

---

MINUTES OF MEETING  
UTAH STATE BOARD OF REGENTS  
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
LOGAN, UTAH

August 27-28, 1998

---

Board Members Present

Charles E. Johnson, Chair  
Aileen H. Clyde, Vice Chair  
Pamela J. Atkinson  
David J. Grant  
Larzette G. Hale  
L. Brent Hoggan  
Karen H. Huntsman  
David J. Jordan  
Evelyn B. Lee  
Victor L. Lund  
Robert K. Reynard  
Paul S. Rogers  
Dale O Zabriskie

Board Members Excused

Kenneth G. Anderton  
Ian M. Cumming  
Jay B. Taggart

---

Office of the Commissioner

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner  
Fred R. Hunsaker, Associate Commissioner for Finance and Facilities  
Chalmers Gail Norris, Associate Commissioner for Student Financial Aid  
Michael A. Petersen, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs  
Philip V. Bernal, Director of Student Services and Minority Affairs (Thursday)  
Joyce Cottrell, Executive Secretary  
Linda Fife, Academic Affairs Program Officer  
Jerry H. Fullmer, Director of Information Systems  
Max S. Lowe, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education  
Whitney J. Pugh, Budget Analyst and Personnel Officer (Thursday)  
Norman C. Tarbox, Assistant Commissioner for Finance and Facilities  
Courtney White, Research Analyst (Thursday)  
Bradley A. Winn, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs

INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

University of Utah

J. Bernard Machen, President  
David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Paul T. Brinkman, Director, Planning & Political Studies  
Arnold B. Combe, Interim Vice President for Administrative Services (Friday)  
Raymond A. Haeckel, Executive Director, Government and Community Relations  
Sarah Michalak, Director, Marriott Library  
V. Randall Turpin, Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services (Friday)

Utah State University

George H. Emert, President  
G. Jay Gogue, Provost  
C. Blythe Ahlstrom, Assistant Provost

Lee H. Burke, Assistant to the President  
Robert L. Gilliland, Vice President for University Extension  
Lynn E. Janes, Interim Vice President for Administrative Affairs  
Richard W. Jacobs, Director, Budget Office  
Jay Nielson, Assistant Director for Campus Planning and Engineering (Friday)  
Patricia S. Terrell, Vice President for Student Services  
Joe Vande Merwe, Assistant Director, Budget Office

#### Weber State University

Paul H. Thompson, President  
David L. Eisler, Provost  
Anand Dyal-Chand, Vice President for Student Services  
Carol J. Berrey, Executive Director of Government Relations/Assistant to the President  
Carol V. Gaskill, Director of Budgets and Institutional Research

#### Southern Utah University

Steven D. Bennion, President  
Ray Reutzler, Provost  
Dennis R. Klaus, Budget Director  
Michael D. Richards, Vice President for Planning and Technology  
Gregory L. Stauffer, Vice President for Administrative/Financial Services

#### Snow College

Gerald J. Day, President  
Gary C. Arnoldson, Controller  
Larry J. Christensen, Vice President for Administration  
Carl M. Holmes, Snow College South  
Richard White, Vice President for Academic Affairs

#### Dixie College

Robert C. Huddleston, President  
Max Rose, Academic Vice President

#### College of Eastern Utah

Grace S. Jones, President  
Raelene Allred, Vice President of Financial Services  
Karen Bliss, Dean of Institutional Advancement  
Don Burge, Vice President of Academic Services  
Don C. Larson, Dean of Instruction, San Juan Campus

#### Utah Valley State College

Kerry D. Romesburg, President  
Gilbert E. Cook, Vice President for College Relations  
Robert L. Loveridge, Assistant Vice President for Student & Academic Support  
Linda L. Makin, Associate Director of Budgets  
Lucille Stoddard, Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Ryan Thomas, Vice President for Student Services and Campus Computing  
Douglas E. Warner, Executive Director of Budgets

## Salt Lake Community College

Frank W. Budd, President  
Marjorie Carson, Vice President of Academic Services  
Richard M. Rhodes, Vice President of Business Services  
Rand A. Johnson, Assistant to the President

### Representatives of the Press

Marjorie Cortez, *Deseret News*  
Dan Egan, *Salt Lake Tribune*  
Jennifer Gallagher, *Ogden Standard Examiner*  
Miriam Rand, *Logan Herald Journal*

### Others Present

Thomas C. Anderson, Office of the Attorney General  
Gary Carlston, Governor's Deputy for Education  
David Colvin, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
Boyd Garriott, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
Debra Headden, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
Lynne N. Koga, Director, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget  
Leo L. Memmott, Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
Brad Mortensen, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget  
Kenneth E. Nye, Program Director, DFCM  
Kevin Walthers, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:12 a.m. He excused Regents Anderton, Cumming, and Taggart and explained that Regent Lund would be in attendance at the afternoon session. He asked each President for a progress report on the semester conversion on their respective campuses. Presidents whose classes had already begun reported a smooth opening, but, as expected, students were taking fewer classes.

President Day pointed out that USHE faculty had not received any money for the extra work they had done in preparing for the semester calendar. Regent Atkinson moved that the Board highly commend all of the faculty, staff and administration at all eight colleges and universities for the tremendous work they had done in the astronomical task of the semester conversion process. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde and carried unanimously with a round of applause.

President Bennion pointed out that this year's academic calendar shortened the summer work opportunity for the students by at least a month and increased their tuition by 150% for the beginning of the year, but the enrollment is still high because people are very committed to the pursuit of a higher education in this state.

Commissioner Foxley recognized the Legislative Fiscal Analyst's office support in helping the Legislature realize that FTE enrollments would likely decrease and be willing to hold enrollment funding harmless. Higher education will not lose funding because of the decrease in FTE this year. This was spelled out in intent language. Chair Johnson pointed out that while the institutions will not lose state funding, tuition losses will be real and must be managed.

President Day pointed out that, for students taking a full load, books and supplies are higher for the students under semesters. A Snow student can easily expect to pay \$300 for books this fall.

President Machen agreed that the extra cost of books and supplies is hitting students very hard.

University staff and faculty will look at this very carefully. Students are very positive about this conversion.

Chair Johnson thanked the Presidents for their reports and briefly reviewed the agenda for the two-day meeting. He explained that the Board will not receive a budget and tuition recommendation at this meeting. Many recommendations are still coming from the task forces. The budget will be finalized at the October meeting at UVSC. The task forces will be asking for approval on midpoint policy issues at this meeting.

### Introductions of New Personnel

President Bennion introduced Dr. Ray Reutzel, the new Provost at SUU. Dr. Reutzel was previously the Associate Dean of the School of Education at BYU, where he played a major role in restructuring that school. He is an international scholar in literacy and reading, and SUU is pleased to have him on their administration. Chair Johnson introduced Debbie Headden, who is new to the Fiscal Analyst's office. President Thompson introduced Dr. Anand Dyal-Chand, Weber's new Vice President of Student Services. He comes to Utah from Santa Barbara, California. President Jones introduced Dr. Don Burge, Academic Vice President at CEU for the 1998-1999 year. Dr. Burge had been Director of the CEU Prehistoric Museum in Price for many years.

### Budget Presentations and Discussions

#### Overview of 1999-2000 USHE Budget Needs

Commissioner Foxley referred to Tab A, which was not an action item, but rather a framework in which to discuss major budget themes and institutional needs and priorities. The Commissioner and her staff had previously visited each campus to learn of institutional priorities and their processes of establishing institutional budget priorities. In addition, Chair Johnson and Vice Chair Clyde had met individually with each President to learn of institutional needs. Attachments A and B explained the major budget themes for which funding will be requested. Attachment C (Operation and Maintenance for New Facilities, Mandates, and Institutional Priorities) was incomplete. Attachment D showed the schedule of the budget presentations at this meeting.

#### Student Priorities

Commissioner Foxley asked Regent Reynard to take a few minutes to explain the student priorities. Regent Reynard said the students had four major initiatives: privacy, state financial aid, technology and libraries.

**Privacy.** Regent Reynard said the students were concerned with the use of their Social Security numbers being used for identification, and with institutional faculty and staff having unnecessary access to their records. He referred to a report which had been completed at the University of Utah; Commissioner Foxley said copies of that report would be distributed to the Regents and Presidents. Chair Johnson referred this issue to the Council of Presidents, with Regent Reynard to serve as the student liaison on this issue. Commissioner Foxley said her staff would survey what safeguards are already in place on all the campuses. Some systemwide applications may not fit each institution. She promised to report back to the Board at an upcoming meeting.

**Financial Aid.** The student leaders recommended to the Student Financial Aid Subcommittee that UCOPE be increased by \$1.5 million. This would increase students' ability to pay their educational costs and not force them out of school due to their

inability to pay. The students would also like more subjectivity in making financial aid available to students. Regent Atkinson reported she is working with business leaders to encourage the formation of a private foundation to help students with these extra costs of filling the gaps between UCOPE and what is already available. This could be a big help to the lower income students. Chair Johnson asked Regent Atkinson to continue to keep the Board apprised of the progress of this venture.

**Libraries.** The students support continued funding for all libraries in the system, especially at the research universities.

**Technology.** The students would like more base funding to go toward technology and computers in higher education. They are particularly concerned with the number of new computers being used for administrative use rather than student use. The schools increase their student fees for computers each year; the students would like increased use of the computers for which their fees are paying.

Chair Johnson thanked Regent Reynard for his excellent report.

### ATE Initiative

President Budd explained the proposed system ATE Initiative. Applied Technology Education has become a central theme with many of the institutions, as well as public education and the Joint Liaison Committee. All institutions except for the University of Utah have significant ATE offerings. In 1997-1998, contact hours in ATE exceeded 10 million hours. Another major area of Applied Technology Education is non-credit courses. Public education, through the ATCs, provide ATE for adults as well as secondary students. Essential job training is provided through ATE, which is usually open-entry, open-exit, consistency-based training, geared for specific jobs. Last year the USHE institutions produced 1.9 million hours of non-credit training. These numbers are increasing each year, yet our institutions are not funded for it. Some funding comes through STIT or custom fit; however, most is not state funded. Sometimes employers provide funding for training of their employees.

Another group of individuals are those who need job training, but who do not need a degree or certificate, and for whom no funding is available. Most of these students go to an ATC and pay 85 cents per hour. The balance is subsidized through public education. Higher education needs to be able to offer this same service but has no way to fund those students. The ATE Initiative requests funding for students in postsecondary job training. The Initiative also considers the ongoing need for equipment in ATE areas. There is a tremendous cost for equipment and overhead, as ATE programs are heavily equipment-intensive. A third area is funding for new ATE credit programs. All institutions except the University of Utah have requested two new programs as well as their institutional budget priorities.

### SLCC Institutional Priorities.

President Budd referred to Attachment C of Tab A, page 6. Requests are heavy in the areas of personnel for all institutions. The biggest challenge is finding personnel to keep the computers running and maintained. As a result, 61% of the instruction at SLCC is taught by adjunct faculty.

Regent Lee emphasized the importance of the ATE Initiative. The demand for technically skilled people is great, particularly in Utah. USHE students are hired before they complete these training programs. It is our responsibility to meet employer demand in terms of providing training. The institutions are cooperating with the ATCs very well, but growth at the ATCs is so great that they are getting positive funding from the Legislature while higher education

funding for ATE has not been as great. Public education is expanding their ATCs throughout the state; their ATC request will probably be around \$10 million. Regent Lee said higher education is not asking for enough money for ATE programs in its budget request. She encouraged the Regents to look carefully at the budget request and make ATE a funding priority.

## Y2K

President Romesburg said the problems with mainframes or servers were already being addressed by the institutions. The SCT system is already Y2K-compliant, as is PeopleSoft. The costs of fixing this problem will increase dramatically each quarter until the year 2000. PCs present a major problem. It is estimated that there are 30,000 to 35,000 PCs in the Utah System of Higher Education. Some are Y2K-compliant; some are not. Most of these PCs run Windows 95 and must be converted to Windows 98 to be Y2K-compliant. This will cost a lot of money. We will not get everything done in time. We will do what we can and take a chance with the rest. We will not receive sufficient funding to do all the testing and analysis that is needed. Commissioner Foxley said the costs for assessment of the problem and work involved would be available at the October Board meeting.

## Utah Valley State College Institutional Priorities.

President Romesburg said UVSC's budget priorities were for personnel, computer hardware and software. The Capitol Reef educational facility presents an incredible opportunity for students to learn outdoors in environmental sciences at a time when we are increasingly being closed out of national parks. UVSC has reached an agreement with the National Park Service in Capitol Reef to use an abandoned dude ranch. The college will use private funds to restore the facility and operate it within the auspices of the park. The facility will have heavy use once it has been restored. A caretaker will be on-site. The agreement should be signed within two months. The facility will be an asset to the entire state.

## Higher Education Technology Initiative

President Jones explained that the HETI provides help to institutions in the area of technology. We need to continue to enhance the quality of education offered to our students by maintaining quality of staff and faculty, as well as equipment and curriculum development. This year the USHE will work on a federal data collection system under the HETI. Institutions determine their own unique needs. Regent Grant asked about the possibility of using computer science students through internships or getting a group together, which would represent all the USHE institutions, to make comparisons and determine if we are using the most effective ways of meeting this need. Jerry Fullmer stated that a group has been formed, which meets about every six weeks. There is a high degree of cooperation among the institutions already. Regent Jordan suggested a program of sending a computer science student from a major institution as an intern to one of the smaller schools. President Budd replied that the schools have been doing this for a number of years; however, the institutions cannot offer a university graduate the salary which is available in the business world.

## CEU Institutional Budget Priorities.

President Jones said CEU's highest need was in the criminal justice area. CEU has received requests from law enforcement officers for a crime lab in southeast Utah. There are excellent adjunct faculty but no full-time faculty. Regent Jordan requested FTEs for the CEU budget request.

## Compensation

President Huddleston gave examples from Dixie College as typical of USHE institutions. Eight mid-management level employees have left Dixie this year because of compensation; three of them made \$10,000 more at their new jobs. In 1997-98, 55 positions were opened; 14 of them were opened twice because of an insufficient number of qualified applicants. One position has been open for 5 months and the job description has changed three times; still it has not been filled. Eleven faculty positions were opened in November; three still have not been filled. In many cases the first choice applicants turn the position down because of the salary offered. Even many applicants for clerical positions cannot pass the exam. The USHE institutions are not able to attract qualified personnel with their limited resources. Utah has seen a dramatic rise in professional salaries, but higher education does not have the funding to make those adjustments. We are not able to compensate for highly technical positions. President Huddleston stressed that without quality people to educate our students, the buildings and equipment will not matter. Commissioner Foxley said compensation information for faculty and staff would be available at the October meeting.

Regent Jordan asked the Presidents to share their experiences with respect to qualified faculty applicants. President Bennion reported getting fewer applicants than in previous years because salaries being offered are too low. President Emert reported that USU is still getting a good applicant pool but they are unable to hire the most qualified because of their inability to compensate them adequately. USU is 21% below peer institutions on salary. President Romesburg agreed, stating that many individuals are applying, but once they see the salary schedule, the top 10-15 will not consider accepting the positions. President Budd said SLCC gets good applicants who turn down the positions because of salary. They are not getting applicants in the technical fields. The cost of living is high in Utah. Housing costs, which previously were the deciding factor, are very high.

Regent Atkinson agreed that costs have gone up in Utah, but salaries have not. She urged the Regents to justify the increased salary requirements to the Legislature and let them know we are losing the top 10-15 candidates for faculty positions. Recruitment is not our only problem any longer; it is retention

## Dixie Institutional Budget Priorities.

President Huddleston said there was a heavy need in the Hurricane Valley area to establish an off-campus center. Dixie has received an offer of donated space. They would also like to provide courses in Kanab and Orderville. There is a need for help in student services, which is highly understaffed. Dixie needs faculty for computer technology and math, where 53% of the instruction is being taught by adjunct faculty.

## HOPE/Motor Pool

President Day explained that HOPE scholarships were provided through the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, which was a tax credit program for tuition and educational costs. Institutions will bear the burden of significant reporting and information requirements. Regarding the Motor Pool, the institutions will need the ability to finance their state vehicles up front. More data should be available in October.

## Snow Institutional Budget Priorities.

Snow's top priority is its merger with the Sevier Valley Applied Technology Center. President Day introduced Dr. Carl Holmes, Superintendent of the SVATC. President Day distributed the ATC request and asked Dr. Holmes to elaborate. During the legislative session, over 300 personal letters were sent in support of this merger. The USHE institutions, particularly SLCC and UVSC, have worked hard on a teacher-to-teacher basis to prepare SVATC and Snow College for this move. The Legislature has mandated that Snow College South continue to offer programs on an open-entry, open-exit basis, non-credit programs, and high school programs to secondary students. This creates new challenges. Dr. Holmes said he was looking forward to the growing experiences and to learning from Salt Lake Community College. In explaining the ATE recommendations, he said the ongoing requests were for staff, and the one-time funding was for equipment.

Regent Lee said the request was much greater than the Regents were able to put into our budget request. It reinforces the great need for ATE funding. The Joint Liaison Committee had recommended not holding ATE programs to the 5-6% level increase, but rather increasing those programs by 12%. Particularly in high demand areas, Regent Lee recommended that the Regents consider increasing that portion of the budget to at least 12%.

Regent Huntsman asked if the time would ever come when the Legislature would specify that public ed should educate high school students and higher ed should educate adults. Chair Johnson said good progress has been made in that direction. State income taxes are now being used by higher education as well as public education. The JLC is gaining strength. Public education is considered "free education;" beyond that, it is considered "supported education." Regent Huntsman recommended letting public education pay for the remedial education of college students.

#### (ETI) Teacher Education

President Bennion stated instructional learning resources have expanded dramatically. The world's body of knowledge will double four times between 1998 and 2000. By the year 2000, it is expected that 70% of American homes will have at least one computer. Our charge is to prepare children and those who teach them for this exploding world. The ETI was approved several years ago. For the five years in which funding was received for ETI, there were five specific objectives. Funding was not renewed in 1995 and beyond, and the program has eroded. Enabling legislation was passed in 1998 to reintroduce the ETI, but it was not funded. We need funding to prepare teachers to teach. Money is also needed for public education for the same purpose.

#### SUU Institutional Budget Priorities.

President Bennion pointed out that the faculty-to-student ratio at SUU has gone from 17:1 to 23:1. The university has tried to maintain an 85% ratio of full-time faculty. Equity compensation is a priority. We are pricing our educators out of the ability to make a decent living. Average personal living expenses have gone up over 8% annually, but average USHE salaries have risen only 3 to 3.5%. It is critical to recognize that teachers worry about being able to provide for their families. SUU needs funding for technical support, student retention, and campus preventative maintenance, especially in the area of student hourly wages for personnel to maintain the buildings and grounds. The equivalent of 58 tuition scholarships are being earned by students providing a valuable service.

Regent Jordan asked if it would be possible to collect the information on salary inequities for presentation to the Legislature. Commissioner Foxley said the information would be brought to the Board in October. Regent Jordan asked for information from the Presidents about individuals whom they were not able to retain — where they went, why they went, and how



much more money they are now receiving. He requested more than anecdotal information about applicant pools and where the top five choices went who did not come to Utah, and for how much money. Chair Johnson agreed that information forwarded to the Legislature must be specific. Commissioner Foxley called attention to Attachment B, Selective Salary Adjustments, which is a priority issue for all the institutions.

### Science Equipment

President Thompson said the demand for people trained in science and technology exceeds the supply. We are trying to recruit high tech firms to Utah. Students are paying high fees and lab costs for these classes. He encouraged the Regents to provide support for this initiative.

### WSU Institutional Budget Priorities.

One of Weber's top priorities is its First Year Experience. More money is needed to expand and add new programs. It is critical to get support for technology. A masters degree program is proposed in criminal justice due to much pressure from the community, but it has not yet been through the Program and Planning Committee process. For the past several years, higher education has received very little funding for ATE programs. This is a high priority for Weber State University. Employers are putting a great deal of pressure on the university.

### Data (ADP/MIS)

President Emert reiterated the need to provide accurate, timely data to the Legislature. This has been discussed in depth at several recent Board meetings.

### USU Institutional Budget Priorities.

President Emert said USU had developed a mission and draft vision statement for its budget request. USU's strategic plan is connected to its daily needs. He briefly reviewed the budget needs shown in the agenda materials, and urged that institutional adjustments be resumed. USU is just not competitive in technical areas. The space and facilities needs reflected life safety and life cycle issues only.

### Libraries 2000

President Machen said the students support the Library Initiative, as do the Presidents. He introduced Sarah Michalak, who is the current chair of the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) and Director of the University's Marriott Library. The Library Initiative proposal has been revised and endorsed by all the Presidents. President Machen said if we cannot support our libraries, the rest of our enterprise is in great danger. The proposal has two parts — one for universities and one which is system-wide. Ms. Michalak agreed to respond to specific questions about the Library Initiative during lunch.

### University of Utah Institutional Budget Priorities.

President Machen requested more flexibility in administering the resources of the University. In looking at revenue projections for state appropriations and tuition, President Machen noted that every dollar was already dedicated. The Presidents cannot be creative without some flexibility. They need the ability to assess differentiation in tuition rates, particularly at the

graduate level, and to decide what must be funded. There are too many unknowns at this point in time to set tuition rates for next fall; a clearer picture is needed. He stressed the need for quality growth funding, not just enrollment increase funding. If system priorities do not become system priorities, they become top institutional priorities. He said he perceived a change of philosophy on O&M funding. Regents and Presidents need to decide what is required and have serious dialogue with the Legislature about O&M funding.

In response to a question by Regent Rogers, Commissioner Foxley said the numbers had been based on historic patterns and the traditional approach to funding higher education. There is a perception that if buildings are not used for instructional purposes, they should not receive O&M funding. Chair Johnson said two separate issues are involved — donated buildings and state-funded buildings. The Legislature makes a distinction in donated buildings for non-teaching purposes.

Regent Jordan asked for institutional priorities with dollar amounts attached for the October meeting.

Following lunch, the meeting reconvened at 1:40 p.m.

### 1999-2000 Capital Development Priorities and Land Acquisitions

Commissioner Foxley stated that Kevin Walthers, who has been working as a higher education analyst in the LFA's office, has moved into John Massey's former assignment with capital facilities as John assumes the position of Legislative Fiscal Analyst. The Commissioner said the Regents would be meeting jointly with the State Building Board again this year, probably in November. Higher education budget hearings for capital facilities will be on October 8. Bud Scruggs is the new chair of the State Building Board.

Commissioner Foxley referred to Attachment B of Tab B, USHE Qualification and Prioritization Formula (Q&P). Points are designated by the institutions, based on need and student population, enrollment projections, space standards, etc. Life safety analyses are requested by the institutions and points awarded as appropriate. The Q&P was run based on life safety information received earlier in the week. The Presidents had agreed on the student enrollment. Growth numbers were estimates. Associate Commissioner Hunsaker said the major driver of the Q&P formula is space need.

Commissioner Foxley explained the line marked "Regents land acquisition funding." Sometimes opportunities arise to buy property adjacent to USHE campuses. In discussions with DFCM, this item would be a pool of funds which the Regents could use for allocation to institutions to acquire much-needed land for future development, where it would be impractical to wait until the next Legislative session to obtain funding.

Regent Jordan asked to see the actual numbers used in the Q&P process. Chair Johnson asked Associate Commissioner Hunsaker to mail this information, including the reasons in Regent policy for establishing points and the specific numbers assigned to each project as a result of this formula. Regent Jordan pointed out that it was very important that the Regents and Presidents approach the Legislature with a united front on capital facilities issues. We also need the support of the Building Board on our priorities.

Associate Commissioner Hunsaker said two sets of intent language came out of the 1998 legislative session. One applied to SUU's PE Building, making it the "top project" in the state for funding. The other set of language dealt with the legislative intent not to fund new additional construction projects until projects previously designed were funded for construction. This language applies to the second and third items on the Q&P list.

Chair Johnson asked Lynne Koga, Director of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, to review the Regents' priorities, Building Board priorities and Legislative funding for the past few years. Ms. Koga said Governor Leavitt's rule of thumb is \$20-\$25 million for capital facilities for higher education. The GOPB may have to rethink that this year. The Governor has listened to the Regents' and Building Board's priorities. The Building Board has tried to work with the Regents and they are feeling a higher degree of confidence in the revised Q&P formula. When any of these recommendations get to the Legislature, politics add dynamics. The Legislature tries to make many people happy by invoking intent language. They also need to recognize that priorities change from time to time. The top three priorities on the Regents' list have fundamentally been decided by the Legislature. Ms. Koga said the Governor's Office would look into it.

Chair Johnson suggested that all the information be gathered and sent to the Regents which Regent Jordan requested, after which a telephone conference call could be held to approve the higher education priorities for capital facilities.

President Thompson urged caution about going away from the Q&P process. The process was chaotic prior to using the Q&P formula. Leo Memmott, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, said Legislative Leadership last year decided not to fund design one year and construction the following year. If they follow through, they will not appropriate funding for design one year and for construction the following year. Commissioner Foxley said if future legislation follows this intent, we have to decide whether or not to ask for anything over the first \$60 million. She asked, Is it helpful for the Legislature to see the existing backlog at our institutions?

Regent Atkinson asked if there was a way of letting the Legislature know how long these projects have been on the waiting list and the likelihood of their being funded. The Legislators need to be aware of the ramifications of waiting. The Regents need to tell them, in writing, what will happen if the other projects continue not to be funded. Chair Johnson noted that we were also accumulating a backlog of deferred maintenance projects which have not been funded. Regent Hale pointed out that the institutions are very limited by the total amount which is funded. We need to work on our ability to get more than \$25 million in funding.

Commissioner Foxley noted that not all institutions have the same proportion or age of old buildings, and not all institutions grow at the same rate. Increased access is vitally important, as are life safety issues. It is difficult to prioritize all of these projects and still be fair. Associate Commissioner Hunsaker added that capital improvement funding is received for projects less than \$1 million. Many life safety issues can be and are solved within that range. Sometimes the life safety issues do not come within that range. We have requested funding for safety issues over a two-year period of time.

Chair Johnson asked Ken Nye, DFCM Program Director, to respond. Mr. Nye said DFCM had received a letter from Legislative Leadership asking that design-only projects not be submitted for funding. Previously, planning/programming has been funded in one year, followed by design/construction funding. Most projects on the Regents' list have not gone through the program/planning step. He suggested asking for planning/programming money rather than design or acquisition funding. Mr. Nye said many of the higher education projects were planned 5-6 years ago. There is currently a five-year backlog of construction projects.

Mr. Memmott said the difficulty with this approach is that the Legislature ends up with 50 projects for program/planning because the cost is relatively inexpensive. Legislative Leadership wants projects addressed on a total project basis rather than incrementally. The Legislature has been building a fund out of ongoing money for capital construction, which is built into the base budget for buildings.

Chair Johnson thanked everyone for the healthy discussion. Regent Jordan pointed out the private funding issue still needs to be addressed.

## USHE Master Planning Session

Commissioner Foxley called attention to the Supplement to Tab C, which was in the Regents' folders. A schedule of meetings for all task forces was included. Chair Johnson invited all Regents to come to the task force meetings as their schedules permitted. Important discussions are taking place in those meetings, particularly in the Missions/Roles Task Force. The Commissioner's Office will notify all Regents and Presidents of every task force meeting as the pace accelerates. Meetings are scheduled around the availability of all task force members, particularly the Legislators in each group. Chair Johnson said the intent of this meeting was to take action on task force recommendations or to instruct the task forces to rework some of their recommendations.

### Missions/Roles and System Governance

Vice Chair Clyde acknowledged the effort and work which is done between meetings for the task forces to be effective when they meet. Suggestions are welcome. She thanked Associate Commissioner Petersen and Assistant Commissioner Winn, who serve as staff. The task force is trying to see where we are now and look to the future. The task forces also need to hear from each other before making final decisions. The entire master planning project will require a great collaborative effort.

The task force decided to deal with the issues on which there is consensus first. Regent Clyde commended the staff of the institutions and Commissioner's Office for their responsiveness. The task force has reached consensus on four specific areas:

1. Recommendations on Board Structures. This item is not ready for approval, but the task force agrees that the existing single board structure will accommodate future needs of expansion and growth. Regent Clyde asked for comments or suggestions on the two recommendations shown. Regent Zabriskie suggested inserting "and the Board of Regents and" after "assist" and before "Utah's public colleges." Regent Clyde thanked him for his excellent suggestion.

*The Task Force recommends:*

*. . . 2. Retaining and refining the roles of the institutional Boards of Trustees to assist **the State Board of Regents and Utah's public colleges and universities** in better meeting the needs of ~~their~~ students and communities and fulfilling ~~their~~ institutional missions.*

2. Coordination Between State Board of Regents, State Board of Education and Joint Liaison Committee. The draft document has been shown to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chair of the State Board of Education as a courtesy. Regent Clyde read the five recommendations and requested suggestions. She explained that it is the task force's concern that what is said about this matter be clearly understood and agreed. The other task forces, particularly the Funding Mechanisms Task Force, will also be involved. The task force is looking into who has the responsibility for teaching Utah's citizens. Generally, funding for training of adults should come through the Board of Regents, and funding for K-12 should come through the State Board of Education. Regent Zabriskie strongly recommended that in the third recommendation, "recommendation" replace "review" on the part of the JLC. President Budd expressed concern about "short-term, temporary, job-specific training" in the second recommendation. This is a key issue to many community colleges. There is continuing controversy in the Wasatch Front South Region about the issue of whose responsibility it is. President Romesburg said this wording was in that particular recommendation because the task force does not want to inhibit the institutions from responding to requests from industry.

President Huddlestone asked about governance of the ATCs. Regent Lee said when the Legislative Strategic Planning Task Force was established four years ago, governance was a central issue. The decision was made then not to have a third board which would be responsible for governance of Applied Technology Education. One of the recommendations of the task force then was to strengthen the Joint Liaison Committee and give them more focus over ATE. Many significant changes have occurred as a result. Regent Lee credited Commissioner Foxley for turning this around. It is hopeful that future expansion of the ATCs would involve only training for secondary students. The State Board of Education has agreed to this principle in the Wasatch Front South Consortium. A resolution was adopted in the July JLC meeting stating that ATC expansion in the region would be based on the training of secondary students by the ATCSRs and the training of adults by SLCC. The JLC endorsed this language to strengthen the cooperation of the two systems.

Regent Lund said technology will allow common education (concurrent enrollment) to occur. He asked if the Joint Liaison Committee had or should be given the authority in the future on areas where there is not a clear delineation. Regent Clyde said the task force had not considered that with this specific recommendation and agreed that it would become very important in system configuration and delineation of roles. President Romesburg said overlapping roles would involve the JLC, especially in the areas of concurrent enrollment, teacher education, and technological enrollment. This is included in the first recommendation.

Regent Jordan moved approval of the recommendations as amended. Following a second by Regent Grant, the motion carried unanimously.

*The Task Force recommends:*

*. . . 3. No new applied technology education and training facilities should be established by any public educational institution in Utah without prior ~~review~~ **recommendation** by the Joint Liaison Committee; . . .*

3. Doctoral and Advanced Graduate Education. There was unanimity in the task force that research and doctoral needs are presently being served by two excellent research institutions. The task force believes that the present structure should be continued. Chair Johnson suggested adding the word "exclusively" at the end of the first recommendation. Regent Zabriskie moved approval of the recommendations as amended. The motion was seconded by Regent Hale and carried unanimously.

*The Task Force recommends:*

*1. A continuation of a clear definition and differentiation of academic roles and missions within the USHE that assigns doctoral-level instruction to the University of Utah and Utah State University **exclusively**, and. . .*

4. Provision of Educational Offerings in Sparsely Populated Counties. Vice Chair Clyde explained that this is an effort to provide education appropriately in the more sparsely populated areas of Utah. Regent Jordan suggested that the task force address the issue of who provides service in sparsely populated counties. He requested additional information from the task force, which Regent Clyde agreed to provide. Regent Jordan recommended that no action be taken on this issue until more substantial recommendations are provided by the task force.

Vice Chair Clyde said for the next level of discussion, a subcommittee will be appointed to make recommendations to the task force on the issue of Applied Technology Education. Regent Atkinson will chair this subcommittee. Regents Clyde and Atkinson invited all Regents and Presidents to contact them if they would like to be part of this discussion.

## Funding Mechanisms

Following a break for Aggie ice cream, Chair Johnson referred to the lists of enrollment funding formula components by academic cluster, which were included with the agenda materials. He reviewed the process for obtaining funding which was shown on pages 3-6 of the task force's report. As a result, USHE Presidents have had to be creative in managing this funding process. One result has been a high number of adjunct faculty teaching in our institutions. Chair Johnson commended the Presidents for their excellent job of managing institutional needs.

### Change Enrollment Funding Formula.

Chair Johnson called attention to page 2 of the task force's report. The task force recommends revising the enrollment funding formula. They want to build in a factor to maintain quality, including non-instructional costs. The assignment for this revision has been given to a subcommittee. President Romesburg expressed concern about accurately reflecting direct instructional costs. He cautioned the task force that these costs may be artificially low at some institutions due to heavy use of adjunct faculty. He was concerned that this formula would lock institutions in to the same ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty.

### Differential Funding by Institution Type.

Chair Johnson stated that the methodology must be changed, and the task force is looking for the correct answer. He referred to page 7 of the report, Methods of Accounting for Mix Changes. The Legislature said this year that they would like the Regents, Governor's Office and Legislative Fiscal Analyst's office to come back with a single method upon which they all agree. The task force suggested that the historical method be used with the formula being adjusted to prevent undue benefit in subsequent years. Regent Jordan moved that the Board endorse the historical funding model with the intention not to benefit unduly in the "make up" year. Regent Zabriskie seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

### Timing on Setting Tuition Rates.

The tuition subcommittee has recommended increasing tuition by 3%. Tuition has traditionally been set in the fall, and we learn after the legislative session whether or not we guessed correctly. The Legislature will fund 75% of our faculty and staff compensation. They have not mandated that the balance be covered by tuition, simply that it be covered. The task force proposed that this year tuition not be set in advance, but rather that we send a presumption to the Governor and LFA that compensation will be funded at 75% of the rate they establish. We will respond by deciding how to fund the remaining 25% next spring.

Regent Atkinson reminded Chair Johnson that the Board had previously decided to take a firm stand of doing away with the policy of funding 25% of compensation from student tuition. The Regents need to ensure that the Legislature does not raise tuition for us. We need to be even more careful of how our tuition compares with other institutions in the area. She recommended taking a strong stand on tuition and a full compensation package. She emphasized, "Quality education deserves a quality faculty." Regent Jordan said the Regents were not in a position to lead out on this because no one is following. It is important to have the Legislature buy into the changes we are trying to make. Real costs must be covered. Mr. Memmott again explained Legislative Leadership's policy regarding dedicated credits and compensation. Regent Grant requested a written copy of the Executive Appropriation Committee's policy. Mr. Memmott said the policy had been established because of higher education. Regent Rogers recommended asking the Legislature to fund 100% of compensation, possibly at the expense of another of our

initiatives.

Regent Hale moved that the tuition timing be delayed and no action taken prior to January 1, 1999. The motion was seconded by Regent Grant and carried unanimously.

### Undergraduate Tuition.

The table on page 8 showed the relation of tuition to the cost of instruction. Because tuition drives enrollments, until we know our capacity and other deciding factors, the task force is recommending holding off on this issue until long-range planning is completed.

### Graduate Tuition.

Regents have been charged to look at graduation tuition levels. The task force recommendation is that at the graduate level, flexibility be given to the institutions on tuition whereby they can raise or lower tuition, and any impact will be considered completely separate from any other tuition adjustments. This is a big step toward giving Presidents the flexibility they have requested. Regent Atkinson moved that undergraduate tuition levels continue in the same relative relationships with each other and that greater flexibility be provided to the institutions to set and spend graduate tuition. Regent Zabriskie seconded the motion. President Emert noted that tuition for many graduate students is paid out of contracts and grants. President Machen stressed the importance of assessing this program by program, year by year. Administration's responsibility is to make sure the quality of the program does not suffer. Vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.

### Technology

Regent Lund referred to the task force's interim progress report and noted we cannot control all aspects of technology. The role of the Regents must be to decide what we want to try to monitor and control, and then do a good job of it. Centralization of data is a huge, expensive process. Three states backed off before completing the process. A subcommittee will assess the results of those efforts and bring information back to the Regents at a later meeting. Regent Lund asked the Regents to turn to page 4 of the task force's report and asked Assistant Commissioner Tarbox to report. Mr. Tarbox reported that a list of common data is being compiled which can be taken to the Legislature. Representatives of the Commissioner's Office would lead a team, to include representation from each of the institutions, to decide on common data definitions. Institutional representatives would go back to their campuses and extract data. Some data must be manually constructed. He referred to the recommendation on page 5, summarized in bold type on page 2 of the task force's report.

Regent Lund said all institutions have data, none of which is consistent. It must be deposited at a common depository in the Commissioner's Office. It will take time to develop this process. The task force's intent is to be able to provide consistent, useful data. The list of data to be collected covers everything requested in the last legislative session. The task force proposed that the Regents undertake a study to determine how understaffed we are and what is necessary for this process to be accomplished. This study needs to be funded on an ongoing basis. Regent Lund stressed the large time gap between a request for new information and our ability to provide that information. The second part of the proposal is that the Commissioner's Office make a survey of IT understaffing. Regent Jordan moved approval of the task force's proposal. The motion was seconded by Regent Rogers and approved unanimously. Regent Lund commended Assistant Commissioners Tarbox and Winn for their excellent work on this effort.

Associate Commissioner Petersen addressed the role of technology in higher education (page

3). The format on which the task force agreed was to identify several areas in which there are a range of options to be considered. Other areas are more straight-forward. He referred to page 8 and said distance education is of primary importance because it will allow us to provide more opportunities for education for Utah citizens who would not otherwise have access to a campus-based education. Another alternative is to consider the opportunity to export higher education to people outside Utah. Dr. Petersen briefly explained the options listed on pages 8-12 of the task force's report. Chair Johnson said he would like to provide answers to the questions raised by the Technology Task Force in the October Board meeting. Regent Lund agreed that we need to know the impact of competency-based education on our institutions. He suggested bringing in a professional consultant to help the Regents assess our real options.

Regent Atkinson expressed her appreciation for the work done by this task force. However, it raises a tremendous number of questions. One of the most important is registering out-of-state courses. How will these courses be measured with ours? How important are criteria? What should we do if these courses do not meet our standards? Chair Johnson said KPMG has offered to make a presentation to the Regents on what they have learned as they have assisted the Western Governors University.

Vice Chair Clyde indicated her appreciation for Regent Lund's articulation of the complexity of this issue. She asked that this discussion include consultation with other people within the system who use technology and who are thoroughly grounded in what we have been doing traditionally. She stressed that the Regents need an understanding of the whole picture before making these decisions. This information will also impact the discussions of the Missions/Roles Task Force. Regent Jordan requested a dialogue (not a presentation) with WGU officials. Chair Johnson asked the Regents and Presidents to reserve the day of October 15 for this discussion at UVSC.

Chair Johnson asked that discussion of the Accountability Task Force be deferred until 9:00 a.m. Friday morning prior to committee meetings. The meeting was recessed at 5:30 p.m. Regents and Presidents were asked to meet at 6:20 p.m. in the lobby of the University Inn to go to the President's Residence for dinner.

The Committee of the Whole reconvened at 9:23 a.m. on Friday morning, August 28, following breakfast with the USU Board of Trustees.

### Accountability

Regent Jordan reported that since the last report was given to the Regents, the task force had met twice to follow up on the four performance measures which had previously been approved by the Board.

### CAAP Test.

The task force's first assignment was to discuss in more detail a CAAP test or similar test to determine a student's progress after two years of college education. Second, the group was to follow up on faculty workload guidelines. The CAOs met to evaluate the tests and determined that the CAAP test is the best fit for the USHE. It is administered by the same company as the ACT test, which is taken by most high school juniors and seniors. The ACT can serve as a baseline and be compared with the CAAP test results.

President Romesburg said UVSC is currently using the CAAP test for the following reasons: 1)



Determining levels of proficiency, 2) changing from one educational level to another, 3) making comparisons with peer institutions, and 4) determining eligibility requirements for advanced programs. The main problem is getting students to take the test seriously enough to give meaningful results. Administrators have focused on devices which might motivate students to take this test more seriously, such as awarding credit to students who pass the exam with a certain score, changing the preparation of students for upper division programs, requiring the test for graduation with associate degrees, or undertaking a pilot study as an excellent opportunity for dealing with this issue through various means. Another possibility is building this into a course. The task force assigned each institution to consider how the CAAP test might be piloted on their campuses.

Snow College has used the CAAP test for two years. They would like to pilot this program next spring. The task force would like at least one each of the three classes of institutions to pilot this program next year. UVSC is talking about requiring a successful score on this test for graduation with an associate degree. Task force members are also interested in trying this program on distance learning students. It could be a way to compare distance learning students with traditional methods of delivery.

Dr. Petersen said one of the values of having a year of pilot study is our ability to evaluate several programs. CAAP scores on transcripts may be a factor in admission to very competitive programs. The ASSET tests given at community colleges are also an ACT-type of test and usually is comparable with the CAAP. President Huddleston noted that this is being tried in several places, and a wide array of data should be available.

Regent Reynard asked about students who enter college as juniors or who spread their general education courses over all four years of their college education. Regent Jordan said the test may be taken at any point in a person's college career, not just as incoming juniors. Regent Reynard said, speaking as a student, the most motivational suggestion would be credit on a transcript. He spoke against requiring students to take remedial classes if they did not successfully pass the test. Some students do not test well.

Regent Hale cautioned that we need to be clear why this test is being given and what the Board wants to do with the results. She warned that to begin to require a standardized test without knowing exactly why could take us into some dangerous areas. Diversity is necessary; we must not lose that diversity through required testing.

President Budd said SLCC students do not generally take SAT or ACT tests. Neither do they use an ASSET test, but a computerized placement test. SLCC emphasizes ATE; if this test is linked to performance funding, SLCC would put their resources behind that which will get the college more money. A required test could cause serious financial repercussions.

Regent Jordan said the Board may not decide that this test should be used in the same way at all institutions. At the last Board meeting, an affirmative decision was made to delink this recommendation from funding when these recommendations go to the Legislature.

Regent Atkinson asked, "What changes are we going to make as a result of these tests? What effect will it have on our faculty and students?" She asked President Romesburg what changes were being made in UVSC's curriculum as a result of this test and if he felt they had been worth it. President Romesburg responded that it was a good use of resources. It is a great tool to evaluate curriculum and to determine if students are receiving the proper background to succeed in their education. The problem has been in getting a good mix of students. UVSC is still making improvements in the way the CAAP is used.

Commissioner Foxley reminded the Board that the recommendation was to do a pilot study and then evaluate those results before deciding to go further. Institutions are not all alike, by design. Students are not all alike. A pilot program would give us the opportunity to analyze the

results to see if it would be meaningful to meet our purpose. No money has been allocated. The LFA's Office has indicated a willingness to help. President Romesburg endorsed a good solid pilot program to see if this will work.

Regent Jordan said the CAOs believe this can be done and have recommended a pilot. They want a variety of institutions tested so a true comparison can be made. Vice Chair Clyde said that in the pilot study, she would appreciate the CAOs' consideration of the many applications for distance learning. Regent Jordan said the Legislators have told us we need to better assess how higher education is doing its job. This program is in direct response to a legislative request. Chair Johnson said the Board must agree that we are not doing this *for* them, but we will be doing it *with* them if we decide to proceed.

### Faculty Workload Guidelines.

Regent Jordan referred to Agenda Tab G, Proposed [Policy R485, Faculty Workload Guidelines](#). One of the accountability performance measures sent to the Legislature was faculty workload. The Regents expressed their willingness to have this particular measure tied to funding. Regent Jordan said the Board had specifically told the Legislature we would track weekly teaching hours by FTE faculty and student credit hours. A standard is needed for these two measures.

We also told the Legislature we would report on weekly teaching contact hours. Regent Jordan asked Associate Commissioner Petersen to explain the difference between credit hours and teaching contact hours. Dr. Petersen explained that the expectation is that faculty will teach 9 credits per semester in the research universities, 12 in the state universities, and 15 in the community colleges. Credit hours is a measure which does not necessarily tie to the amount of time spent in class, except in standard lower division classes. Where there are labs, the weight of labs is discounted. Standards are used at institutions, and there are links between the amount of time spent in class and the credit hours received. This is not directly proportional to the faculty load. The new measure shows the faculty contact hours.

Regent Jordan reminded the Board that last year Regent Hale chaired a task force which looked at faculty workload. The recommendation of that task force was that a Regents standard be formally set at 9/12/15 hours, as shown in §4.1 of [Policy R485](#). Contact hours have been established at 10 for the research universities, 13 for state universities, and 16-19 for community college faculty. The CAOs would like to hold off on assigning contact hours until the system has had one year under the semester calendar. The Legislature has the expectation that we will give them a contact hour standard now, or else have a very good explanation of why this is not being done.

President Machen said this was a very important move by the Regents. It is appropriate that we be responsive to the public's desire to know how we are utilizing our resources. This year will be very atypical for 8 of the 9 institutions. There is only data from the institutions from last year on contact hours under the quarter system. The suggested contact hour standard is based on the quarter system. This should be weighed very carefully. Faculty are not afraid to show the world how hard they work. However, we need to remember that this year will be atypical.

President Day said his concern with the contact hour standard was that the minimum could tend to become the maximum. Snow's faculty contact hour effort is at the top of the range given by the Board. President Day said he did not want a standard less than what is already being done, so he was not comfortable with the 16-19 hours as expressed because it does not reflect what is being done now. Chair Johnson cautioned the Board not to back away because we have gone to a semester calendar. The range could be broadened. Regent Jordan suggested adding language that the institutions could use on a program-by-program basis to set a higher standard.

Associate Commissioner Petersen said the CAOs had discussed adding in each of the paragraphs, "It is expected that average institutional contact hours. . ." President Budd said Legislative Leadership had been given the number of credits taught by each faculty member — credits, contact hours, student hours generated, and they said this was exactly what they wanted to receive. Those Legislators consider this the most important issue the task force can do. Regent Hale said during the deliberation of her task force last year, the Legislators were asked if we could educate them to understand student hours rather than faculty contact hours. They want to know how many contact hours our faculty make. Perhaps we should give them what they want, but give them our measure also, as a true measure of what goes on in our institutions. Chair Johnson agreed, saying this was meaningful data. When we get superior data, we should finish that, too.

Regent Atkinson asked the Presidents how the faculty felt about this issue. Presidents indicated that faculty is supportive because they already surpass the standard being recommended. They understand that contact hours reported alone give an incomplete picture, but when used with other data, they provide meaningful information. It is important that teachers be affirmed in the excellent work they are doing. They have already been through an extra effort in preparing for the semester conversion.

President Machen used an analogy of professional football player Steve Young, who may have three contact hours each week on Sunday afternoons and Monday nights. However, the number of hours he must spend in doing his job is not limited to those three contact hours per week. Reporting only contact hours shows a lack of the full appreciation for the complexity of the jobs faculty perform.

Regent Lund suggested emphasizing that these numbers were estimated on a quarterly basis and explaining that they may change under semesters. We do not want this statistic used against us when funding is appropriated.

Regent Atkinson said she had heard faculty try to explain to the Legislators what goes into teaching a class. She has explained herself how much time she spent in preparation for classes taught in California and the effort expended in staying current. It is hard for Legislators to understand this concept if they are not teachers themselves. We need to persevere with the Legislators in helping them to try to understand this. She moved approval of policy R485 as amended, with the provision that it be clearly stated to the Legislature that this is based on experience with the quarter system, and we have not had any experience with the semester system yet. Regent Zabriskie seconded the motion.

Regent Grant offered a substitute motion to show that the assignment would be due in the Fall of 1999, after a one-year delay. The motion died for lack of a second.

Regent Rogers said everyone agrees on credit hours. He suggested gathering data this year as a practice, short of a policy statement, while the appropriate mix of numbers is gathered under the semester calendar. Those components would be added to the policy at a later date. He suggested approving the policy without giving specific contact hours. Commissioner Foxley pointed out the timing and expectation of the Legislature. Regent Rogers asked, do we want to go forward under written policy as a regulation, or just do it? The Commissioner confirmed that additions will be made to the policy in the future as we get the best measurement. The Legislature has asked us to report on faculty workload to Legislative Leadership, both on data we have been able to collect during the fall term and on actual credit hours. We can present our data to them with the caveats previously mentioned. Reasonable people will understand that the implementation of a new calendar will bring uncertainties. Submitting this policy will keep our commitment to the Legislature, not provide them with another delay.

Regent Hale agreed with Regent Rogers on the need to do both. Rather than delay our report to the Legislature, she recommended accepting and sending forward this policy and the student

credit information with explanation, hoping this will become an additional pr