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COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair Charles E. Johnson called the meeting of the State Board of Regents to order at 8:38 a.m. He welcomed the group, excused Regents Jensen, Jordan, Huntsman and Mantes, and announced that Regent Winn Richards had resigned from the Board because of health problems. He welcomed USU Provost Stan Albrecht, sitting in for President Hall, and Dixie Vice President Max Rose, who was representing President Huddleston while he met with his Board of Trustees.

Chair Johnson announced the schedule of USHE basketball teams who were competing in tournaments and commended the institutional presidents for the excellence of their athletes. He congratulated Regent Atkinson for receiving a Continuum of Caring Award and an award from the Humanitarian Foundation. Commissioner Foxley added her congratulations, calling Regent Atkinson “Utah’s Mother Theresa.”
Commissioner Foxley recognized Assistant Commissioner Gary Wixom’s birthday. She announced that former Regent Brian Brown and his wife, Heather, were the very proud parents of a baby girl, Hannah Hinckley Brown, who was born on January 19. Brian has recently returned to work. The Commissioner announced that Brad Mortensen and his wife had become parents of a baby girl, Collette, on Tuesday, March 13.

**Overview and Discussion of 2001 Legislative Session**

Commissioner Foxley thanked everyone who had contributed to making this a successful legislative session. She thanked Regents and others who had attended the meetings at the Capitol when their schedules permitted. She thanked the Presidents for their crucial roles throughout the session. Commissioner Foxley gave special thanks to the legislative representatives, whom she asked to stand and be recognized. They, along with Dave Buhler, tracked the bills of importance to higher education throughout the session. She also expressed her appreciation to Harden Eyring for analyzing legislation of interest to higher education.

Commissioner Foxley commended Associate Commissioner Buhler for coming up with a higher education “Fact of the Day” which was given to each legislator every day of the session. The legislators were very appreciative of the opportunity to know more about higher education and the accomplishments of our institutions. On the 36th day of the session, the Fact of the Day recognized Utah Valley State College for their ethics curriculum. Commissioner Foxley thanked Dr. Elaine Englehardt, Vice President Lucille Stoddard and President Romesburg for their work on the ethics program. She offered her congratulations for the national acclaim which this program brought to the state and to the College.

Commissioner Foxley referred to Tab A of the agenda. Higher education received an increase in ongoing funds of 9.1 percent for 2001-2001. With the one-time money, the increase totals 12.8 percent, the largest increase higher education has received in several years. This funding was greatly appreciated and greatly needed by the institutions. The biggest disappointment was that enrollment growth was not fully funded (only 78.8%). This presents a challenge to the institutions. In capital facilities, nine projects were funded, in whole or in part, making it an outstanding year for higher education. Commissioner Foxley pointed out that higher education has about two-thirds of the state’s buildings, so we are hopeful for substantial improvement funds through AR&I as well. UEN was also funded nicely. The Commissioner noted that higher education’s share of tax funds slipped slightly, but with all of the one-time money and capital facilities projects, it was a banner year for higher education.

The Commissioner announced that Representative Afton Bradshaw, co-chair of the Legislative Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee, had undergone knee surgery and was doing well. She noted legislation of interest to higher education and referred to Attachment 3 of Tab A.

**Tuition** S.B. 210, Higher Education Tuition Disclosure, passed both houses and specifies a public hearing process for tuition increases. Institutions who were requesting a second-tier tuition increase worked
hard to meet the spirit of that bill for the current year. Regent Jardine asked if there was a conflict between the enacted legislation and the policy passed at the last Board meeting wherein the Regents requested guidelines from the Presidents in making tuition decisions. Commissioner Foxley replied that the Presidents work with their student body leaders in determining the best way to get the word out to their students. Regent Jardine asked the Presidents to give the Regents the benefit of their experience this year and to make recommendations for better methods in the future.

**Capital Improvements.** Chair Johnson pointed out that HB62, Operation and Maintenance of State Buildings, increased capital improvements project maximum from $1 million to $1.5 million and also raised the total amount of available improvement funding by a total of $8 million beginning next year. This is of special significance to higher education.

Chair Johnson noted S.B. 187, Prohibiting State Departments and Entities from Employing Contract Lobbyists, and asked if this legislation applied to foundations. Harden Eyring said it would probably depend on whether or not foundations were meant to be an extension of the institution. Commissioner Foxley said Senator Evans had specifically intended that this legislation apply to higher education. She indicated that legislators preferred hearing directly from presidents.

**Intent Language.** Commissioner Foxley referred to Attachment 4, Intent Language. She said the Regents had wanted authority to make second tier tuition changes but had not imagined the proscriptive language which was ultimately included in the bill. She will report the outcome and discussions to the Legislative Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee as requested. The formula funding language remained in the bill. In addition to the enrollment growth, the increase on the existing base was not fully funded. Chair Johnson suggested the Regents might want to look at formal legislation on the funding formula during the next legislative session.

**Facilities.** SUU will be working closely with DFCM and the Regents to acquire improvement funding for the projects listed on page 14 of Tab A. Commissioner Foxley remarked that it is highly unusual for the Legislature to be proscriptive on AR&I funding. She asked President Bennion to comment. President Bennion said he appreciated the support for older buildings. Old Main and Braithwaite Hall need to be strengthened because their unreinforced masonry walls place the students at risk. Other improvement issues were not addressed by the Legislature. It was thought there could be a savings of $4 million in the various projects listed at the bottom of page 14.

Commissioner Foxley reported that the intent language for the Wasatch Front ATC encourages the continuation of the efforts SLCC has made with the Jordan School District. She said that while there were areas in which we would have liked more funding, it was overall a good year for higher education.

**Underfunding of Enrollment.** President Romesburg distributed a handout which showed the impact of funding enrollment growth at 78.8%. This translates to a total of 925 unfunded FTE students. The budget request for enrollment funding is for students who are currently in the system, not projections for the future. Since the system has gone to the new method of funding enrollment, this is the first time enrollment growth
has not been fully funded. This presents a challenge for the institutions who are trying to reduce their reliance on part-time faculty. The two solutions left to the schools are to either cap enrollments or rely even more heavily on adjunct faculty who do not receive benefits. President Romesburg asked about next year’s students. Should the institutions accept more new students who may not be funded, or should they cap enrollments? He requested that this issue be one of the top priorities in planning for next year’s budget request.

Chair Johnson said this could be a result of transitioning to a funding formula. Regent Atkin remarked that it appeared the institutions had an “access vs. quality” issue for the coming year. Regent Rogers suggested that the Board would have to decide whether or not the institutions should accept only those students whom the legislature was willing to fund. Chair Johnson said this was obviously the Regents’ second choice; the course on which the Board has embarked would clearly be their first choice. He suggested the best solution would be to codify an enrollment funding formula, taking into account enrollment growth as well as existing students.

Regent Atkinson reminded the Regents that they had placed quality high on their list of goals during the strategic planning process of the past few years. She asked how greatly this would compromise quality for the coming fall semester. President Thompson said Weber would prefer to continue to take students rather than capping enrollments. He expressed his appreciation for the support higher education had received and suggested that we attempt to get the funding formula documented in statute.

Vice Chair Clyde said she was concerned that the Regents and general public did not fully understand the implications of this dilemma. This affects the decisions the Board must make in this meeting about adding new programs. Institutions have struggled with the issues of academic quality and adjunct faculty. Students will not receive the quality of education for which they are asked to pay if the present practice of underfunding enrollment continues.

Regent Jardine suggested that higher education do a better job of communicating with legislators so that they understand the need for fully funding enrollment growth. Chair Johnson said higher education representatives had been very consistent with the message that enrollment growth should be fully funded.

President Machen said UVSC’s analysis was accurate. The institutions will have to bend to absorb this into the system. The real concern is that this will become a trend. Some legislators have asked that we reduce our dependence on growth funds. As we move forward with our projections for next year, we need to stress restoring funding for students who are already enrolled. Chair Johnson said next year that our number one issue might be catch-up funding for enrollment growth, and funding the formula would be the second priority.

President Bennion said there may be a legislative perception that all we worry about is enrollment growth for the institutions. While this is important, Utah has demographics which are solid. In this information age, the need for an education becomes even more critical. Access is very important.
Regent Jardine pointed out the wording in intent language which talks about reducing our reliance on growth funding. If the Legislature sees the formula as a mechanism to reduce enrollment funding, this is a misperception.

Commissioner Foxley said the formula is broader than just enrollment growth. When a formula is not fully funded, something has to be sacrificed. Unfortunately, this year’s sacrifice was enrollment growth funding. If this state wants to have a well educated work force and a healthy economy, higher education must be funded.

Regent Rogers asked President Romesburg if he would assume any increase in student enrollment as he prepared his budget request for next year. President Romesburg responded that he would project the increase and rely more heavily on adjunct faculty. The institutions – particularly the community colleges – have a commitment to provide access to students wishing a higher education. However, quality must ultimately be addressed. We cannot continue to “water the soup.” Regent Rogers suggested that legislative leadership be involved in this dialogue before the budget request is prepared for next fall. Chair Johnson said the Legislative Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee has funding the formula (including enrollment) on their agenda.

Regent Peterson said he was impressed with the efforts the students made to organize themselves and to be heard by the Regents. Students will be most affected and would really mobilize behind this plan. He strongly suggested including the students in the dialogue on enrollment. Regent Peterson said he thought the Legislature would listen to students who were actively interested.

Provost Albrecht expressed his appreciation for the funding appropriated to higher education. He suggested that the underfunding of our base budget and enrollment were more important than intent language. The base needs to be fully funded, as well as enrollment growth.

Tuition Issues for 2001–2002 Public Hearings

Commissioner Foxley called the Regents’ attention to Tab B. The Commissioner’s recommendation is that the first tier of tuition be increased to 5.5% (an increase of 1.5% to the 4% tuition increase already approved) in order to have a compensation package for the institutional employees comparable to other state employees. This is necessary because of the Legislature’s policy and practice of requiring one-fourth of the compensation increase to be covered with tuition revenues. Commissioner Foxley said she and the Presidents agreed that an increase to 5.5% in tuition would be the best course so that USHE employees are treated on a par with other state employees. We are already less than competitive in what we are able to offer our faculty and staff. Chair Johnson noted that even with this increase, not every institution would be able to offer an overall 6% compensation increase. The Commissioner’s recommendation would meet the spirit of the legislators’ intent. He invited students and other concerned members of the audience to comment.
Regent Atkinson said the Regents had not had time to thoroughly review the information. She noted that an increase in fees was also being proposed. She cautioned the Regents to consider the total cost to the students when the 5.5% tuition increase is added to a second-tier increase and a corresponding increase in fees. Commissioner Foxley said a 5.5% increase at each institution would raise a student’s tuition by the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>$107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>$89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow College</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State College</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Eastern Utah</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Valley State College</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>$89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commissioner pointed out that the fees are recommended to the Board by the Presidents after consultation with students, and sometimes at the direct request of the students. She referred to the WICHE comparison shown on Attachment 2. Our four-year institutions are below the average of comparable institutions in the Western Region, and our two-year institutions are above the average of their comparison institutions. While none of the community college Presidents were requesting a second tier increase, their faculty and staff also need the compensation package to be funded.

Regent Sweeten moved the approval of a 5.5% across-the-board tuition increase within the USHE to match legislative appropriations for compensation for the 2001-2002 academic year. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin.

Jed Montgomery, an SUU student, spoke in support of the increase. He said students are very concerned with quality and want to have good teachers in their classrooms. Students go to college where they can obtain the best education.

Regent Atkinson requested the total cost of tuition and fees when fee increases (Tab Q) were discussed by the Committee of the Whole. She applauded the Legislature for their actions to fund salary equity.

Vote was taken on the motion to increase tuition by 5.5%. It carried unanimously.

Regent Peterson suggested that an explanation of the requirement for 25% of compensation increases to be taken from tuition would enable students to better understand the reason for the additional tuition increase. Chair Johnson asked the Presidents to get this message to their students.

Following a short break, the meeting resumed with a discussion on second-tier tuition. Chair Johnson pointed out the proposed revisions to policy R510 (attachment 4). He proposed that §4.7 on page 3 of the policy be amended to read: “4.7. Summer School – Non-resident summer school students shall may be assessed the same tuition per credit hour or full-time load as that assessed resident students during the regular academic year. This technical change was added to those already drafted designed to
accommodate second-tier tuition increases. **Regent Hoggan moved the approval of the changes to policy R510, including Chair Johnson’s suggested revision. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin.**

Boyd Garriott referred to legislative intent language which stated, “It is the intent of the Legislature that any tuition surcharge increase not be across the board but be based on a differential system reflecting the cost of providing for the type of degree sought by the student.” He then referred to new §3.2 of policy R510 which reads, in part, “Second-tier tuition rate increases may apply to all programs equally or they may be different for specific programs.” Representative Goodfellow rose to say he had been a member of the Conference Committee which met to craft the intent language. He said his interpretation of the intent language would be “across the board” meant across the system rather than within an institution. President Thompson referred to the phrase “used to fund critical institutional needs” and said those needs may not be directly related to a specific program. He asked that the Presidents be allowed the flexibility to address critical needs on their campus as they arise. Commissioner Foxley said Representative Goodfellow’s interpretation was consistent with the language in the policy and with discussions with legislative leaders. She recommended that the Board approve the policy and continue discussions with the Legislative Higher Education Appropriations Committee and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst’s office.

**Regent Jardine moved to amend the motion by deleting the second sentence in §3.2 of Policy R510. Regent Atkinson seconded the motion.** The amendment was accepted by the maker and seconder of the original motion. Vote was taken, and the amended motion passed unanimously.

**Second Tier Tuition Requests**

**University of Utah.** President Machen said he was asking for no increase for lower division students. Revenues from the proposed increase will be divided between libraries and web-based student services, neither of which was funded by the Legislature. The proposed undergraduate tuition increase will be 5.5%, and upper division and graduate students will have a 6.8% increase (5.5% plus an additional 1.3%). A public hearing was held to obtain student input. This request was approved by the University’s Board of Trustees earlier in the week. **Regent Atkin moved, seconded by Vice Chair Clyde, that the University of Utah’s second tier tuition increase of 1.3% for undergraduate and graduate students. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Southern Utah University.** President Bennion reported a very positive experience in the hearings on his campus. There was not a large turnout at the institutional hearing but the result was positive support. Academic Computing has met with faculty and staff and proposed a $30 fee increase per semester. That increase was not approved, but the discussion was vital. Mike Wasden, the Student Body President, suggested that the tuition surcharge be applied to technology rather than increasing fees so greatly. Scholarship dollars are generally counted in tuition but not as fees. President Bennion commended the students for their helpful insight. Tuition would not be across the board, but would be for resident
undergraduate students only. Major increases were made to the graduate resident tuition last year. **Regent Rogers moved, seconded by Regent Sweeten, that SUU’s second tier tuition increase of 2% be approved.** Regent Hoggan asked if this met the requirements of the legislative intent language. President said it did, because every program on campus needed this support. He explained that two factors were driving this recommendation: (1) improved technological support for the quality of the students, and (2) overall funding for accreditation review and to move SUU closer to WSU’s tuition level.

Mr. Garriott said the Legislature had appropriated $250,000 for a study of platforms, integrated data systems, etc., for technological needs on USHE campuses. This includes communications and registration systems. Chair Johnson clarified that this was intended to include academic use. President Machen pointed out higher education had been asking for support for five years. Money appropriated for a study does not solve this year’s problems. **Vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**Utah Valley State College.** President Romesburg distributed copies of the handout which was used for their public hearings. The information received much exposure. No students appeared at the campus hearing, which officials viewed as student approval because of the extensive discussions on campus. The increase was endorsed by the student body president. He explained that UVSC had two tuition levels – undergraduate, which is comparable with SLCC, and upper division, which is comparable with WSU. The College’s long-term plan is to get to a single tuition rate over time. The proposed 7% addition of second tier tuition increase should generate $1.6 million after deducting compensation match requirements. It would be used as follows: $250,000 for advising, counseling, and library; $150,000 for software license fees and computer leases; $400,000 to increase adjunct faculty pay rate; and $800,000 for new full-time faculty with emphasis on English, Mathematics, Behavioral Science, and Languages. The tuition increase would raise lower division tuition to $1542 and upper division tuition to $1786 for 2001-2002, which is an $180 increase for lower division and $116 for upper division students.

President Romesburg noted that the handout showed the programs in which over 50% of the courses were taught by adjunct faculty. Some areas, such as Languages and Behavioral Science, have far more than 50% of their classes in core subject areas taught by adjunct faculty. This has been addressed by the funding mechanism. The chart also showed student-to-staff ratios, which were also very high. The money from the tuition increase will be used to address long-standing problems on campus. President Romesburg pointed out the increase in Pell Grants and Hope Scholarships for the coming year. College officials feel this is the best way to meet those critical needs. They will not be able to hire ten more full-time faculty because enrollment growth was not fully funded. **Regent Atkin moved, seconded by Regent Rogers, that UVSC’s second tier tuition increase of 7% or $53 be approved. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Weber State University.** President Thompson said Weber was proposing a second tier tuition increase of 1.5%, or $12 per semester. From this increase, $325,000 will be generated to replace the University’s student information system. The University does not know the total cost of replacing this system. The proposal received support from the students. The money will be banked with the anticipation
that it will be needed next year as the University begins to acquire the hardware and software to make this transition. Only one negative comment was received, which came from an International student. President Thompson pointed out non-resident tuition in Utah is very low when compared with other states around the country. The increase will apply to both resident and non-resident tuition. **Regent Atkin moved, seconded by Vice Chair Clyde, that WSU’s second tier tuition increase of 1.5% be approved. The motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Johnson thanked the Regents for making these difficult decisions.

The meeting recessed for lunch at 11:35 a.m.

Planning Session re Applied Technology Education

The Board of Regents met jointly Thursday afternoon with representatives of public education for a joint discussion on applied technology education. Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:13 p.m. and announced that the Utah State University basketball team had won their game in overtime. He welcomed the following individuals from public education: Janet A. Cannon, Vice Chair of the State Board of Education; Bette O. Arial, Denis Morrill, David Moss, Marilyn Shields, and Teresa Theurer, members of the State Board of Education; Superintendent Steven O. Laing and Associate Superintendent Robert O. Brems; Richard L. Maughan, Superintendent of Bridgerland ATC; Michael J. Bouwhuis, Superintendent of Davis ATC; C. Brent Wallis, Superintendent of Ogden-Weber ATC; Royanne Boyer, Superintendent of Mountainlands ATC; Bo Hall, Acting Superintendent of the Wasatch Front South ATC; and Brent Judd, Director of the Southwest Applied Technology Center Service Region (ATCSR).

On behalf of the Board of Regents, Chair Johnson expressed appreciation to the members of the State Board of Education for making the effort to come to St. George to exchange ideas about applied technology education governance. He read a message he had received from Kim Burningham, Chair of the State Board of Education, expressing his support for the joint meeting and the mutual desire to make sure that excellent ATE experiences are available throughout the state. Chair Johnson said the intent of the meeting was for both boards to better understand each other and understand the issues involved in governing applied technology education in Utah. He acknowledged that both boards had huge responsibilities to the citizens of this state.

As background, Chair Johnson explained that the students in question are the 16- to 18-year-olds who are completing their secondary education and beginning their higher education. The Joint Liaison Committee worked very hard on several issues – teacher preparation and concurrent enrollment, as well as ATE. However, as a committee, they did not have budgetary or governance responsibility. The Regents suggested to the Governor that a group be formed of higher education, public education, and legislative members to study this issue. As a result, the Legislature decided to form a legislative task force.

Chair Johnson affirmed that both systems are capable of governing applied technology education. However, the main focus of this discussion must be what is best for the students, their parents or guardians, and both systems of education in this state. Both boards would prefer to keep governance of ATE within
the two systems to forming a third board. He asked, how will the taxpayers be better off? What about employers?

He briefly explained why higher education believes they can handle ATE under the Utah System of Higher Education: (1) Moving ATE centers to applied technology colleges overcomes a question of credit or degrees for taking these classes. (2) There is efficiency in combining this into one system regardless of where ATE is delivered. (3) The open-entry, open-exit, competency-based method of delivery is already used in the System, and it can be used more extensively.

Superintendent Bouwhuis distributed a handout of his PowerPoint presentation. He explained the background which led to the development of applied technology centers. Students generally have many job offers before they complete their training program. Competencies are defined by employer teams in business and industry. The cost of training at an ATC is determined by membership hours and is 90 cents per membership hour. After a number of hours per week, training is basically free to the students. Between 1996 and 2000, the state average was 2,983,000 membership hours, with 55% of the training taken by adults and 45% by secondary students. A typical ATC class will include equal numbers of adults and high school students. Mr. Bouwhuis explained the composition and authority of ATC boards and outlined a typical school day. He expressed his appreciation to the State Board of Education for the flexibility and autonomy to create new and better educational systems.

Chair Johnson asked Vice Chair Cannon for an overview from the State Board of Education’s perspective. Ms. Cannon explained that the SBE had been formed at statehood with 15 elected officials. They were given constitutional authority for the general control and governance of public education in Utah. Later the Board was given authority by statute to govern ATE. This is a high priority for the Board, and ATE funding has been given high priorities in their budget requests. Applied technology education provides training for those students who are interested in going into the work force by providing skills for employment. Vice Chair Cannon pointed out that high school students need vocational training. Without funding from ATE, high schools were not able to provide the necessary programs and facilities. The SBE is concerned with the ideas presented in the change of governance. The system is succeeding and is outstanding. Board members are concerned that applied technology colleges will become community colleges. There is a feeling that the needs of both high school and adult ATE students will become less important in college. The State Board of Education champions the needs of AT students.

President Cundiff stated that higher education believes the role of educating adults belongs to community colleges and universities. Sixty-five percent of all students in the United States are in community colleges. “Mission creep” has occurred where two-year colleges have become four-year colleges, but the same thing has happened in public education. Institutions which have been involved in training high school and adult students have taken on the role of offering credit. The Regents are extremely concerned about technical education and working skills for high school students and adults, as well as job skills for employment. The SLCC Board of Trustees is extremely concerned about ATE in Utah. President Cundiff and Chair Randall Mackey are involved on the Wasatch Front South ATC Board of Directors. This is a very productive relationship.
SLCC works closely with Bo Hall and the WFSATC to provide opportunities for every citizen in the Salt Lake Valley. Together they have made significant progress. An advisory board to the Board of Trustees for ATE issues has been considered. Salt Lake Community College works closely with five school districts, including Tooele, in the Wasatch South Front area, all of which offer ATE on their campus. SLCC provides buildings on two campuses for ATE programs in conjunction with local high schools. It is a “blended solution” within the Salt Lake Valley with value-added programs. There are 500-600 high school students taking classes at SLCC during any semester.

Salt Lake Community College’s programs are competency based, as are programs of other institutions. Sixty percent of SLCC’s ATE programs are open-entry, and all of them will be open-entry by next fall. All of them are open-exit. SLCC offers 30 non-credit ATE programs with 15,000 students enrolled. The College also offers 48 credit programs with 17,000 students enrolled throughout the Salt Lake Valley. Higher education officials constantly talk about ways to articulate with high school students and ATC Superintendents. Higher education nation-wide is looking at competency-based education. Competency-based programs are converted to credit for students in higher education.

President Cundiff pointed out that high school students pay no tuition for concurrent enrollment classes taken during the school year. At SLCC alone, this is a lost revenue of $335,000 for non-credit students. SLCC does the majority of non-credit training in the Salt Lake Valley (more than 800,000 hours in non-credit ATC/ATE work with both students and secondary students), none of which is funded.

Associate Superintendent Brems said tuition has been an issue with ATCs and ATCSRs. Legislative funding has enabled them to provide services to secondary students on a tuition-free basis. Others are offered on a shared-tuition basis. School districts appreciate having services which do not cost the district or students extra money. Mr. Brems asked President Cundiff to speak about addressing these costs. President Cundiff said that in the concurrent enrollment program, the $1500 per FTE which goes to SLCC is currently being split as follows – $500 to SLCC, $500 to the high school, and $500 to whoever provides the instructor. In many cases, the high school provides the instructor. If high school students remain on their own campus and are taught by a high school teacher, they are not charged tuition at SLCC. On blended facilities, where the College offers classes at a high school, tuition is shared.

Commissioner Foxley referred to the handout entitled “Applied Technology Education (ATE) Characteristics of Community Colleges, ATCs and ATCSRs,” and said nine of the thirteen characteristics are in common; only four are different. She referred to another handout, “Applied Technology Education Programs by County/Programs Available to Adult Students,” which was prepared for the Joint Applied Technology Education Committee of the USHE Master Planning Task Force on Institutional Missions/Roles and System Configuration in 1998-1999. Representatives from public education were involved in the subcommittee, which was chaired by Regent Atkinson. Regent Atkinson said it had been an incredible process, and the task force learned that there was not a lot of duplication in the state. It was a great learning experience for everyone involved. The task force worked together as a team. By throwing out “turfdom,” they were able to come to agreement on major issues.
The Commissioner recognized Dr. Max Lowe, who was present with his wife, Laura. Dr. Lowe was instrumental in developing materials for the task force and was viewed as “Mr. ATE” throughout his educational career.

**SBE Principles.** Vice Chair Cannon said the State Board of Education had held a session on ATE. They felt that six principles should be incorporated within any ATE legislation. The six principles were Mission, Clientele, Student outcomes, Dedicated and protected funding, Participatory oversight and management at state and local levels, and Governance of ATE programs for secondary students in regional ATE programs under the State Board of Education. Ms. Cannon said it was important to the Board that secondary students be served at no cost (to the student or to the school district) and that adults should receive training at low cost. Open-entry, open-exit courses are also important, as are certificates of competency.

Associate Superintendent Brems asked what would happen to the constitutional responsibility of the State Board of Education for secondary students if the governance of ATE should shift from the State Board of Education to the State Board of Regents. Superintendent Laing said he had hoped John Fellows (State Office of Legislative Counsel) would be at the meeting to explain the legislation. He expressed his concern about the ability of ATE to be spread across the state equitably. The State Board of Education has been the Board for ATE and is invested in it administratively and philosophically.

It became clear last summer that the direction would be a governance structure which removed the ATCs from the direct control of the SBE. That direction became even more clear with the proposed legislation (SB 34, 1st Substitute). The SBE recognized that it was in their best interests to espouse the principles rather than governance. Decision makers are not talking about leaving the ATCs under the State Board of Education. The First Substitute incorporated these principles so the SBE took an unofficial position of support. Before the bill was introduced onto the House floor, a Third Substitute was introduced at the Governor’s request. It was not accepted as a substitute, and the First Substitute passed out of the House and went to the Senate. Finally, a Fifth Substitute was submitted and passed in the Senate but did not pass the House. Ultimately, the House suggested a special session and left the issue unresolved.

Superintendent Laing briefly reviewed the Fifth Substitute, which created a Utah College of Applied Technology (UCAT), modifying the State Board of Regents’ authority. He distributed a colored organizational chart which explained the structure and funding flow (“green line”) of the new UCAT. The UCAT Board would be required to submit an annual progress report each year. The new college would be charged to develop a new degree – the Associate of Applied Technology Degree – which would be transferable to other higher education institutions. In addition to the new UCAT, there would be stand-alone Applied Technology Colleges and Applied Technology Colleges within existing higher education institutions.

Regent Grant asked how the institutions would be funded for the coming year. Chair Johnson said that legislation was included in another bill. Dr. Brems referred to lines 625-634 of HB34S5 and explained that UCAT funding was not included. Custom fit, development and equipment funds were included in SB3. Debbie Headden noted that line 11 showed the existing money which would have been transferred, while
new money was put into SB3. Line 631 on page 11 shows that $299,400 is SBR/ATCSR funding. The other items were included in the SBE budget for services which already existed. The money would be transferred to the administration of the new UCAT, had the Fifth Substitute passed in both houses.

Chair Johnson suggested analyzing the proposed legislation to see whether or not it met the State Board of Education’s principles for secondary students. The SBE is mandated to provide education equitably. Higher education does not have a similar mandate but desires the same thing. Superintendent Laing said Governor Leavitt had stated that the Constitution specifies that the public education system in Utah should be free and open to all students. The speculation is that a legitimate legal argument could be made about whether or not the system is open to all students if comparable programs are not available to all institutions. Where ATCs do not exist, there is not a similar quality of training opportunities offered in other areas. Associate Superintendent Brems said the structure of the proposed UCAT would cover the entire state and be a hybrid. The expectation would remain that these services would be available across the state.

President Huddleston brought up the subject of competency-based ATE programs. Controlled entry and exit may be requested by the agency or company providing the payment for the training. Assistant Commissioner Wixom noted that every program which comes to the Board of Regents for approval includes a market-driven competency factor. Superintendent Maughan said he had just met with Boards and Superintendents and they were concerned that the mission of the ATCs remain viable to serve the secondary students.

Vice Chair Cannon reviewed the principles individually, and discussion ensued about whether or not the proposed legislation met those principles. Commissioner Foxley asked how equal access was currently being preserved for the high school students in the ATCs and ATCSRs. Superintendent Bouwhuis said the schools use the SEOP, a plan for high school students, to determine which programs were ATC-directed. Those students pre-enroll and are guaranteed a slot all year. Adult enrollment follows the college module. When programs are filled, waiting lists are created which are non-discriminatory. There are currently waiting lists in nursing programs and in computer technology programs. Superintendent Maughan said some students exit back to the high schools and slots are filled. It works out very well as long as open-entry, open-exit, competency-based goals are kept. Vice Chair Cannon said ATC budgets come through the State Board of Education. Chair Johnson credited public education for their funding formula in using membership hours.

Associate Superintendent Brems said guaranteeing access to high school students had not been a problem. The ability of the local board to monitor this access would be ensured by the representation of local school boards on the UCAT boards. Snow College South would return to an open-entry, open-exit model for high school students. The local board studied the issue and made recommendations. President Wheeler said the discussion had concerned trimesters. The schedule was more difficult to meet. Credit was another issue. Credit classes were not open-entry, open-exit but were offered on a semester system. Associate Superintendent Brems said there will still exist the possibility for students who document competency to be awarded credit.
Regent Atkinson asked Superintendent Laing what portions of the proposed bill gave the State Board of Education concern about protecting secondary students, both in access and funding. Dr. Lang said the Board’s specific issue is with lines 364-367 (page 12) of the bill, which could be seen as an invitation to drift. The SBE did not have a chance to see this bill because it came out late in the session. Regent Atkinson asked if another statement providing that protection could meet that concern. Vice Chair Cannon said the Board’s concern was about the ultimate outcome to secondary students with funding coming from a different stream.

Dr. Rowley referred to line 366 (“offer lower division courses for credit within the associate of applied technology degree program”) and said Governor Leavitt felt strongly that the Associate of Applied Technology Degree should be offered strictly as a competency-based program. Credits should be offered in cooperation with colleges and universities. The Colleges of Applied Technology should not offer credit. Associate Superintendent Brems said there needs to be a “currency” indicating a level of competency in a program, and there should be an interchange between institutions.

Regent Grant asked if public education’s governance stopped when students graduate from high school. Vice Chair Cannon said the State Board of Education was designated the State Board for Applied Technology Education because the governance continues.

President Thompson said Weber State University worked well with the board of the Ogden-Weber and Davis Applied Technology Centers. Weber’s concern is that the changes made do not undermine that working relationship. Partnerships must be maintained in a productive way. Superintendent Wallis agreed that relationships are very positive between the Ogden-Weber and Davis ATCs and Weber State University. He said he was very supportive of the bill. He was amazed to watch the entire state come to terms with what needed to take place for the betterment of ATE throughout the state. He said he hoped to be able to better serve and add value to the high school students and adults working in the area through the new organizational structure.

President Cundiff said Salt Lake Community College and the Wasatch Front ATC had come very far in a short period of time in finding a suitable solution for a large number of people. The College cannot serve well without the WFS being a part of them, and vice versa. This is a real opportunity to find a solution everyone has been seeking for a long time. Director Hall agreed with President Cundiff’s comments. Both entities view this as an exceptional opportunity and are firmly committed to work together to address the unique needs of the Salt Lake Valley. Legislation was enacted this year to address funding equities.

Superintendent Boyer said in her 11 years of experience in working with UVSC, no drift was attempted or occurred. A building was given to UVSC to teach concurrent classes to high school students from 7:40 a.m. until the end of the day. Other programs are offered on site in high schools. She said she was thrilled with what they were able to do for both high school students and adults.
Denis Morrill expressed his appreciation to President Cundiff for his willingness to work closely with public education. Regent Atkinson thanked Superintendent Laing and the ATC Superintendents for their help in clearing up misconceptions.

On behalf of the State Board of Regents, Chair Johnson thanked the Superintendents and members of the State Board of Education for their participation and their willingness to help bridge the understanding between the boards.

The meeting was recessed at 4:00 p.m. The Regents and Presidents enjoyed dinner at President Huddleston’s home, where President and Mrs. Day were guests of honor. Chair Johnson, Commissioner Foxley, and President Thompson paid tribute to the Days and expressed their appreciation on behalf of the entire System.

Friday, March 16, 2001

Following meetings of the Board Committees, the Committee of the Whole was reconvened at 10:18 a.m. Chair Johnson announced that the SUU men’s basketball team had put up a valiant battle the previous evening but had been defeated in the last few seconds of the game. He recognized Representatives Goodfellow, King, Winn, Clark and Urquardt.

Chair Johnson welcomed Dave Adams, Chair of the State Building Board. Commissioner Foxley thanked Mr. Adams for his part in making the capital facilities appropriations possible in the Legislative Session. Chair Adams praised the great leadership in the Legislature and thanked them and Governor Leavitt for their support. He also credited the staff of the USHE institutions and the Commissioner’s staff. The Building Board’s goal is to establish an ongoing method of funding the capital needs of the state. This could save the state millions of dollars through better organization. He suggested that the Board of Regents determine a building amount of approximately $100 million per year on a five-year cycle to maintain a constant stream of funds to be able to build the facilities needed for the anticipated growth in higher education.

Reports of Board Committees

Finance and Facilities Committee

Chair Hoggan thanked Mr. Adams for his support with the Legislature and for his participation in the meetings of the Finance and Facilities Committee and the Committee of the Whole.

USHE – Capital Improvement Priorities for 2001-2002 (Tab R). Chair Hoggan said the Legislature had previously funded Capital Improvements annually at an amount equal to .9% of the replacement value of all state buildings. That amount has been raised to 1.1% over the next two years and moves the amount allocated to the Building Board to improve capital facilities from $36.8 million to $44.0
million in 2001. Higher Education has four million square feet of space which are over 50 years old. The Building Board will be meeting in May to approve funds for the next fiscal year. Mr. Adams acknowledged that his term on the Building Board would expire in May. He credited the previous leadership of Nolan Karras, Ron Halverson and Budd Scruggs.

University of Utah – Differential Tuition Proposal for 2001-2002 (Tab B, Attachment 3). Chair Hoggan said the proposed increase was for the Graduate School of Architecture. The increase would be $45 per student credit hour, or an additional tuition charge of $900 per year. The additional tuition would be applied in all three academic terms beginning in Summer Term 2001. Chair Hoggan moved approval of the proposal. The motion was seconded by Regent Grant and carried unanimously.

Dixie State College – Campus Master Plan (Tab O). Chair Hoggan said Dixie officials were requesting approval to acquire two parcels of property totaling .62 acres adjacent to the campus. No O&M was requested. Chair Hoggan referred to the Supplement to Tab O, Receipt of Gifted Property, and said the property was being donated to the College. Chair Hoggan moved approval of the acquisition. The motion was seconded by Regent Grant and passed.

Chair Hoggan pointed out the master plan brochure distributed to Board members. The location of the Graff-Eccles Fine Arts Center has not yet been decided; it will be determined in consultation with the DFCM. Vicki Wilson from IHC had made a presentation to the committee. IHC will be constructing a $100 million health care facility in St. George. The company is having preliminary discussions with the College about partnering on that site with an educational component. The College would be able to use the clinical facilities of the hospital to train medical personnel. Chair Hoggan moved approval of the Campus Master Plan, subject to the location of the Graff-Eccles Fine Arts Building possibly being different than shown on the master plan. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin and carried unanimously.

Salt Lake Community College – Lease of Downtown Instructional Facility (Tab P). Chair Hoggan noted that this item had been pulled from the agenda at the request of SLCC officials.

USHE – Proposed 2001-2002 Fee Increases (Tab Q). Chair Hoggan said the Board’s general rule has been that if student fees increased at a greater rate than tuition, evidence of student support would be required. Two schools (UVSC and SLCC) are requesting increases greater than the tuition increase – UVSC, a 6.3% increase, and SLCC, a 19% increase. Chair Hoggan called attention to Attachment 1 which outlined the increases at each institution. The increases at UVSC and SLCC are for additions to the student centers on campus. President Cundiff said 60% of SLCC’s increase would be used to pay off the bonds for the College Center renovation. Other components of the request were an increase in technology and athletics, as well as student activities. The students have also requested an increase in technology equipment. He said this had been SLCC’s most active student group in several years. Student leaders had tried to survey all the students on all of the campuses and had unanimously recommended this increase. President Cundiff pointed out that SLCC has the second lowest level of fees in the System and with this increase, they will still be the third lowest. The SLCC Board of Trustees unanimously recommended this
increase as well. Chair Grant moved approval of the proposed fee increases. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin. Vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.

Report of the Audit Review Subcommittee (Tab S). Chair Hoggan noted that this item was for information only. No questions had been raised in committee.

Consent Calendar, Finance and Facilities Committee (Tab T). On motion by Chair Hoggan and second by Regent Grant, the following items were approved on the Committee’s Consent Calendar: (1) OCHE Monthly Investment Report and (2) UofU and USU Capital Facilities Delegation Report.

Chair Johnson thanked Chair Hoggan for his report.

Academic and Applied Technology Education Committee
Chair Atkinson thanked Representative Urquardt for his attendance and support. She said the Committee had a very full agenda and a spirited discussion.

Weber State University – Bachelor of Science Degree in Computer and Design Graphics Technology (Tab D). The proposed CDGT program will prepare students to develop engineering and architectural drawings and models, technical manuals, reports, presentations, training textbooks, technical illustrations, interactive multimedia, and animations for industry. Industry representatives have indicated they would hire graduates who had obtained their B.S. in CDGT. Chair Atkinson said no concerns had been received, and the other institutions felt comfortable with this program. The Associate of Applied Science program moves smoothly into the Bachelor of Science program. Regent Atkinson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Clyde, that the proposal be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Arts Degree in History (Tab E). Chair Atkinson said this program would be phased in as new faculty are hired. Consultants from four institutions were involved in making the proposal. Questions raised about the number of Ph.D.-qualified faculty were answered satisfactorily by UVSC officials. There would be no impact on USU’s History program. UVSC’s program has the same number of credits as required by USU for a teaching degree. Other concerns were resolved. Regent Atkinson moved, seconded by Regent Atkin, that the program be approved. Regent Rogers asked about the faculty to be hired in light of the lack of complete enrollment funding. President Romesburg said that would not impact the core faculty for these programs. Funding issues arose on all of UVSC’s requests in secondary education programs, prompting a lengthy discussion in committee. The College also discussed enrollment caps and concluded that it was not appropriate because the needs of these students are so great. New faculty would be teaching these programs, leaving adjunct faculty to teach math and English beginning classes. The committee was assured that funding was available for all of the programs to be implemented by using tuition and other funds appropriated to the College. President Romesburg noted that the Board had decided the previous day to continue to fund programs in hopes that the money would be available. Chair Johnson clarified that sufficient funding was available to implement
UVSC’s new programs. Any curtailment in funding would be applied to subsequent programs. **Vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

Regent Rogers moved that the Board advise the Legislature that the Regents view the 78.8% enrollment funding as a phase of the formula rather than future practice, and that based on that view, the Regents will continue to accept students and to grow academic programs based on market and student demand. Additionally, he moved that the Board advise the Legislature that the Regents can only continue to do so in anticipation that growth would be fully funded in the future. **The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin.** Regent Atkinson expressed the Regents’ appreciation to the Legislature for the funding which was appropriated in the 2001 Session. **Vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously.**

**Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts Degrees in Secondary Education** (Tab F). Chair Atkinson said the program had been reviewed by other USHE teacher preparation programs and found to be based on a sound framework. She noted the five issues to be addressed: (1) decreased enrollment growth funding, (2) adequate placement of student teachers, (3) impact on existing system programs, (4) market for future graduates, and (5) accreditation. UVSC was able to satisfy all concerns satisfactorily. It was determined that the College would offer secondary education degrees in disciplines in which it already has or soon will have baccalaureate degrees. The committee had enjoyed a long and healthy discussion about this issue. The number of graduates coming from this program would not negatively impact graduates in other programs throughout the system. **Regent Atkinson moved approval of the Commissioner’s recommendation, which included the requirement of annual reports for the first four years. Approval would be subject to approval of the State Office of Education. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde and carried unanimously.**

**Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science Degree in Biology Education** (Tab G). Chair Atkinson said concerns which were raised by Southern Utah University and the University of Utah had been answered satisfactorily. UVSC is currently negotiating with Utah State University, the University of Utah, and Brigham Young University for partnerships in various programs, including Biology Education. **Regent Atkinson moved approval of the program. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin and carried unanimously.**

**Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science Degree in Earth Science Education** (Tab H). Chair Atkinson said one new methods course would be added. Other courses in this program are already being taught at UVSC. Representatives from the University of Utah and Utah State University made suggestions related to possible course work and field experience opportunities. **Regent Atkinson moved approval of the program. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde and carried unanimously.**

**Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts Degrees in English Education** (Tab I). Chair Atkinson said this program was built upon the foundation of the recently approved baccalaureate degree in English. Two new methods courses will be developed. Other courses
are already being taught at UVSC. With the growth of schools and population in Utah County, there will be no difficulty in placing student teachers who graduate from this program. The questions raised by SUU were satisfactorily addressed. Chair Atkinson moved approval of the program. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin and carried unanimously.

Salt Lake Community College – Veterinary Technician Associate of Applied Science Degree (Tab J). Chair Atkinson said there was no similar program in the state. This is a technician program as opposed to a technician assistant. Only six states do not have a license component. The Board of Regents has a policy limiting credits for A.A.S. degrees to 69. However, 73 credits would be required for this degree. The program will be taught on the College’s Jordan Campus and is supported throughout the state. Regent Atkinson moved program approval. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde and carried unanimously.

Salt Lake Community College – Fitness Technician Associate of Applied Science Degree (Tab K). Chair Atkinson said there had been difficulty finding people to fill these positions. Companies would rather hire technicians who have completed an A.A.S. degree. Regent Hoggan asked what kind of salary was being paid to graduates of this program. President Cundiff said beginning salaries generally ranged from $28,000 to $32,000. Vice Chair Clyde noted this was more than is paid to beginning teachers in Utah. Chair Atkinson moved approval of the program. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin and carried unanimously.

Southern Utah University – Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering (Tab L). Chair Atkinson said the committee had moved this item to action status. She moved that the item be moved to action by the Board. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde and carried unanimously. Chair Atkinson explained that this program would build on the background of the Pre-Engineering and Engineering Technology programs at SUU. It fills a unique niche. It would not be specialized but would meet the needs of small and medium-sized companies. Funding would require reallocation and some new funding. After salaries for faculty and staff, this program was the University’s top funding priority. The committee heard a presentation from David Sorensen of the Utah Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), who discussed the need for the program in terms of small or medium-sized companies. Students need to be advised that other courses may be required to prepare them for graduate school. University of Utah officials wanted to make sure students were not misled on the type of degree program being offered.

Vice Chair Clyde said there was strong need in industry for graduates of this program. She asked if this would be practical for a University Center model and if the University was able to adequately inform students of the nature of the degree. President Bennion said he would not prefer a University Center model. There are no teacher outreach programs in Engineering throughout the state. Large engineering programs at the research universities focus on grants and research. This is a good program to fill the void. President Machen said the concerns of the University of Utah had to do with a full understanding by employers about what they are hiring, as well as a full understanding by students of the skills attained.
Vice Chair Jardine referred to the Governor’s Initiative and said money would be appropriated to the Regents to allocate within the System on the recommendation of a Technology Initiative advisory committee. Commission Foxley said the Engineering and Technology Initiative (SB 61) had originally earmarked $500,000 for new programs. That piece of the bill was not funded. Regent Jardine asked President Bennion if the University could support this program if state funding did not become available. President Bennion said SUU would need some money from the Initiative. Commissioner Foxley said Chair Johnson had raised a question in committee around a University Center model. This has not been explored with the other institutions.

Regent Rogers moved that the program be approved and that the title of the program be changed to “Integrated” Engineering. The motion was seconded by Regent Atkin. Chair Johnson explained that he would not be voting for the program for a variety of reasons. SUU has always done everything with quality. They have a good reputation for the quality of their programs, and that reputation should be preserved. Also, there is a University Center model in the System which is intended to operate in institutions where they are not capable of financing certain programs. The University Center model is used to incubate new programs. A transition would take place at a future date when all of the issues were covered.

Regent Grant said his company would benefit greatly from the passage of this proposal by hiring graduates with enhanced analytical abilities.

Chair Atkinson offered a substitute motion, that the questions raised regarding the University Center model and funding be investigated and that the proposal come back for action on April 20. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde.

Associate Commissioner Petersen said the Engineering Deans would meet in April. They have worked closely together in the past to allocate prior Engineering Initiative funds or to propose an allocation to be adopted by the Board. The challenge this year is that SB61 created an advisory council whose membership has not been created yet. For that Board to reach some decision on allocation, the process could take several months. Associate Commissioner Petersen said it was unlikely that a recommendation would be forthcoming from the advisory council prior to the April meeting. President Machen said the Engineering Deans have to hire faculty for next fall. Funding needs to be set by next month in order for the Engineering Initiative to be implemented.

Chair Atkinson modified her substitute motion. She moved that the Board approve the program request, contingent upon funding being sufficient to start the program, and contingent upon a continuing exploration of Southern Utah University working collaboratively with Utah State University and the University of Utah. Regent Hoggan seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Jardine said he supported Regent Atkinson’s motion but he did not believe a University Center model would work. He asked that a report be made to the Board of the collaborate efforts of Southern Utah University, Utah State University and the University of Utah.
Vote was taken on the motion by a show of hands. The motion carried with one opposing vote.

Information Calendar, Academic and Applied Technology Education Committee (Tab M). Chair Atkinson said the items on the Information Calendar had been approved by the institutional boards of trustees and required no Regent action.

Consent Calendar, Academic and Applied Technology Education Committee (Tab N). Chair Atkinson said the Petroleum Research Center (PERC) at the University of Utah would continue the University’s long-standing tradition for high-quality research in fossil fuel technology. In May 2000 the PERC was named a State of Utah Center of Excellence in recognition of its contributions to the petroleum industry in Utah and its potential for generating new techniques and software products of commercial value to the petroleum industry worldwide. Chair Atkinson moved approval of the Petroleum Research Center. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Clyde and carried unanimously.

Chair Johnson thanked Chair Atkinson for her informative report.

General Consent Calendar

On approval by Vice Chair Clyde and second by Regent Atkin, the following items were approved on the General Consent Calendar (Tab U):

A. Minutes – Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Utah State Board of Regents held February 16, 2001, at the State Capitol in Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. Grant Proposals - Approval to submit the following proposals:

1. University of Utah - Itr/Ap-Advanced Computational Technique for Biomedical Applications & Safety Assessment of Electromagnetic Fields, $2,637,759; Om P. Gandhi, Principal Investigator.

2. University of Utah - Program for Computational Function Imaging and Visualization: Tools for Image Processing and Fusion, Inter. Visualization, and Invers Problems, $2,001,260; Christopher Johnson, Principal Investigator.

3. University of Utah - Information Technology Infrastructure for the Modeling of Mesostructured Materials, $4,637,550; Grant D. Smith, Principal Investigator.

4. University of Utah - Itr,Sy: Cardioscope: Computational Bioengineering of the Heart, $8,000,852; Christopher Johnson, Principal Investigator.
5. University of Utah - Injection and Scattering of Polarized Spins at Nanoscale Polymer Interfaces, $8000,852; Joel S. Millner, Principal Investigator.

6. University of Utah - Creation of an Enhanced Geothermal System through Hydraulic and Thermal Stimulation, $4,097,297; Peter E. Rose, Principal Investigator.


8. University of Utah - Igert: Cross-Disciplinary Training Program in Mathematical Biology, $2,695,552; James P. Keener, Principal Investigator.


11. University of Utah - Cancors Initiative for Colorectal Cancer, $3,313,516; Joseph V. Simone, Principal Investigator.


13. Utah State University - 01-02-Pell, $10,000,000; Judy Lecheminant, Principal Investigator.

14. Utah State University - TARPS CD – Truman Support, $1,601,875; Niel Holt, Principal Investigator.

15. Utah State University - RAMOS Documentation Task, $1,296,941, Tom Humpherys, Principal Investigator.

16. Utah State University - NAVIS JPEG 2000 Enhancements, $1,499,549; Niel Holt, Principal Investigator.

17. Utah State University - Influence of Stream-Lake Landscapes on Nitrogen Transport and Ecosystems Function in Alpine Watersheds, $1,498,751; Wayne Wurtsbaugh, Principal Investigator.
18. Utah State University - Phosphoinositide Regulation of Protein Secretion, $1067,500; Daryll B. DeWald, Principal Investigator.

C. Executive Session(s) — Approval to hold an executive session or sessions prior to or in connection with the meetings of the State Board of Regents to be held April 20, 2001, at the College of Eastern Utah, to consider property transactions, personnel issues, litigation, and such other matters permitted by the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act.

Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked President Huddleston and his staff for the excellent food and warm hospitality.

Commissioner Foxley called attention to the commencement schedule in the Regents’ folders and asked the Regents to let Joyce know which commencement exercises they would be attending this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Joyce Cottrell CPS
Executive Secretary

Date Approved