dispatch

Incident Reported

On-site Police Officer Responds

If the incident is within campus geography, the on-site police officer will respond. If not, off-site municipal police officer responds.

Law Enforcement Response

Incident within Campus Geography?

Yes

No

Off-Site Municipal Police Officer Responds

Two other nearby schools have on-site officers who will provide additional support as needed.

Crime Log

The Facilities Manager and the Head of Financial Aid work together to collect the Clery crime data needed for the Annual Safety Report.

Timely Warnings

In the event of an emergency that requires a timely warning, information is shared with the front office and then communicated broadly over the PA system and through email.

Title IX Crimes

All incidents of sexual misconduct are reported to the Title IX Coordinator, who will then conduct their own investigation and determine if disciplinary action and/or police involvement is needed.

Students are encouraged to contact the VP of Student Services with any complaints.

Campus safety will also respond if the incident is severe enough (led by the VP of Student Services).

Confidential / 151
USE EVERFI FOR TITLE IX AND OTHER TRAININGS
Online training presentations covering Title IX, alcohol use, and other topics are provided through EverFi to students across campus. These trainings are only required for students who will be in Skills USA or off-campus representing the school for any other reason.

HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE OVERSEES SAFETY RELATED TRAINING
The Health and Safety Committee has a training schedule with active shooter, fire, and lockdown drills covered every year; other topics are rotated into the schedule based on needs and committee input.

POLICE TRAINING DETERMINED BY THE MUNICIPALITY
UB Tech does not require any additional training for on-site officers on top of what is provided and required by the municipality.

NEW DIVERSITY OFFICER
The college recruiter was recently made the diversity officer. As this role is brand new, the responsibilities of that role are still being decided.
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Key Secondary Sources

President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing
- 2015 report documenting important pillars and recommendations for law enforcement

UNC System Campus Safety Assessment
- 2014 research report evaluating UNC’s systemwide safety efforts and opportunities for improvement

UC System Police Task Force Report
- 2019 report analyzing existing campus policing practices and detailing opportunities for improvement

Re-Imagining Safety, Security and Law Enforcement
- 2020 report outlining steps for campuses to take given recent events related to law enforcement

---

1 President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing
2 UNC System Campus Safety Assessment
3 UC System Police Task Force Report
4 Re-Imagining Safety, Security, and Law Enforcement
Campus Safety Organizational Considerations

1. **ELEVATING DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY TO THE CABINET**
   Many campus safety departments report through business affairs rather than directly to the president; how deep within the organization the department lives can be indicative of its relative importance.

2. **MOVING CLERY ACT OUT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY**
   As long as the Clery Act lives in the department of public safety, it will be treated like a police issue; in reality, the Clery Act requires involvement from a number of different departments.

3. **UNIQUE LEADERSHIP REQUIREMENTS FOR HEAD OF PUBLIC SAFETY**
   Leaders must be able to navigate complex organizations and build relationships with stakeholders across multiple departments; the traditional skillset of a Chief of Police may not be fit for this role.

4. **STANDARDIZING CAMPUS SAFETY ACROSS THE SYSTEM**
   Many university systems (e.g., UT System) have systemwide leadership, policies, trainings, reporting procedures, meetings, etc.*

*See slides 156 and 157 for more details on what a more centralized Campus Safety system of higher education may look like.
Trends in Systemwide Standardization

Key Areas of Standardization

**Leaderships Positions**
Systemwide leadership roles across policing, risk management, compliance, etc.

**Policies and Procedures**
Documented policies and procedures at the system level regarding various aspects of campus safety

**Hiring and Applications**
Candidates apply through a system-level application and hiring process

**Cross-campus Meetings**
Regularly occurring meeting cadence with campus safety leadership across different campuses

**Training**
Content creation, scheduling, and training delivery provided by the system

**Award Programs**
Opportunities for recognition and notoriety at the system level through a standardized awards program
## General Campus Safety Themes

### Trust and Legitimacy
- “Strive to create a workforce that encompasses a **broad range of diversity** including race, gender, language, life experience, and cultural background to **improve understanding and effectiveness in dealing with all communities**”
- “Establish a culture of **transparency** in order to build public trust and legitimacy” – 21st Century Police Report
- “Explore ways to release certain **video evidence**” – UC System Police Report
- “Create **independent advisory boards** with representatives from the campus who can facilitate and enhance communication between the police department and the greater campus community as well as work collaboratively with the departments on issues involving campus safety and security” – UC System Police Report

### Accountability
- “Establish a systemwide phone number and web-based intake **system for reporting complaints** of alleged officer misconduct and commendations” – UC System Police Report
- “Departments shall **document and review each use of force** to determine whether the force used was in compliance with applicable policy and law” – UC System Police Report
- Develop a **campus climate survey** instrument for campuses’ use to gather information regarding student attitudes, knowledge and experiences while attending the campus – UNC System report

### Technology
- “Increase in self-awareness (from the use of **body worn cameras**) contributes to more positive outcomes in police-citizen interaction” – 21st Century Police Report
- Create a safety-centered **mobile phone application** for students – UNC System report
- **Social media** is a communication tool the police can use to engage the community on issues of importance to both – 21st Century Police Report
Campus Safety Themes (Continued)

Community Policing

- “New systems of incentives, monitoring, and measurement that put building community trust at the forefront of policing goals must be installed” – Margolis Healy Report
- “Work to identify ways to improve outreach, focusing on principles of engagement, open and responsive dialogues, and education” – UC System Police Report
- “Examine community expectations regarding the role and mission of the campus safety department; an objective assessment of how you use campus safety officers; and opportunities to assign non-campus safety resources to certain categories of calls” – Margolis Healy Report

Training and Education

- “Enhance Training in Cultural Competency, Implicit Bias Awareness, Bias-Based Policing, Crisis Incident Response and Procedural Justice” – Margolis Healy Report
- “Should include mandatory Crisis Intervention Training (CIT), instruction in disease of addiction, implicit bias and cultural responsiveness, policing in a democratic society, procedural justice, and effective social interaction and tactical skills” – 21st Century Police Report
- “offer educational and awareness presentations or classes for students, staff and faculty” – UC System Police Report

Officer Wellness & Safety

- “Institutions should identify a qualified mental health professional to provide mental health services to department members” – Margolis Healy Report
- “Encouraging and assisting departments in the implementation of scientifically supported shift lengths by law enforcement” – 21st Century Police Report
December 18, 2020

Innovation Task Force

At the October 30, 2020 Board meeting, the Commissioner recommended the Board establish an innovation task force to begin exploring and developing systemwide innovations in online education and other areas of high potential. It was proposed that the task force include representatives from the Office of the Commissioner and other System experts to convene regularly and begin laying the groundwork for moving new initiatives forward.

The Innovation Task Force has since been established and has had its first meeting. Members of the Innovation Task Force include USHE representatives from across the state with various areas of expertise. The inaugural meeting was held on December 3, 2020, where task force members began foundational work on designing a framework to prioritize innovation across the System and discussed current industry trends and literature on higher education innovation.

Below is a sampling of the resources shared with the committee:

- [Is This the End of College as We Know It?](Belkin, 2020)
- [Employers as Educators](Fain, 2019)
- [Google’s Growing IT Certificate](McKenzie, 2019)
- [Is Amazon Training its Workers or Creating a College Alternative](Lederman, 2019)

Innovation Task Force Membership

Office of the Commissioner
- Dave Woolstenhulme, Commissioner of Higher Education (Co-Chair)
- Jessica Gilmore, Associate Commissioner for Workforce Development (Co-Chair)
- Geoffrey Landward, Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education
- Kim Ziebarth, Associate Commissioner of Technical Education

Board Members
- Alan Hall
- Aaron Osmond
- Candycce Damron
University of Utah
- Deb Keyek-Franssen, Associate VP and Dean of Continuing and Online Education
- Dan Reed, Senior VP of Academic Affairs

Utah State University
- Noelle Cockett, President
- Robert Wagner, VP of Academic and Instructional Services

Weber State University
- Leigh Shaw, Director of General Education

Utah Valley University
- Kelly Flanagan, VP of Digital Transformation and CIO

Southern Utah University
- Scott Wyatt, President

Dixie State University
- Chris Guymon, Assistant Provost of Adult and Professional Education

Salt Lake Community College
- David Hubert, Associate Provost of Learning Advancement

Snow College
- Brad Cook, President

Southwest Technical College
- Will Pierce, VP of Instruction and Accreditation

Ogden-Weber Technical College
- Jim Taggart, President

Commissioner’s Recommendation

This is an information item only; no action is required.