

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE UTAH STATE BOARD OF REGENTS
COLLEGE OF EASTERN UTAH
PRICE, UTAH
April 19, 2002

Regents Present

Charles E. Johnson, Chair
Linnea S. Barney
Daryl C. Barrett
Kim R. Burningham
David J. Grant
L. Brent Hoggan
Michael R. Jensen
Nolan E. Karras
E. George Mantes
John B. Norman, Jr.
Jed H. Pitcher
Sara V. Sinclair
Marlon O. Snow
Maria Sweeten

Regents Excused

Pamela J. Atkinson, Vice Chair
James S. Jardine
David J. Jordan

Office of the Commissioner

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner
David Buhler, Associate Commissioner for Public Relations
Joyce Cottrell, Executive Secretary
Chalmers Gail Norris, Associate Commissioner for Student Financial Aid
Norm Tarbox, Associate Commissioner for Finance and Facilities
Gary S. Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Applied Technology Education and Special Projects

INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

University of Utah

J. Bernard Machen, President

Utah State University

Kermit L. Hall, President
Celestial Bybee, Student Body President
Steve Palmer, USA President

Weber State University

Paul H. Thompson, President

Southern Utah University

Steven D. Bennion, President
Matt Glazier, Student Body President
Ryan Richey, Vice President, Utah Student Association

Snow College

Michael T. Benson, President

Dixie State College

Robert C. Huddleston, President

College of Eastern Utah

Ryan L. Thomas, President
Dan Allen, Institutional Advancement & Auxiliaries
Charles Foust, Vice President for Academic Services
Dennis Geary, Director of Facilities, Planning and Management
Gail Glover, Dean of Administrative Services, San Juan Campus
Brad King, Vice President of Student Services
Eric Mantz, Information Technology
Jan C. Minich, English Instructor
Kathleen Robinson, Director of Continuing Education
Darlene Severeid, Coordinator of Academic Advising
Shanny Wilson, Academic Advisor

Utah Valley State College

Kerry D. Romesburg, President
Ron Hammond, Associate Professor/Faculty Senate President

Salt Lake Community College

H. Lynn Cundiff, President

Utah College of Applied Technology

Gregory G. Fitch, President and Associate Commissioner

Representatives of the Media

Jacob Parkinson, *Daily Utah Chronicle*
Kirsten Stewart, *Salt Lake Tribune*
Twila Van Leer, *Deseret News*

Others Present

Race Davies, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Roselyn Davies
Boyd Garriott, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Debbie Headden, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Kevin Walthers, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Following breakfast with the College of Eastern Utah Board of Trustees, Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and welcomed everyone. He excused Vice Chair Atkinson and Regents Jardine and Jordan and welcomed Rep. Brad King. Chair Johnson expressed the Board's condolences to Regent Sweeten on the recent death of her father. He announced that a presentation would be made during the luncheon meeting by Superintendent Steven O. Laing and Regents Burningham and Barney.

Report of the Commissioner

Recognition of Norm Tarbox. Commissioner Foxley said this was Dr. Norm Tarbox's last meeting as Associate Commissioner for Finance and Facilities. An open house will be held in his honor on Friday, May 10, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Board's new Gateway facility (60 South 400 West). The Commissioner invited all the Regents and Presidents to stop by and wish Norm well in his new position as Vice President for Administrative Services at Weber State University.

Institutional Report – College of Eastern Utah Highlights

President Ryan Thomas welcomed everyone to the CEU campus. Brochures of the San Juan Campus in Blanding were distributed. President Thomas asked Vice President Foust to introduce the following presentations: (1) a presentation which was made to the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges, (2) a video presentation on the San Juan Campus, and (3) a reading by Dr. Jan Minich, English Professor at CEU, from his new publication.

Dr. Minich read two letters from his new book, *The Letters of Silver Dollar*. He gave a brief background of the central character, who was an actual historical figure from Leadville, Colorado. Darlene Severeid, Director of Academic Advising and Retention, and Shanny Wilson, Academic Advisor, presented their program for orienting and tracking new students. Their presentation was made in Boston to the League for Innovation. Gail Glover, Dean of Administrative Services at CEU's San Juan Campus, introduced a brief video presentation on the campus in Blanding. Chair Johnson thanked President Thomas and his staff for the presentations. He urged the Regents to visit the San Juan Campus if they had the opportunity.

College of Eastern Utah – Campus Master Plan

Dennis Geary, Director of Facilities, Planning and Management, presented the College's 2002 Master Plan, as well as projections for 2005, 2010 and 2020. He said the 20-year plan had been developed in conjunction with community and institutional representatives. Regent Jensen asked about the UCAT Building on the 2010 plan. Mr. Geary said it is felt that it would be easier to share the Sciences Building after it has been renovated. Commissioner Foxley asked about the timing of sharing the building. President Thomas said timelines on the master plans were approximations. College officials do not want to appear to be dictating to the UCAT administrators where they should be located. CEU and UCAT are presently sharing space, and they will continue to do so. The question of a separate UCAT facility has not been fully developed.

Regent Pitcher moved approval of the CEU Campus Master Plans. The motion was seconded by Regent Jensen and carried unanimously.

Master Planning Overview

Chair Johnson gave a PowerPoint presentation which he broke down into three parts: (1) procedures, (2) policy changes to be considered, and (3) items selected for more in-depth review as the USHE Master Plan 2000 is updated. He urged the Regents and Presidents to ask questions and to indicate whether or not they felt the Board was moving in the right direction.

Procedures. To improve relationships between the Board of Regents and institutional Boards of Trustees, an annual meeting will be held between the Chair of the Board of Regents and the Chairs of Boards of Trustees. A message (via e-mail, where possible) will be sent to the Trustee Chairs after each Board of Regents meeting summarizing issues of interest for Trustees. Weekly legislative updates will be sent to Trustee Chairs throughout the Legislative Session. During Board of Regents meetings, the Regent chair of the institutional Resource and Review Team will meet with the Board of Trustees of the host institution. The Regents' Executive Committee and the Commissioner will establish separate periodic meetings with the Governor and Legislative Leadership.

Program Approvals. Chair Johnson suggested a new procedure for program approvals which would require more review before programs are presented to the Regents for approval. An outside consultant could be engaged to make a recommendation on each program suggested, or a small group of Regents could be assigned for a multi-year period to make an in-depth review of new program requests. Chair Johnson explained that because of declining funds, enrollment growth and existing circumstances, the Regents will have to be more deeply involved in program approvals. An independent review may be requested by a third party before specific programs reach the Board. Regent Sweeten asked when the outside consultant would be retained. Commissioner Foxley said institutions often use outside consultants when programs are being developed. When it appears there will be an impact on existing programs, that is the logical time to bring in an outside consultant. UVSC's engineering program proposals are a good example. Regent Pitcher asked if small groups of Regents could use an outside consultant if they felt it was needed. Chair Johnson said they could, and that the two options could be integrated. President Romesburg suggested that when the small group gets together to discuss UVSC's proposals for engineering programs, that bridges could be built by including a member of the UVSC Board of Trustees. Chair Johnson thanked him for the excellent idea.

Policy Changes

Surcharge on Excess Credit Hours. Chair Johnson's first suggestion for discussion was that a surcharge be imposed when a student takes courses that exceed 135 percent of the credit hours required for his/her course of study – either a bachelor's or master's degree. The surcharge plus applicable tuition would equal the full cost of instruction for the appropriate institution and course level. Chair Johnson said several states are already imposing such a surcharge and they have found the students take less time to graduate and there is more efficiency in the elapsed time of getting students through the system. He pointed out that this would not be a modest surcharge, but would be approximately 3.5 times the resident tuition. Commissioner Foxley pointed out that students change majors on an average of three times over a course of study. We do

not want to penalize those students. Regent Karras asked about a graduated increase beginning prior to the 135 percent threshold.

President Machen said he could understand but did not agree with this rationale. As an educator, he thought this was punitive. President Huddleston said there were many variables which should be considered. We believe in lifelong learning. What about individuals who have degrees and want to go back to school to take additional classes, or those who get laid off and need additional training for employment? Chair Johnson said the 135 percent figure was meant to take into account what the state subsidizes and at what point the state stops subsidizing. Commissioner Foxley pointed out that the Board already has an existing policy of 150 percent. This would tighten and enforce the existing policy. There are very few students in the 150 percent range. She said no one wants to be punitive, but our state has limited resources.

President Bennion said he was concerned about non-traditional students who return and who may have had two or three years of college education. Many times they are women who return to school after they have married and had children or whose life circumstances have changed. President Bennion said he would be worried about those individuals if this policy were approved. President Thomas suggested that it would be far more effective to put money into advisement than to create a system for penalizing individuals. Students will graduate more rapidly in credit hours and calendar time if they are appropriately advised. Our problem is not the "professional student," but the poorly advised or returning student. Increased advisement and increased access to career planning will have greater effect.

Regent Norman asked if there could be a policy in conjunction with this surcharge to allow an individual petition to be filed for exemptions. Regent Sinclair agreed that a pro-active prevention approach would be a better solution. Regent Sweeten said she thought this would be a good way to send a message to the Legislature that the Regents were responding to the situation, and were giving the institutions the ability to enforce the existing policy.

Surcharge on Remedial Courses. Chair Johnson's second suggestion for discussion was that the Regents develop a policy that would place a surcharge on remedial courses at all institutions. The surcharge plus applicable tuition would equal the lower-division full cost of instruction for the applicable institution. The policy should also take into account circumstances under which the surcharge should be waived. Chair Johnson said advisement can help lead to proper decision making for students.

President Thomas expressed his concern from a two-year college perspective, calling this a regressive policy. Those who could most benefit are those who can least afford to pay. Those who perform least well in high school are from within the lowest socioeconomic circumstances. Imposing such a surcharge would hurt those who would be least able to pay, effectively eliminating them from the system. He suggested that remedial instruction be offered at no cost. These courses could include cognitive development, secondary language issues, and individuals who come from poverty and a variety of working circumstances.

Chair Johnson explained that his suggestion was driven by the impact on higher education from secondary education and the question of who should bear the cost of remedial education. Commissioner Foxley reviewed the existing policy. At community colleges and universities with a community college role, students take remedial/developmental courses for regular tuition. If taken at a university without a community college

role, they pay the full cost of instruction. She asked, is this appropriate? Are there reasons to provide an incentive for individuals to better prepare themselves before coming to our institutions? What can we do in our partnerships with public education to ensure that high school graduates are better prepared?

President Huddleston said this was a major part of the community college mission. If the move to take applied technology education (ATE) out of the community colleges is successful, we will have two-year state colleges.

Regent Burningham explained that great changes are taking place in public education which will have a profound effect on this issue. A basic competency test will be put into effect next year. This will help with preparedness.

President Romesburg said by increasing the cost for our remedial/developmental students, we would be denying access. Thousands of students would be turned away from the system or would be doomed to failure in the classroom. An alternative suggestion would be to identify those students who arrive on the campus who test at a below-collegiate level and charge the school district from which they came. He argued strongly against charging the students the full cost of instruction.

Surcharge on Repeat Courses. Chair Johnson's third suggestion was that the Regents develop a policy that would assess a surcharge to any student who repeats an individual course. The surcharge plus applicable tuition would equal the full cost of instruction for the applicable institution. Chair Johnson explained that this was aimed toward students who repeat a course to better their grade, not to pass a course.

President Romesburg gave an example of a student who graduated from UVSC and is now attending Georgetown University. Before serving an LDS mission, he was carrying a 2.1 GPA. When he returned to school, he retook two years of classes and now carries a 3.96 GPA. This issue will be addressed by the individual institutions. President Romesburg said he did not personally like the idea of expunging grades when a class is retaken.

Regent Norman recommended that a student be given more than one chance to repeat a class before s/he is assessed a surcharge.

President Hall asked how frequently this occurs and how much revenue would be generated. He pointed out that if a student is driven out because of cost, an institution receives no revenue at all. Will we raise more money by doing this, and if so, how much, and would it be worth it?

Chair Johnson agreed that the remedial issue should be solved in a relationship with public education. He suggested that more data be provided on the first and third suggestions and that specific proposals be brought to the May 31 Board meeting.

Candidates for In-Depth Study. Chair Johnson said he had reread Master Plan 2000. The Regents' goals are still very valid except for changes in our current circumstances. He suggested the following issues for study in greater depth:

1. Selectively update institutional roles and missions.
2. Enhance student success and ensure that AdviseUtah and UtahMentor are successful.
3. Develop a long-term (5-10 years) financial plan including demographics and projection of state resources.
4. Relook at a funding formula to find a means for obtaining implementation.
5. Study the concept of competency-based degrees and the extent of their broader use in the system.

Chair Johnson said the Regents and Presidents need to choose by the May Board meeting the issues to be studied in greater depth. Associate Commissioner Norris called attention to the students' and families' financial capacity for more need-based assistance. He asked, is there a place to look more deeply at the role of the families' ability to pay and the effect of that on retention, time to graduation, etc.?

The group dismissed to small group discussions at 10:45 a.m. The Board reconvened for a working luncheon at 12:30 p.m.

Luncheon Presentation

Superintendent Steven O. Laing, Regent/SBE Chair Kim Burningham, and Regent Linnea Barney were welcomed and asked to make a presentation on public education's U-PASS program. Regent Burningham made some overview statements regarding the U-PASS program and expressed his appreciation for having Vice Chair Atkinson and Regent Jordan serve as members of the State Board of Education. He then turned to Regent Barney for comments about the State Board of Education's planning process.

Regent Barney said the State Board of Education (SBE) had met to identify their mission and goals. She read the Board's Mission and Vision Statements. Four areas of focus were identified last year. Those areas are: (1) significant increase in basic funding, (2) quality professional teachers/principals in every school, (3) literacy improvements for all students, and (4) accountability. The focus has changed slightly this year to include closing the gap between the students who speak English as a Second Language and native speakers.

U-PASS Program. Superintendent Laing thanked the Regents for the opportunity to share information on public education's U-PASS (Utah Performance Assessment System for Students) Program. He explained that this was an assessment system in process which has taken four or five years to develop. The program has been acknowledged for its excellence. The testing areas stipulated by current legislation are reading, language arts, mathematics, and science. All students will take these tests at the end of this year. The Utah Basic Skills Competency Test (UBSCT) is now taken in the tenth grade. This year was the last year of the pilot program; next year students must pass this test, or they will not graduate. Other tests are taken to assess particular levels; however, the UBSCT is the only test which will directly affect graduation. If students do not pass the test in the tenth grade, they have other opportunities to pass it before they can graduate. Superintendent Laing pointed out that the UBSCT was not a simple test.

Commissioner Foxley asked, if students pass this test, will they be ready for college? Regent Burningham said public education and higher education need to work together to make this correlation. It will

probably take some testing to discover whether or not it will prove college readiness. The SBE feels it is a means of assessing whether or not the students are effectively being educated. Financial resources must be provided to help bring students up to acceptable levels. The test is available by school or by class to the professionals. It will include a degree of teacher evaluation.

Commissioner asked about a "consolation prize." If individuals take and retake the UBSCT without passing the test, what then? Superintendent Laing said certificates of completion would be awarded. He pointed out that they were not the same as diplomas for graduation.

Regent Burningham said varied means of assessment are vital. Core curriculum is very important. Public education's assessment system is now tied to the core curriculum, and teachers will be assessed based on their teaching of the core curriculum. This impacts the teacher-training institutions in higher education and should become an essential part of the preparation process.

Dr. Laing noted that the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) test has been optional and many states' participation rates are questionable. It is not optional in Utah. If Utah school districts are selected, they must administer the test.

Superintendent Laing then turned the discussion to the No Child Left Behind Act which details specific testing and serves as an accountability program. UPASS meets the criteria set by this Act and is one of seven states well prepared to continue without major investment of additional money and effort. Utah is the last state to develop a consolidated plan and to ask school districts to do the same around blocked funds appropriated by the Legislature. This focuses resources on proven educational methods, particularly reading instruction. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is required by the Legislature. If students do not meet this requirement, they are designated as schools needing assistance. Dr. Laing noted concerns about the AYP because the requirement is that in 12 years every child is at the proficient level. Many states use norm-referenced tests as a means of assessment. Superintendent Laing pointed out that highly qualified teachers will impact higher education. Noting that "highly qualified" is left to the discretion of the state, he said teachers will have to know how to teach from standards and how to analyze the results of the test to determine how to meet the needs of all students.

The MGT of America Audit was discussed. The audit commended the state for its hard working staff and the relationship between the staff and the State Board of Education and their usefulness to the school districts. It then went on to make 90 recommendations. The State Board of Education has appointed a subcommittee chaired by Regent Linnea Barney to address the issues raised by the audit. Some of the resources which were recommended for reallocation do not exist any more because staff have been laid off.

In going through Code 53A, 83 reports were identified which were specified or implied. The 2002 Legislative Session eliminated 14, which still leaves 69 reports. Superintendent Laing said the State Board of Education was making an effort to stay on top of these requirements. The first MGT recommendation was that the Board be more clear and definitive in their regulatory role.

Dr. Laing spoke of budget reductions in public education. The school districts were cut \$48.6 million or 2.9 percent from FY01 to FY02. The Utah State Office of Education was cut \$3.1 million, or 7 percent.

Removing the areas over which they have no control, that cut becomes 10½ or 11 percent. Superintendent Laing said his office was struggling with identifying capacity to deliver services to the district. He said he appreciated the opportunity to share this information with the State Board of Regents and offered to respond to questions.

Commissioner Foxley commended Superintendent Laing and Regents Burningham and Barney for the direction the State Board of Education is taking. It should help students become better prepared for college. The institutions with teacher preparation programs will be working in partnership with the State Office of Education to know where our efforts need to be focused. Hopefully the new testing system will mean students will now take their 11th and 12th grades more seriously.

President Romesburg referred to developmental education in the higher education institutions. In many cases students who graduate in June and enter college in August do not demonstrate competency in mathematics. He asked if any correlation was being done between the Basic Skills Test and college entry requirements. If a student is identified below level in the 10th grade, are areas identified to help prepare that student for college readiness? Superintendent Laing said the UPASS was a basic skills test. The SBE is looking at and has expressed a desire to consider the scheduling of courses, particularly math. Many students take these classes in the 9th grade and do not take additional math classes before they enter college. The SBE is also looking at the sequencing of courses and differentiation of diplomas.

President Cundiff asked about competency with regard to technology. Superintendent Laing said the State Board of Education had recently revised the graduation requirements and added the requirement to satisfactorily complete a technology course or demonstrate competency through the passage of a test. They are working with higher education to determine compatibility of these tests. Commissioner Foxley said that a work group had been appointed by her and Superintendent Laing and includes representation from both offices, districts and schools. They have made some very good progress.

President Huddleston said Dixie State College was starting a new elementary education program. They have looked at curriculum, including specialized accreditation. He asked, what can college presidents do in looking at the specialization and making changes? Dr. Laing said the newest standards for the NCATE are much more flexible and accommodating of performance standards in important areas and recognize the importance of content. Public education teachers and employees must model high standards. A new set of standards is being phased in which is much broader and will allow the institutions to demonstrate to the accreditors competency of teachers to work in basic skills, for example.

President Fitch referred to the high school diploma which is to be completed jointly with UCAT and public education. He asked if that was considered in graduation. In regard to the certificate of completion, completion of what? Superintendent Laing said the title "certificate of completion" was encoded in legislation. Certificate of completion is used to mean different things. This could create a problem. However, that is what the law specifies. There is already in place a means of assessing the academic mastery equivalent to a high school diploma, which is the GED. With the advent of UCAT and specification in the Utah Code for a competency-based diploma, students who participate in UCAT could be allowed to demonstrate their academic portion through a GED. Coupling that with the vocational training component and working together with USHE institutions, Dr. Laing said he thought we could meet the qualifications of a diploma.

President Cundiff spoke of faculty salaries and their impact on quality. He asked if this issue was as big for public education as it was for higher education. Superintendent Laing said Utah is ranked near the bottom for average teacher salary. All districts have a salary schedule which starts very low. Maintaining teachers will be a critical issue. A recent national survey looked at retention of teachers. Because of retirements and growth in the number of students, a shortage of teachers is feared. However, this is not the case. Dr. Laing said we are losing teachers in the first five years. We must help them feel successful and better about the teaching environment. Working conditions must be made more attractive and support must be provided so the teachers can grow in their profession.

Regent Burningham said the discussion about teacher salaries illustrates another problem. Utah is 35th in the nation, with the lowest per-student expenditure. The State Board of Education has moved available resources to the teachers; other tools such as professional development are cut and large class sizes are the norm.

President Bennion pointed out that one-third of the Utah population is 18 years of age or under. He asked if demographics show increasing class sizes from high school through the lower grades. Superintendent Laing said the State Office of Education relies on figures from the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. Projections show that in the next ten years Utah schools could have as many as 100,000 new students. This is based on a robust economy. The present economy may not generate as much in-migration. Closer projections are 60,000 to 70,000 new students, but growth will begin in the early grades.

Chair Johnson expressed the Board's appreciation for a closer working relationship between the two boards. He thanked Superintendent Laing for coming to the meeting and thanked him, Regent Burningham and Regent Barney for their presentation.

HB 331, *Nonresident Tuition for Higher Education*

Chair Johnson announced that a special legislative session would be held the third Wednesday in May to address non-resident tuition. A group of representatives from the Governor's Office, Legislative Fiscal Analyst's Office, legislators and higher education leaders have been meeting to discuss this bill. Our primary concern is the financial impact (\$5 million) on higher education and how it will be handled. There may also be other budget shortfalls this year which will impact this issue. Chair Johnson reported the group is getting good reception from those who want to make changes.

Proposed Change to SBR Bylaws

Chair Johnson said the Board Bylaws indicate that a chair shall serve for no more than two consecutive two-year terms. He reminded the Regents that he had been elected four years ago in December. Another provision of the Bylaws states that the chair shall continue to serve until a successor has been elected. He said it makes more sense to have the chair elected in the even-numbered years because it would allow new Regents to serve a year and become familiar with the System before the voting occurs. The proposed change

to the Bylaws will be presented to the Board for approval in May. Chair Johnson said elections would also be held at the May Board meeting as the last item on the agenda.

Reports of Group Discussions

Group 1. Regent Sweeten reported for Regent Karras, who facilitated the discussion and had to leave early. The group was charged to discuss the issue of taking education to the people rather than forcing people to go to education centers, and issues facing delivery systems. Regent Sweeten said the group had agreed that the Regents need to monitor and refine the roles and missions of each of the institutions. They discussed dual enrollment, admissions, and using incentives and other avenues to foster partnerships between the institutions. They want to ensure that conversation is taking place on a regular basis between the institutions. Another area of agreement was the need to watch "academic creep." There is a real need to funnel funds through the Regents so these moves can be made. There was an emphasis on articulation and a need to monitor the partnerships to ensure that the institutions are performing to the original standards. President Hall suggested to the group that the term "distance learning" be replaced with "time-enhanced learning."

The group discussed delivering education in new ways. Regent Sweeten said we would always fight the political battles of institutions and students wanting programs delivered locally. However, the Board must take a stand and determine whether or not new programs would be cost-effective. Chair Johnson agreed that updating institutional missions and roles was one of the Board's top priorities.

Group 2. Regent Jensen facilitated the discussion and reported for the second group, whose assignment was to discuss competency-based education. The general consensus was "we're making it up as we go along." Regent Jensen said he had brought his notes from a previous meeting at Weber State University to ensure that there was a common denominator. It was agreed that "competency-based" does not mean "open-entry, open-exit" courses alone. There is a need for determining common standards. The accreditation issue will loom large with UCAT and the other institutions. Those students who may want to move into a management role in the job market could start at UCAT, then transfer to a community or state college. The UCAT legislation requires the development of a competency-based degree, but no time frame is specified. We need to develop the reasons we are trying to expand competency-based education. The goal should be to meet the needs of the learners.

Competencies are based on industry standards. Open entry/open exit is a method of delivery. There is much confusion over courses vs. programs vs. degrees. We have competency-based courses; what we do not have is a competency-based degree. English and Math, for example, work well in a competency-based format. The challenge is in concurrent enrollment and in developing a competency examination. The group agreed that higher education is not doing a good enough job in evaluating competencies.

The Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) Degree was also discussed. The BAT will be built on an Associate of Applied Technology (AAT) Degree with the general education component coming from other institutions in a competency-based format. Legislation also requires a competency-based high school diploma. There was extensive discussion on the importance of creating incentives rather than surcharges. The group feeling was that articulation issues will work themselves out in the transition from an AAT Degree to an AS or

AA Degree to a BAT Degree. The relationship between competency hours and credit hours is another issue to be considered, but it was felt that this should not be a significant issue in articulation.

Regent Barrett said she liked the idea of incentives rather than surcharges. She asked how the Board would go about presenting these incentives. Regent Jensen replied that the group did not get down to specifics. Regent Barrett asked when the Board would be discussing these issues. Chair Johnson said they would be discussed in the May 31 meeting.

Group 3. Regent Barrett facilitated and reported on the group discussion, which focused on quality vs. resources. All agreed that it is necessary to preserve quality in these difficult economic times. She reported a rich conversation about understanding present performance measures. Other benchmarks which describe a good quality institution are faculty workload, class size (ratio of faculty to students), types of faculty hired and retained (full-time vs. adjunct), and student services performance. The Presidents in the group were blunt in saying those four areas are the first considered in stretching meager resources. Quality seems to be eroding at each of the institutions as a result of budget cuts which have been made due to dwindling state resources. The Regents would like all of the institutions to get their full funding with annual inflationary increases. Presidents should be able to set and keep their second-tier tuition increases and manage those funds for their respective institutions. As new money is available, growth will be funded. Schools are assimilating large numbers of new students without adequate resources. Funding growth would retain quality. The group would like to see direct funding coming through the Regents to instigate more cooperation between institutions in meeting their missions and goals.

The second part of the proposal is that if growth is not funded, revenues must be raised through tax dollars. The group felt strongly that the quality of each institution must have parameters. Regent Hoggan spoke of enrollment caps and said if an institution cannot be funded at a certain level, class size cannot be increased and quality cannot be maintained. The only alternatives are to cap enrollment, increase taxes, or reallocate resources.

Regent Barrett said she liked the performance measures already in place. She recommended that the discussion be continued and taken to the Council of Presidents for fine tuning. The institutions are doing an admirable job; however, quality is being eroded.

Chair Johnson suggested that the Board come up with assignments to Regents, Presidents and perhaps legislators. He asked Regents or Presidents with a preference for the area with which they want to be involved to contact Commissioner Foxley directly.

General Consent Calendar

On motion from Regent Hoggan and second from Regent Pitcher, the following items were approved on the General Consent Calendar, with the minutes of the April 2 meeting being corrected to show the President of Snow College as Michael Benson (rather than Bennion):

1. Minutes

- A. Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Utah State Board of Regents held March 14-15, 2002, at Dixie State College in St. George, Utah (Attachment 1)
 - B. Approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Utah State Board of Regents held via conference call on April 2, 2002 (Attachment 2)
2. Grant Proposals - Approval to submit the following proposals:
- A. Utah State University – U.S. Department of Education; “The Utah Preschool Curriculum Comparison Project;” \$2,282,614. Mark S. Innocenti, Principal Investigator.
 - B. Utah State University – Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice; “Youth and Families with Promise;” \$1,165,633. Thomas R. Lee, Principal Investigator.
 - C. Utah State University – USDA - CSREES Extension SARE (Training) Program; “Implementation of the Western Region Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) Professional Development Program (PDP);” \$1,076,025. V. Philip Rasmussen, Principal Investigator.
 - D. Utah State University – Technical Support Working Group; “Imager Surveillance System for Combatting Terrorism on Critical Infrastructure;” \$2,797,618. R. Duane Hill, Principal Investigator.
 - E. Utah State University – Department of Defense/Missile Defense Agency; “Robust Versatile Boost Phase Interceptor Tracking Optics;” \$1,507,573.00. Carl Howlett, Principal Investigator.
 - F. Utah Valley State College – Department of Commerce; “Telecommunication Services in Rural Areas;” \$700,000.
 - G. Utah Valley State College – National Science Foundation; “Partnerships in Electrical Power: Power Plant Training;” \$540,000.
 - H. Utah Valley State College – Department of Commerce; “Telecommunication Services in Rural Areas;” \$700,000.
 - I. Utah Valley State College – National Science Foundation; “Nanoscale Technology BS Program Development;” \$500,000.
 - J. Utah Valley State College – DOE for Human Genome; “Evaluation of Ethics in HG Research;” \$500,000.
 - K. Utah Valley State College – National Science Foundation; “Biology Field Stations for Capital Reef National Park;” \$1,000,000.

- L. Utah Valley State College – National Science Foundation; “Math and Science Partnership;” \$7,000,000.
- M. National Science Foundation – “Regional Center for People with Disabilities to Promote Involvement in Science, Math, Engineering, and Technology Majors;” \$4,000,000.
- 3. Utah State University – Campus Housing Fire and Life Safety Improvements. Utah State University officials propose to expend \$2.5 million to make fire and life-safety improvements in the University’s campus housing. The upgrades would include the installation of sprinklers, alarms, smoke detectors, enhanced lighting, and electronic locks. No state funding would be involved in this project. A planned lease purchase for the needed equipment would be serviced by University auxiliary funding (Attachment 3)
- 4. 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 May 31, 2002, at Weber State University, to consider property transactions, personnel issues, litigation, and such other matters permitted by the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act

Report of the Commissioner

Commissioner Foxley pointed out the press release about the Weber State University presidential search which was in the Regents’ folders. Regent George Mantes, who chairs the committee, and Commissioner Foxley met the previous day with the WSU Faculty Senate. The full search committee will meet on April 22 to receive their charge from Chair Johnson.

Also in the folders was the updated list of New Programs Under Consideration. The Commissioner recommended that the Regents take a hard look at this growing list in light of recent budget cuts.

Commissioner Foxley referred to the May issue of *US News and World Report*, which contained their annual list of Best Graduate Schools. The Commissioner commended Presidents Machen and Hall for the high ranking of the University of Utah and Utah State University and their programs. She said students look at these rankings in choosing their graduate programs. She will send a fax to the Regents and Presidents with a complete listing of the programs which were ranked from Utah’s two research universities.

Introduction of New Student Body Presidents. Chair Johnson asked each outgoing student body president to introduce his/her successor. He said he was pleased to have the students attend Board meetings and expressed his appreciation for the smooth transition between the outgoing and incoming student leaders.

Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked President Thomas and his staff for their gracious hospitality. The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Joyce Cottrell CPS
Executive Secretary

Date Approved