



AGENDA

MEETING OF THE UTAH STATE BOARD OF REGENTS

April 18, 2003

**Utah State Board of Regents
Office of the Commissioner
of Higher Education
Board of Regents Building, The Gateway
60 South 400 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1284**

AGENDA
MEETINGS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS' STANDING COMMITTEES
BOARD OF REGENTS' OFFICES, THE GATEWAY
5th Floor Board Room
April 18, 2003

8:30 a.m. - ACADEMIC, APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
11:30 a.m.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. State Board of Education Report on Competency-based Education | Tab A |
| 2. Policy R401, <i>Approval of New Programs, Program Additions or Program Changes</i> | Tab B |
| 3. Policy R312, <i>Institutional Categories, Accompanying Criteria, and Institutional Missions and Roles</i> | Tab C |
| 4. Student Success Task Force and Noel-Levitz Report Recommendations | Tab D |
| 5. Report on Nursing | Tab E |
| 6. Other | |

1:00 p.m. - FINANCE, FACILITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE
4:00 p.m.

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Administrative Efficiencies – Consolidation/Clustering of Some Functions | Tab F |
| 2. Progress Report on Health Benefits Study | Tab G |
| 3. Early Retirement | Tab H |
| 4. Financial Controls, Auditing, and Investment Practices – Training | Tab I |
| 5. Refinement of “Report Card” | Tab J |
| 6. USHE – Proposed Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Budget Request Calculation | Tab K |
| 7. Salt Lake Community College – Expansion of Leased Space at Sandy Center | Tab L |
| 8. Utah College of Applied Technology – Land Purchases for Mountainland Applied Technology College | Tab M |
| 9. Other | |

* * * * *

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify ADA Coordinator, 60 South 400 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84180 (801-321-7124), at least three working days prior to the meeting. TDD # 801-321-7130.

April 9, 2003

To: State Board of Regents

From: Cecelia H. Foxley

Subject: State Board of Education Report on Competency-based Education

Issue

Utah State Board of Education Chair and member of the State Board of Regents Kim R. Burningham and State Superintendent of Public Instruction Steven O. Laing will report to the Regents' Academic, Applied Technology and Student Success Committee the plans which the State Board of Education (SBE) has for improving the academic preparation of high school graduates and for implementing a competency-based diploma.

Background

During the past year, the SBE and Superintendent Laing have discussed ways in which public education can enhance the learning and academic preparation of students. An ad hoc committee of the SBE was established to explore the ramifications of increasing core graduation requirements and of switching to competency-based requirements for high school graduation. The ad hoc committee's report (see attachment) was discussed and approved at the April 4 meeting of the State Board of Education.

Other vocal proponents of competency-based education are Governor Leavitt, who stressed it in his State of the State Address, and the Employers' Education Coalition, chaired by Fraser Bullock. Many ideas of the Coalition's report were incorporated into S.B. 154, Public Education Amendments, sponsored by Senator Thomas Hatch. The bill also calls for higher education to prepare to admit students with a competency-based high school diploma, and for a statewide summit to be held on the topic of competency-based education in the fall of 2003.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Regents hear the report of SBE Chair and Regent Kim Burningham regarding increased high school graduation requirements and competency-based education and discuss the implications these changes will have for higher education. It is further recommended that the Board Chair request the Academic, Applied Technology, and Student Success Committee to keep this item on its Committee agenda for appropriate follow-up.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

Attachment

DRAFT

Utah State Board of Education
Ad Hoc Committee on Graduation Requirements
April 2003

Utah State Board of Education Proposal for Public Comment

Background

For years the Utah State Board of Education has been concerned about the rigor of high school graduation requirements. The Board's desire for all students to be better prepared resulted in the adoption of a November 1 Board motion for "increasing student competency."

Subsequently, the 2003 Utah State Legislature passed SB 154 complementing the Board's intent, and directing the Board and State Superintendent of Public Instruction to: focus on core academics, increase graduation requirements, assure high school seniors are progressing in challenging courses; and implement competency standards for progress and graduation.

As a result of the Board's November motion, an ad hoc committee of Board members was created. Following is the resulting proposal. (Many of the legislative directives of SB154 are also addressed.)

The proposal will:

- a. "Raise the bar" so that all students will graduate with core curriculum competency
- b. Focus on core academics and maintain a balanced curriculum

Proposal

A. **To graduate, students will complete competency AND experience requirements.**

Diplomas will be awarded to students accumulating 18 graduation units by demonstrating exit competencies and showing successful experience in additional curriculum areas.

B. **Students will demonstrate exit competencies.**

Graduates must demonstrate exit competencies during their last two years of high school. These competencies will be equivalent to:

Geometry or Applied Math II, or higher
Language Arts–Eleventh Grade
United States Government and Citizenship
Biology, Chemistry, Physics, or other advanced science course

The math and any one of the other subjects listed above must be successfully completed and/or demonstrated during the last year of high school; the other two within the last two years of high school. Successful completion/demonstration of the exit competencies equals 3.5 graduation units out of the 18 required for a high school diploma.

DRAFT

C. Students will show successful experiences to prepare for exit competencies.

In addition to the graduation units for exit proficiencies, students will be required to earn another 14.5 units within specified curriculum areas. These experiences will demonstrate preparation sufficient to attempt the exit competencies and also offer experiences necessary for the well-rounded student. The 14.5 units of general education and preparatory competencies will consist of:

Language Arts (2)	Health (1)
Math (1)	Physical Fitness (1)
Science (1)	Education Technology (.5)
Social Studies (2)	Applied Technology Education (1)
Fine Arts (1.5)	General Financial Literacy (.5)
Electives (3) in an area of focus selected by the student and parent/guardian.	

Existing graduation requirements specify 15.0 units of credit in various subjects and a minimum of 9.0 units of electives. The 9.0 units of electives are unspecified. The new requirement of 18 graduation units represents an increase of 3.0 units over the existing, specified graduation requirements, as well as an increase in the proficiency required.

(Note: Institutions of higher education may have additional entrance requirements. Students and their parents or guardians are responsible for becoming aware of, and meeting those entrance requirements.)

D. Students may demonstrate competency in different ways.

Successful demonstration shall be through one of the following:

1. Earning a grade of C or better in the class and passing (scoring “sufficient” or better) the appropriate criterion referenced, end-of-level test (CRT) within the Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) (where available)
2. Earning a grade of A in the class and taking the CRT (where available)
3. Providing evidence of preparation in the subject area and passing the CRT within U-PASS (where available) at the “substantial” level
4. Where end-of-level CRTs do not exist, successfully passing a class of the appropriate content with a grade of C or better, or demonstrating competency in the subject area according to requirements established by the USOE.

E. Districts and charter schools will maintain autonomy within requirements.

Because local autonomy is precious and reflected in local schedules and graduation requirements, districts and charter schools may exceed the 18 graduation units specified, according to the following conditions.

1. The basic high school opportunity must be, minimally, a six period (preferably of 55 minutes each) day per year.
2. Districts and charter schools may have schedules resulting in greater numbers of credits, providing that one third of the additional credits are specified in district graduation requirements for either English/language arts, mathematics, or science.

DRAFT

This provision provides balance, allowing districts to increase student opportunity through various schedules, but maintains emphasis on basics by requiring one third of those additional units dedicated to English, math, or science.

F. **Student Education Occupation Plan (SEOP) is fundamental.**

The SEOP shall be the vehicle through which a student, his or her parent or guardian, and the school representative verify the student is garnering the necessary competencies. By this means, the “area of focus” electives should be selected and the student’s educational experience customized. Areas of focus could be academic preparation for college, applied technology programs and preparation for employment, or emphasis in music, art, or other areas of personal student interest.

The individualized education plan (IEP) will remain the means by which the education program for special education students is determined.

G. **Proposals for funding pilot programs may be submitted.**

Proposals will be accepted from school districts and charter schools to pilot a new weighted pupil unit funding based on competency as well as class time. Proposals will be considered and funded as allocations permit.

H. **Elementary and middle level education must adequately prepare students.**

In order to prepare students for the high school experience, districts and charter schools should review curricula in the elementary and middle levels and consider incentives, instructional alternatives, and consequences for students if successful completion of the required standards and objectives are not achieved.

I. **Interventions for students will require significant additional funding.**

Additional funding is essential for successful implementation of this proposal. When learning becomes the constant (as opposed to seat time), additional funds must be available to address the different learning needs of individual students. Resources must be provided for counseling and critical interventions (e.g. tutoring, remedial classes, after school programs, summer school, or other supplemental services) without which students not achieving essential levels of proficiency will never be able to do so.

Time Line for Further Action

January 10	Concept distributed to all members of the Education Coalition, the Governor’s Office, and the education committees of the Utah State Legislature requesting comment and input. (COMPLETED)
Mid March	Ad Hoc Committee meets to refine proposal if necessary. (COMPLETED)
April 4	Ad Hoc Committee presents refined proposal to the Utah State Board of

DRAFT

130		Education for approval to solicit public comment. (COMPLETED)
131		
132	May – July	Public comment meetings held in areas of state; hosted by Board Members
133		
134	August/ September	Ad Hoc Committee meets to consider input received through public
135		comments and refine proposal as necessary.
136		
137	Fall, 2003	Governor’s Competency Summit
138		
139		Final action to approve new graduation requirements by Utah State Board
140		of Education, including adoption of time line for implementation.

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2002

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Relationship of Policy R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Additions or Program Changes; "Exceptions to the Moratorium on New Programs"; and "Guiding Principles for Program Discontinuation and Personnel Reductions"

Issue

Policy R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Additions or Program Changes, should contain all the information pertinent to the approval of new programs and the process for discontinuing programs.

Background

Policy R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Additions or Program Changes, was approved by the Board of Regents on November 8, 2002. Since that time an additional document dealing with programs has been written. Due to the imposed moratorium on new program approvals "Exceptions to the Moratorium on New Programs" was developed by the Program Review Committee. This document provides institutions with information regarding criteria for program approvals that would be considered during the moratorium. These criteria have application regarding the evaluation of program proposals even without a moratorium in place. Because of the rigor demanded by the criteria, section 9.1.6. "Rank Order of Program within the Proposing Institution" was amended to include only "...a clearly defined relationship to a high institutional priority." A fourth category concerning "transfer, restructuring, or consolidation of existing programs" is included within this document. An appendix identifying the "Exceptions to the Moratorium on New Programs" has been added even though language throughout Policy R401 has been strengthened to include the concept in each exception.

In addition “Guidelines for Program Discontinuation and Personnel Reductions” has been developed in conjunction with the Legislative Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee and the Regent’s committee reviewing program discontinuation, chaired by Regent Pamela Atkinson. This document identifies eight criteria to be used when considering program discontinuation. The additional information for identifying programs for discontinuation and the treatment of students currently admitted to such programs has been merged into section 4.2.2 in Policy R401.

New language that precluded students from eligibility for financial aid was corrected in the “Fast Track Program” section of Policy R401. These programs approved by the Commissioner and with the Regents’ consent will enable students to seek financial aid. However, additional language now requires a two-year review of programs approved through the fast track process.

Commissioner’s Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Board approve Regents’ Policy R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Additions or Program Changes with the inclusion of “Exceptions to the Moratorium on New Programs” and “Guidelines for Program Discontinuation and Personnel Reductions.”

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/DDW
Attachment

R401, Approval of New Programs, ~~Additions, or~~ Program Changes, and Discontinued Programs**R401-1. Purpose**

To provide guidelines and procedures for Board approval and notification of new programs and programmatic and administrative changes in academic and applied technology education programs. In addition, this policy includes notification of discontinued programs and other program-related items that institutions shall provide to the Office of the Commissioner.

R401-2. References

- 2.1. Utah Code [§53B-16-102](#) (Changes in Curriculum)
- 2.2. Policy and Procedures [R220](#) , Delegation of Responsibilities to the President and Board of Trustees
- 2.3. Policy and Procedures [R315](#) , Service Area Designations and Coordination of Off-Campus Courses and Programs
- 2.4. Policy and Procedures [R355](#) , Planning, Funding, and Delivery of Courses and Programs via Statewide Telecommunications Networks
- 2.5. Policy and Procedures [R411](#) , Review of Existing Programs
- 2.6. Utah Code [§53B-16-102](#) (Continuing Education and Community Service R430)
- 2.7. Policy and Procedures [R465](#) , General Education
- 2.8. Policy and Procedures [R467](#) , Lower Division Major Requirements

R401-3. Summary of Process. Institutions submitting program proposals for the Action Calendar shall adhere to the following process:

- 3.1. Letter of Intent
- 3.2. Staff and Chief Academic Officers Review
- 3.3. Submission to Program Review Committee
- 3.4. Preparation of the Full Proposal
- 3.5. Timetable for Submission
- 3.6. Council of Chief Academic Officers

3.7. Board of Regents Consideration

3.8. Budgetary Consideration Separate from Approval

R401-4. Programs Requiring Board Consideration. Programs inclusive of those in **R401-4** will have undergone institutional review and been approved by the institutional Board of Trustees prior to submission to the Office of the Commissioner. A definition follows each item.

4.1. Action Calendar. Programs placed on the Action Calendar require Board approval upon recommendation of the Academic, ~~and~~ Applied Technology ~~Education and Student Success~~ Committee (See **R401-9.1** for **Template for Letter of Intent**). The following programs, including incubated programs in any of the following categories, require action by the Board:

4.1.1. New Certificates of Completion and Diplomas. A coherent sequence of courses 30 credit hours or 900 clock hours or greater, with general education requirements, ~~or at least 600 clock hours and eligible for financial aid.~~ These certificates are designed for entry-level employment or subsequent completion of an associate degree. For certificates developed in rapid response to business and industry, refer to **Fast-Track, R401-7.**

4.1.2. New Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degrees. Programs of study primarily intended to encourage exploration of academic options, provide a strong general education component, and prepare students to initiate upper-division work in baccalaureate programs or prepare for employment. A minimum of 60 and a maximum of 63 credit hours, which include 30 to 39 credit hours of general education course work, and other requirements as established by USHE institutions, are required for completion of an associate degree. The Associate of Arts Degree may have a foreign language requirement. Based on compelling reasons, exceptions to the maximum credit hour requirement may be granted by the Board.

4.1.3. New Specialized Associate - Associate of Pre-Engineering (APE Degree). Programs of study which include extensive specialized course work intended to prepare students to initiate upper-division work in baccalaureate programs. A minimum of 60 and a maximum of 63 credit hours, which include a minimum of 28 credit hours of preparatory, specialized course work, general education requirements that are less extensive than in AA or AS Degrees, and other requirements as established by USHE institutions, are necessary for completion of the degree. Because students do not fully complete an institution's general education requirements while completing a specialized associate degree, they are expected to satisfy remaining general education requirements in addition to upper-division baccalaureate requirements at the receiving institution.

4.1.4. New Associate of Applied Science Degrees. Programs of study intended to prepare students for entry-level careers. A minimum of 63 and a maximum of 69 credit hours are required. Additionally, general education requirements that are less extensive than in AA or AS Degrees and others, as established by USHE institutions, are required. Based on compelling reasons, exceptions to the maximum credit hour requirement may be granted by the Board.

4.1.5. New Associate of Applied Technology (AAT) Degrees. Programs of study intended to prepare students for entry-level careers. The AAT Degree is competency-based and offered on an open-entry/open-exit basis. A mastery of a series of identified competencies, general education course work that is less extensive than in AA and AS Degrees, and other requirements as established by the Utah College of Applied Technology, regional boards, and program advisory committees, are necessary for completion of the degree. The average time to completion of the AAT Degree should fall within a range of 1890 to 2070 clock hours; however, open-entry/open-exit, competency-based instructional delivery allows students to complete their course of study at their own pace. Like the AAS Degree, the AAT Degree is designed to prepare students for direct entry into the workforce; however, the AAT Degree may also transfer directly into Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) Degree programs.

4.1.6. New Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science and Professional Bachelor Degrees. Programs of study including general education, major course work, and other requirements as established by USHE institutions and accreditation standards. Credit requirements include completion of a minimum of 120 and a maximum of 126 credit hours. However, some professional Bachelor Degrees, such as the Bachelor of Business Administration or Bachelor of Fine Arts, may have additional requirements. Other disciplines such as engineering and architecture may exceed the minimum of 120 credit hours in order to meet accreditation requirements. Based on compelling reasons, exceptions to the maximum credit hour requirement may be granted by the Board.

4.1.6.1. Major. A sequenced set of courses within a Bachelor's Degree program that comprises study in an academic discipline. The Major is listed on the graduate credential and signifies that the recipient possesses the knowledge and skills expected of graduates in the discipline. (**Minor** courses/programs within approved degree programs will be reviewed only by institutional Boards of Trustees and submitted to the Commissioner's Office.)

4.1.7. New Master's Degrees. Graduate-level programs of study requiring a minimum of 30 and maximum of 36 credit hours of course work beyond the bachelor's degree, and other requirements as established by USHE institutions and accreditation standards. Professional master's degrees such as the Master of Business Administration or Master's of Social Work may require additional course work or projects. Specialized professional master's degrees typically

require additional course work. Based on compelling reasons, exceptions to the maximum credit hour requirement may be granted by the Board.

4.1.8. New Doctoral Degrees. Graduate-level programs in an advanced, specialized field of study requiring competence in independent research and an understanding of related subjects.

4.1.9. New K-12 School Personnel Programs. Endorsement and licensure programs for teacher education, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel and which are within existing major degree programs previously approved by the institutional Board of Trustees and the Board. These programs adhere to a parallel approval process which requires the following steps: review by the Office of Academic Affairs, the Chief Academic Officers, appropriate officials and faculty from USHE colleges and schools of education, and the Program Review Committee (PRC); review and approval by the Board; review and approval by the Educator Development Advisory Committee (EDAC); and review and approval by the State Board of Education. Institutionally-approved proposals may be submitted to the EDAC once they have been reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs, CAOs, colleges and schools of education faculty and officials, and the Program Review Committee. However, approval by the EDAC is contingent upon approval by the full Board of Regents and the State Board of Education.

4.2. Consent Calendar. Board Consent, which follows approval of the Academic, and Applied Technology Education and Student Success Committee, is required for significant program and administrative changes. (See **R401-9.3** for Template for program submission). The following items require consent of the Board:

4.2.1. Reinstatement of Previously Eliminated Administrative Units and Instructional Programs.

4.2.2. Discontinuation of Instructional Programs. The following criteria should be used to guide the review of programs for discontinuation and attendant reductions in personnel or funding prioritization.

4.2.2.1. Maintain Consistency with Institutional Mission and Roles. Review necessity of program continuation for the centrality or essence of the institution's role and mission.

4.2.2.2 Demand. Assess student demand as well as workforce and employer needs. Use program reviews to assess ongoing relevance and avoid continuing programs that may be antiquated. Identify placement and success of students in the work force.

4.2.2.3. Duplication. Consider unnecessary duplication of programs within the

System, particularly programs that may be high cost and/or low producing.

4.2.2.3.1 System Coordination. Consider the statewide impact of discontinuing the program, and identify opportunities for establishing the program at another USHE institution.

4.2.2.4 Program Costs. Examine relative costs and anticipated savings from program reduction or deletion, and the comparative advantage of reallocating resources to other priorities in order to maintain student access as much as possible. Public service, institutional support, academic support and other operating areas should absorb a share of the burden.

4.2.2.4.1. Factors Affecting Short-term Cost Savings. The discontinuation of a program at a USHE institution does not produce an immediate financial savings nor reduction in personnel. It is the cost saving in the long term, which is beneficial to an institution. For example, faculty teaching in the program are not terminated immediately, but based on their hiring status (tenured or non-tenured) must be given the appropriate length of notification and they also must work with students to help them complete the program. Facilities still require maintenance and are generally absorbed by other programs resulting in no reduction in costs to the institution. And student FTE will be decreased as programs are discontinued.

4.2.2.5. Program Quality. Assess quality of the program as measured by the success of its graduates, reputation of faculty, and employer/community acceptance.

4.2.2.6. Enrollment Management and Institutional Capacity. Consider institutional enrollment management policy, limited access at the institution, upper division access, or caps within given majors.

4.2.2.7. Economic Stimulus and Recovery. Protect programs vital to economic stimulus and recovery.

4.2.2.8. Long-term Impact. Examine potential long-term impact of program discontinuations.

4.2.2.9 Role of Decision Makers. Through the process of determining which programs should be considered for possible discontinuation it is intended that the decisions should be made at the local campus in consultation with the Commissioner's Office regarding unnecessary duplication of programs. Those closest to the situation can best understand the multitude of ramifications involved in such a critical decision.

4.2.2.10. Treatment of Students. Students currently admitted to the program will be given a way to complete the program. This may require the enrollment of

students at other institutions of higher education or that courses be taught for a maximum of two years after discontinuation of the program. All students must be given the opportunity to complete their program within a reasonable amount of time.

4.2.2.3. Out of Service Area Delivery of Approved Programs. Programs which require substantive change notification to the regional accreditation organization and are offered outside of the institution's designated service area.

4.2.3.4. Permanent Approval of Centers, Institutes, or Bureaus.

Administrative entities which perform primarily research, instructional, or technology transfer functions, and are intended to provide services to students, the community, businesses, or other external audiences, or to obtain external funds.

4.2.3.4.1. Temporary Approval and Temporary Sources of Funding.

Requests to establish centers, institutes, bureaus, or other administrative entities which perform a primarily research, instructional, or technology transfer function, and are intended to provide external services and/or obtain external funds.

4.2.3.4.2. Modest Effort/Consistent with Roles/Affiliation/Three Year Limit.

Institutions may seek temporary approval from the Commissioner for a center, institute, or bureau which is being established on an experimental or pilot basis. The Commissioner will evaluate and approve requests for temporary approval on the basis of the following criteria and conditions:

4.2.3.4.3. Temporary Source of Funds. Funding support is from temporary, non-public resources or from temporary institutional reallocation within a limited time frame.

4.2.3.4.4. Relatively Modest Effort. The proposed change requires a modest effort in terms of staff and space needs, normally with no permanent staff or no permanent facility assignment

4.2.3.4.5. Consistent with Role. The activities involved are consistent with established institutional mission and role assignments.

4.2.3.4.6. Affiliation with Existing Program or Department. The administrative entity involved has programmatic affiliation with an existing academic program or department.

4.2.3.4.7. Three-year Limit. Temporary approval of centers, institutes, etc., may be granted for a period no longer than three years, after which an institution must request approval of the Board.

4.2.4.5. Certificates of Completion in which Instruction is Provided by an Outside Vendor and Requires Accreditation Review. The institution offers Certificates of Completion, credit or non-credit, for instruction provided by an organization outside of the USHE.

4.2.4.6. Non-credit Certificates Eligible for Financial Aid. Non-credit certificates that do not fit the definition in 4.1.1 but that are eligible for financial aid.

4.3. Information Calendar. Program Additions or Changes Requiring Notification on the Boards' Information Calendar. Board notification is required for changes to programs and administrative units, elimination of programs, institutional program reviews, and programs under development. (See Template, R401-9.4.1.).

4.3.1. Transfer, Restructuring, or Consolidation of Existing Programs or Administrative Units.

4.3.2. Discontinuation of Instructional Programs.

4.3.3.2. Name Changes of Existing Programs.

4.3.4.3. Institutional Program Review Report.

4.3.5.4. Programs under Development.

4.3.6.5. Stand-alone Minors. A coherent collection of courses, related to one another, that is not part of a previously approved Major or degree program. (Submission: as they are approved or eliminated by institutional Board of Trustees.)

4.3.7.6. Interdisciplinary Minors. A coherent collection of courses, related to one another, from previously approved Majors or programs.

R401-5. Information to be Provided to the Office of the Commissioner. The USHE institutions shall submit to the Commissioner's Office the following items:

5.1. An annual list of scheduled program reviews, as defined in R411 including date of review. (Submission: September)

5.2. An annual list of credit and non-credit certificates not meeting the definition as defined in R401-4.1.1. (Submission: December)

5.3. A list of new Minors that are part of a degree or Major program, as they are approved by institutional boards of trustees. (Submission: as they are approved)

R401-6. Procedure for Submitting New Program or Program Changes for Board Approval**6.1. New Program and Program Changes as specified in the Action**

Calendar, R401-4.1. The process for the approval of new programs includes the submission of a Letter of Intent and the subsequent submission of a formal proposal to the Board of Regents. To help insure quality, institutions may wish to enlist the assistance of external consultants in developing the proposed program. Typically, applied technology education programs relate directly to the requirements of business and industry. Thus, programs submitted in this area should have the benefit of consultation from a program advisory committee regarding: (1) curriculum, including specific outcome-based competencies; (2) desired level of faculty qualifications; and (3) equipment and laboratory requirements.

6.1.1. Letter of Intent. Institutional Chief Academic Officers will submit a Letter of Intent electronically for each new program proposal to initiate the Regents' program approval process. The template provided in **R401- 9.1** will be used for the Letter of Intent. (Fast-Track programs refer to **R401-7.**)

6.1.2. Staff and Chief Academic Officers (CAO) Review. USHE staff will review the Letter of Intent to assure that it is complete. Incomplete letters will be returned to the institution with suggestions. When Letters are determined to be complete, the Office of the Commissioner will advise the submitting institution to forward the Letter to the CAOs at all USHE institutions for review and comment. Within two weeks, the CAOs will identify issues related to the information provided in the Letter of Intent, including those that impact their institutions and/or programs, program quality, and other issues the CAOs believe to be pertinent. These comments will be sent electronically to the Commissioner's Office and to all USHE institutions.

If no concerns are raised by Commissioner's staff or any institution, the Commissioner's staff will recommend to the Program Review Committee (PRC) (see **R401-6.1.3.**) that the program proposal is ready to be placed on the next Regents' agenda. The PRC may either accept or reject the staff's recommendation based upon its review. If the PRC accepts the recommendation, the proposing institution will prepare a full proposal in a timely manner so that it may be included on the subsequent Regents' agenda.

6.1.3. Submission to Program Review Committee (PRC). Once the proposing institution addresses issues raised by the CAOs, the revised Letter of Intent and institutional issues that have and have not been resolved will be forwarded for review by the Program Review Committee (PRC). The role of the PRC is to assess the proposal based upon six elements (description, market/student demand, source of funding, mission fit, current availability of similar programs already offered in the USHE, and institutional ranking according to the priorities

of the submitting institution. Confidential information may be submitted to the Commissioner under seal. (See **Letter of Intent Template R401-9.**) The PRC will review the Letter of Intent and accompanying information, raise questions, and request additional information as appropriate, including a request for a consultant to review the proposed program and surrounding issues. In this case, the proposing institution will provide to the Commissioner's staff a list of appropriate consultants. The staff will contact one of the consultants and arrange for the review. Once the consultant's report has been completed, it will be made available to the PRC, proposing institution, and the CAOs. As programs are reviewed, additional individuals, such as institutional representative(s) appointed by the CAO, and Commissioner's staff, may meet with the PRC. A member from the institution's Board of Trustees also may be included.

6.1.4. Preparation of the Full Proposal. After the review process has been successfully completed, the proposing institution will develop a full proposal. The full proposal will follow the template in **R401-9.2.** and address issues raised by the CAOs and [Reviewers PRC](#).

6.2. Timetable for Submittal. Following the Letter of Intent review process, proposals will be submitted to the Commissioner's Office of Academic Affairs electronically, according to the annual schedule prepared by the Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs, approximately two months before the date of the Regents' meeting when the proposal would be on the Regents' agenda for the first time. At the same time, the proposing institution's CAO will circulate the proposal to all USHE CAOs for review and evaluation. Once a proposal is evaluated by appropriate faculty at the other USHE institutions, comments and suggestions will be sent electronically to the Commissioner's Office and all CAOs at least one week prior to the CAO meeting where all proposals are discussed. The proposing institution will be responsible for addressing these concerns and any others in written communication electronically sent to the Commissioner's staff and all CAOs. If deemed necessary, the Office of Academic Affairs may request reviews from external evaluators.

6.3. Council of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs). The Council of Chief Academic Officers will meet prior to the Council of Presidents' and Regents' meetings. This meeting is for the purpose of discussing institutional proposals on the basis of comments submitted by other USHE institutions, any external reviews that have been conducted, initial evaluation from the Office of Academic Affairs, and comments from the PRC. This discussion will be reported to the Council of Presidents and considered by the Commissioner's staff in preparing materials and recommendations for the Board's agenda. The Commissioner's review for the Board will address not only the readiness of the institution to offer the program and the need for the program, but also the impact of the program on other USHE institutions.

6.4. Board of Regents Consideration. Program proposals that have been reviewed according to the procedures described in **R401-6.** are placed on the Board agenda for consideration by the Regents. The Board's Academic, ~~and Applied Technology~~ Education and Student Success Committee reviews proposals for new programs or program changes and recommends action to the Board. The Board then takes action on the proposed program during the meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

6.4.1. Two-year Review of New, Approved Programs. Institutions with approved programs will be responsible for submitting a two-year report to the Commissioner's Office based upon quality indicators determined by the proposing institution and the Board.

6.5. Votes for Approval. All new certificates of completion, diplomas, associate, and bachelor degree programs must be approved by a majority vote of the Board members in attendance. All new master's and doctoral degree programs require at least a two-thirds majority of the members in attendance to be approved.

6.6. Budgetary Considerations Separate from Approval. Program approval by the Board consists only of authorization to offer a program. Budget requests necessary to fund the program shall be submitted separately through the regular budget process.

R401-7. Fast-Track Programs.

7.1. Fast-track Approval of Applied Technology Education Certificates of Completion and Diplomas. Credit or non-credit applied technology training programs, leading to certificates of completion, that meet the criteria in **R401-4.1.1** may be approved according to the fast-track approval procedure outlined in **R401-7.2.** The procedure is designed to accommodate the need for rapid action by institutions in providing opportunities for students to be trained to meet changing job requirements of business and industry.

7.2. Fast-Track Program Approval Procedure. If programs meet the requirements in **R401-4.1.1.** and the Commissioner has previously approved the institution's internal program development and approval process, the Commissioner may ~~preliminarily~~ approve the program ~~for two program cycles~~, effective immediately. To request ~~preliminary~~ approval, the proposing institution will submit a Letter of Intent to the Commissioner's Academic Affairs Staff. The Commissioner will respond within 15 working days and will place the program on the Consent Calendar of the next Board meeting. ~~For the program to continue beyond the two cycles, it must undergo full Board review. If the program is to continue, the full program proposal must be placed on the Action Calendar of the Academic and Applied Technology Education Committee for final action by the Board.~~ Fast-Track programs donot require institutional ranking.

7.2.1. Two Year Review of Programs Approved through the Fast-Track Procedure. Institutions operating programs approved through the fast-track process must submit a report to the Commissioner's Office two years from the date that the program is implemented, outlining the continued viability of the program in terms of enrollment, student outcomes, budget and regional business and industry need.

R401-8. Programs Under Development/Consideration

8.1. Advance Information. Each institution shall submit to the Commissioner's Office of Academic Affairs an updated matrix of programs under development or consideration that may be brought to the Board for formal approval during the next thirty-six months. A compilation of this information will be included on the Information Calendar of each Board of Regents meeting. These planning documents will provide Regents with a continuously updated, system-wide view of the programs that may be brought to them for approval.

8.1.1. Two Time Periods. The information is presented in matrix format and includes two time periods: The first matrix provides information for a twelve-month period beginning with the month of the current Board agenda. The second matrix provides information for a subsequent 24-month period.

8.1.2. Information Updates. The information in each matrix is to be updated whenever the status of a program changes or a new program is being considered. This provides the Board ongoing information, for a thirty-six month period, regarding the status of programs as they progress through the institutional review process. Updated matrices should be submitted to the Commissioner's Office of Academic Affairs on the submission schedule for each Board of Regents agenda. Once a program has been approved by the Board, or is no longer under consideration at an institution, it should no longer appear in the matrix.

8.2. Matrix. In accordance with the existing program review schedule set by the Commissioner's Office, institutions will provide updated information to the Academic Affairs Office for programs under development or consideration. Changes to the matrix can be submitted electronically. The matrix will appear in the Information Calendar on each Board agenda.

R401-9. Template for Submitting Program Proposals. The templates request information and provide the format to be used when submitting program proposals for review and Board action. (Please use Ariel Narrow 12 point font.)

9.1. Template for Submission of Letter of Intent

9.1.1. Program Description. Present a short description of the program. Include information on current faculty preparedness to deliver a quality program.

9.1.2. Market and Student Demand. Provide specific data on market and student demand for the program, including how the program will function if market demand changes. including how the program will function if market demand changes. Include information regarding placement opportunities both in and out of state. Indicate student demand for the program. If there is evidence of urgent need in the business and industry communities, provide appropriate details.

9.1.3. Budget. Provide specific budget information, including the source of funding, and specify if enrollment growth funding is to be used. If internal reallocation is to be made, state which programs will need to be adjusted in order to support the proposed program-, and the anticipated amount of funding from such a reallocation. Incorporate information regarding any new funding that is immediately available to this program.

Confidential information may be sent to the Commissioner under seal-

9.1.4. Institutional Mission. Describe how the proposed program fits within the institutional mission- as defined by Policy R-312.

9.1.5. Similar Programs Already Offered in the USHE. Identify similar programs already approved and functioning in USHE institutions and justify why the proposed program is needed in light of existing programs. Include need and Utah employment data. Identify any articulation or collaboration with other USHE institutions.

9.1.6. Rank Order of Program within the Proposing Institution. The proposing institution will determine the rank order of the program submitted by institutional priority. A ranking of one (1) means that the program submission is a top priority. At the beginning of the academic year, each institution will be allotted two programs that reflect its top priority, three programs that might be ranked number two (2), and three programs that might be ranked number three (3). The rankings are made in accordance with program planning conducted by the institution and will be reported to the PRC. Institutions are not precluded from proposing a program that is not ranked number one (1). Justification for proposing the program should accompany the ranking. In unusual and compelling circumstances, an institution may request the PRC to reconsider the original ranking identified by the institution. The ranking system assists the Regents and institutions in making choices regarding which programs to bring forward and the timing of the Board review. (Program submissions from the University of Utah's Health Sciences may be ranked separately.) There should be a clearly defined relationship to a high institutional priority.

9.1.7. Signature Page to Accompany Letter of Intent. The Letter of Intent will include the signatures of the Chief Academic Officer and the appropriate dean and department chair.

9.2. Template for Submission of Proposals for New Programs Following the Successful Review of the Commissioner's Staff, PRC, and CAOs. This template provides the formats and information to be used when submitting program proposals for review and Board action and approval. Please use Ariel Narrow 12 point font.

9.2.1. Template for submission of proposals for new Certificates of Completion and Diplomas, AA/AS Degrees, AAS Degrees, AAT Degrees, specialized associate degrees, Bachelor's Degrees, Master's Degrees, Doctoral Degrees, K-12 School Personnel Programs.

SECTION I The Request

[Name of Institution] requests approval to offer **[Name of Degree]** effective **[Semester and Year]**. This program has been approved by the institutional Board of Trustees on **[Date]**.

SECTION II Program Description

[Complete Program Description] - Present the complete, formal program description.]

[Purpose of Degree] - State why are you offering this degree, what are the expected outcomes.]

[Admission Requirements] - List admission requirements specific to the proposed program.]

[Student Advisement] - Describe the advising process for students in the proposed program.]

[Justification for Number of Credits] - Provide justification if number of credit or clock hours exceeds 63 for AA or AS, 69 for AAS, 2070 clock hours for AAT, 126 credit hours for BA or BS; and 36 beyond the baccalaureate for MS.]

[External Review and Accreditation] - Indicate whether any external consultants were involved in the development of the proposed program, and describe the nature of that involvement. For an applied technology education program, list the members and describe the activities of the program advisory committee. Indicate any special professional accreditation which will be sought and how that accreditation will impact the program; pProject a future date for a possible

accreditation review; indicate how close the institution is currently to achieving the requirements, and what the costs will be to achieve them.]

[Projected Enrollment - For credit programs, project both student FTE enrollments and the mean student FTE-to-faculty FTE ratio for each of the first five years of the program. For non-credit programs, project student headcount enrollments and mean student-to-faculty ratio for each of the first five years of the program. If accreditation requirements specify a specific student-to-faculty ratio, indicate the ratio(s).]

[Expansion of Existing Program - If the proposed program is an expansion or extension of an existing program, present enrollment trends by headcount and also by student credit hours (if appropriate) produced in the current program for each of the past five years for each area of emphasis or concentration.]

[Faculty - Identify the need for additional faculty required in each of the first five years of the program. State the level of preparedness of current faculty and the level of preparedness that will be needed by the fifth year. Describe the faculty development processes that will support this program.]

[Staff - List all additional staff needed to support the program in each of the first five years; e.g., administrative, secretarial, clerical, laboratory aides/ instructors, advisors, teaching/graduate assistants.]

[Library - Describe library resources required to offer a superior program. Does the institution currently have the needed library resources?]

[Learning Resources - Describe other learning resources required to support the program.]

[Institutional Readiness - Describe the impact of the new program upon existing administrative structures and identify new organizational structures that may be needed to deliver the program.]

SECTION III Need

[Program Necessity - Clearly indicate why such a program should be initiated.]

[Labor Market Demand - Include local, state, and national data, and job placement information, what types of jobs have graduates from similar programs obtained.]

[Student Demand - Describe evidence of student interest and demand that supports potential program enrollment.]

[Similar Programs - Are similar programs offered elsewhere in the state or Intermountain Region? If yes, cite justifications for why the Regents should approve another program. How does the proposed program differ from similar program(s)? Be specific.]

[Collaboration with and Impact on Other USHE Institutions - Describe discussions that may have occurred regarding your institution's intent to offer the proposed program with other USHE institutions that are already offering the program, and any collaborative efforts that may have been proposed. Analyze the impact that the new program would have on other USHE institutions.]

[Benefits - State how the institution and the USHE benefit by offering the proposed program.]

[Consistency with Institutional Mission - Explain how the program is consistent with and appropriate to the institution's board-approved mission, roles and goals.]

SECTION IV Program and Student Assessment

[Program Assessment - State the goals for the program and the measures that will be used in the program assessment process to determine if goals are being met.]

[Expected Standards of Performance - List the standards and competencies that the student will have met and achieved at the time of graduation. How or why were these standards and competencies chosen?]

[Student Assessment - Describe the formative and summative assessment measures you will use to determine student learning.]

[Continued Quality Improvement - Describe how program and student assessment data will be used to strengthen the program.]

SECTION V Finance

[Budget - For each category below, present the projected budget for an ongoing, quality program for each of the first five years:

Salaries and Wages
 Benefits
 Current Expense
 Library
 Equipment
 Travel
 TOTAL]

[Funding Sources - Describe how the program will be funded, i.e. new state appropriation, reallocation, enrollment growth, grants etc.]

[Reallocation - If program is to be supported through internal reallocation, describe in specific terms the sources of the funds.]

[Impact on Existing Budgets - If program costs are to be absorbed within current base budgets, what other programs will be affected and to what extent? Provide detailed information. Confidential information may be sent to the Commissioner under seal.]

Appendix A

Program Curriculum.

[New Courses to be Added in the Next Five Years - List all new courses to be developed in the next five years by prefix, number, title, and credit hours. Use the following format:]

Course Number	Title	Credit Hours
---------------	-------	--------------

[All Program Courses - List all courses, including new courses, to be offered in the proposed program by prefix, number, title, credit hours, or credit equivalences. Use the following format: (please include all course descriptions in appendix.)]

Course Number	Title	Credit Hours
---------------	-------	--------------

General Education

Sub-Total

Core Courses

Sub-Total

Elective Courses

Sub-Total

Track/Options (if applicable)

Sub-Total

Total Number of Credits**Appendix B**

[Program Schedule - For each level of program completion, present, by semester, a suggested class schedule - by prefix, number, title and semester hours.]

Appendix C

[Faculty- List current faculty within the institution, with their qualifications, to be used in support of the program.]

9.2.2. Signature Page to Accompany Proposals Requiring Board Approval.

This signature page, with all appropriate signatures included, should be sent to the Commissioner's Office and kept on file at the proposing institution.

Institution Submitting Proposal:

College, School or Division in
Which Program Will Be Located:

Department(s) or Area(s) in
Which Program Will Be Located:

Program Title:

Recommended Classification of
Instructional Programs (CIP) Code: ____ . ____ _

Area(s) of Emphasis or Academic
Specialty: (if appropriate)

Certificate, Diploma and/
or Degree(s) to be Awarded:

Proposed Beginning Date:

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):_____
Department Chair_____
Dean or Division Chair_____
Applied Technology Director_____
Graduate School Dean_____
Chief Academic Officer_____
President_____
Date

9.3. Template for Submission to the Consent Calendar of the Academic and Applied Technology Education and Student Success Committee and Board action.

9.3.1. Template for Consent Calendar Items, to Include Reinstatement of Previously Eliminated Administrative Units and Instructional Programs, Out of Service Area Delivery of Approved Programs, Certificates of Completion, and Proposals for Centers, Institutes, Bureaus- Program Discontinuation, and Non-credit Certificates Eligible for Financial Aid.

SECTION I Request

[Request- Briefly describe the change. Indicate the primary activities impacted, especially focusing on any instructional activities.]

SECTION II Need

[Need- Indicate why such an administrative change, program, or center is justified. Reference need or demand studies if appropriate. Indicate the similarity of the proposed unit/program with similar units/programs which exist elsewhere in the state or Intermountain region.]

SECTION III Institutional Impact

[Institutional Impact - Will the proposed administrative change or program affect enrollments in instructional programs of affiliated departments or programs? How will the proposed change affect existing administrative structures? If a new unit, where will it fit in the organizational structure of the institution? What changes in faculty and staff will be required? What new physical facilities or modification to existing facilities will be required? Describe the extent of the equipment commitment necessary to initiate the administrative change. If you are submitting a reinstated program, or program for off-campus delivery, respond to the previous questions as appropriate.]

SECTION IV Finances

[Costs- What costs or savings are anticipated from this change? If new funds are required, describe in detail expected sources of funds. Describe any budgetary impact on other programs or units within the institution.]

9.3.2. Signature Page to Accompany Proposals Requiring Board Consent.

This signature page, with all appropriate signatures included, should be sent to the Commissioner's Office and kept on file at the proposing institution.

Institution Submitting Proposal:

College, School or Division in Which Program/Administrative
Unit Will Be Located: _____

Department(s) or Area(s) in Which Program
Will Be Located: _____

Program Title: _____

Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code: ____ , ____

Area(s) of Emphasis or Academic
Specialty: (if appropriate)

Certificate, Diploma and/or

Degree(s) to be Awarded:

Proposed Beginning Date:

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

Department Chair

Dean or Division Chair

Applied Technology Director

Graduate School Dean

Chief Academic Officer

President

Date

9.4. ~~Transfer, Restructuring or Consolidation of Existing Programs or Administrative Units, Stand Alone Minors, Interdisciplinary Minors, Discontinuations and Name Changes.~~ (Approved by the Board of Trustees and sent to Board of Regents as an information item.) Template for Submission to the Information Calendar of the Academic. Applied Technology and Student Success Committee and Board Action

9.4.1. Template for Information Calendar Items to Include Transfer, Restructuring or Consolidation of Existing Programs or Administrative Units, Stand-alone Minors, Interdisciplinary Minors, and Name Changes. (Approved by the Board of Trustees and sent to the Board of Regents as an information item.)

SECTION I The Request

(Request- Briefly describe the change. Include a listing of courses and credits as appropriate.)

SECTION II Need

(**Need**- Indicate why the change is justified. Reference need or demand data if appropriate.)

SECTION III Institutional Impact

(**Institutional Impact** - Will the proposed recommendation affect enrollments in instructional programs of affiliated departments or programs? How will the proposed recommendations affect existing administrative structures? What(new) faculty, physical facilities or equipment will be impacted?)

SECTION IV Finances

(**Costs** - What costs are anticipated? Describe any budgetary impact, including cost savings, on other programs or units within the institution.)

9.4.4.2. Signature Page to Accompany Proposals Providing Board Notification. This signature page, with all appropriate signatures included, must be attached to proposals submitted for Board notification.

Institution Submitting Proposal:

College, School or Division affected:

Department(s) or Areas(s) affected:

Change Description: _____

Proposed Beginning Date:

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

Department Chair

Dean or Division Chair

Chief Academic Officer

President

Date

R401-10. Template for Submitting Program Reviews. The following information will be contained in the Program Review Report submitted to the Commissioner's Office.

10.1. Template for Submission of Program Reviews

10.1.1. Background Information. Identify the program under review and the date of the review. List each reviewer including degree and current affiliation. Provide any additional information to better understand the context of the review, i.e. date of last review, in conjunction with accreditation or national review, etc.

10.1.2. Student and Faculty Statistical Summary. List in chart form the past five years of data regarding students, graduates, faculty, student/faculty ratio and other data that are pertinent to understanding the program.

10.1.3. Program Strengths. List the program strengths as identified by the review team.

10.1.4. Areas Suggested for Improvement. List the areas where the review team indicated improvement is needed

10.1.5. Recommendations. What specific suggestions does the review team make in regards to program improvement?

10.1.6. Commendations. List any outstanding aspects of the program as identified by the review team.

10.1.7. Institutional Response to the Review Team Report. List specifically, what the institution intends to work on prior to the next review.

(Approved November 7, 1972, amended September 25, 1973, February 21, 1984, April 27, 1990 and revised and combined with R402 October 27, 2000; amended June 1, 2001. [R402 was approved September 10, 1971, amended November 18, 1980, July 19, 1983, March 20, 1984, September 12, 1986, August 7, 1987, October 26, 1990, April 16, 1993, January 21, 1994, May 1, 1997, May 29, 1998, and revised and combined with R401 October 27, 2000.]) R401 re-written and approved: November 8, 2002.

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2003

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: R312, Configuration of the Utah System of Higher Education, and
Institutional Missions and Roles

Issue

The Regents' 2002 Master Planning Task Force on Missions and Roles recommended the development of Policy R312, Institutional Categories, Accompanying Criteria, and Institutional Missions and Roles, to incorporate the changes that have occurred in the USHE since 1993. This document, which has since been renamed, has been shared with institutional Boards of Trustees, and feedback is being received.

Background

At the November 8, 2002 Board of Regents' meeting, proposed Policy R312, Institutional Categories, Accompanying Criteria, and Institutional Missions and Roles, was introduced. This is a new policy which replaces two previous policies: R311, Institutional Roles and Missions, and R313, Institutional Categories and Accompanying Criteria. It has now been changed to R312, Configuration of the Utah System of Higher Education, and Institutional Missions and Roles.

The purpose of this policy is to incorporate the changes that have occurred in USHE institutions and create a comprehensive, system-wide approach to the individual roles of the institutions that reflects what is in the best interest of Utah students and citizens. Policy R312 exhibits what is considered to be the appropriate roles and missions for each type of institution at this point in time and for the near future. However, as stated in the policy, every five years institutions will have an opportunity to have roles and mission statements reviewed to determine if state-wide needs have changed.

Between the November 8, 2002 and the January 17, 2003 Board meetings, input was received from several institutions. These revisions were discussed at the January Board meeting, but not all institutions had an opportunity to discuss the proposed policy with their Boards of Trustees. All Boards of Trustees have now seen the policy. On April 16, 2003 a meeting will be held with the Trustee Chairs and Vice Chairs to further discuss Policy R312.

Changes that are included in the most recent draft of R312 include: a name change for the category of doctoral/research institutions; specific articulation of community college functions; and specified averages of upper-division credits taught by faculty at Dixie State College.

If general agreement is reached on the policy, the Regents may choose to move this item to action status. If further deliberation and consideration are needed, appropriate time will be provided.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Board review Policy R312, Configuration of the Utah System of Higher Education, and Institutional Missions and Roles, receive feedback from the USHE institutions and either approve the policy or continue the dialogue as needed.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/DDW
Attachment

DISCUSSION DRAFT

04-08-03

R312, ~~Institutional Categories, Accompanying Criteria~~ Configuration of the Utah System of Higher Education, and *Institutional Missions and Roles*

R312-1. Purpose

To provide institutional categories, criteria, and mission statements for the institutions in the Utah System of Higher Education. To configure appropriately a system of colleges and universities in order to meet the educational needs of the citizens of the State of Utah; to maintain system integrity by defining institution types and characteristics; and to recognize the mission and roles of the institutions in the Utah System of Higher Education.

The Regents will review institutional roles and missions every five years to ensure congruence with the economic and social conditions in the State of Utah.

R312-2. References

- 2.1. Utah Code §53B-6-101 (Master Plan for Higher Education)
- 2.2. Policy and Procedures R301, Master Plan Executive Summary
- 2.3. Policy and Procedures R310, Systemwide Vision and Mission Statement
- 2.4. Policy and Procedures R485, Faculty Workload Guidelines

R312-3. Definitions

3.1. “**Institutional Categories**” —~~types or~~ categories of institutions have been adapted from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>

3.2. “**Mission Statements**” – the general purposes and functions of various institutions

3.3. “**Roles and Scope**” – the types and levels of educational programs and services assigned to and offered by the institutions.

3.4. “**Faculty Workload**” – the institutional average teaching workload for full-time faculty at the various institutions.

R312-3. ~~Doctorate-granting~~ Doctoral/Research Institutions: Type I.
(University of Utah, Utah State University)

4.1. Type I institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. Doctorate granting institutions in this category generally award 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines.

4.1.1. Mission - The institution's mission is to discover, create, and transmit knowledge through education and training programs at the undergraduate and graduate/professional levels and through research and development, and service/extension programs associated with a major teaching and research university. Emphasis is placed on teaching, research, and service. The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the state and the nation.

4.1.2. Land Grant Institution - Through its extension services, a land grant institution may fulfill a community college role in areas of need.

4.2. Programs

4.2.1. Instructional Programs - The institution offers baccalaureate programs, advanced professional training, graduate education of national significance and prominence at the master's and doctoral levels, and associate degrees where appropriate. A strong emphasis exists on research to complement the important teaching role.

4.2.2. Accreditation - ~~National~~ Regional, specialized and state accreditation is a goal for all programs for which this accreditation is available.

4.2.3. Research Programs - High priority is given to research and professional programs which make scholarly and creative contributions to the various disciplines and which support master's and doctoral programs of excellence. High priority is also given to research which results in the development, transfer and potential commercialization of new technology, processes, and products.

4.2.4. Graduate Organization - Graduate study is a distinct organizational element within the institution.

4.3. Faculty

4.3.1. Criteria for Selection, Retention and Advancement - Faculty are selected, retained and promoted on the basis of:

4.3.1.1. evidence of effective teaching,

4.3.1.2. research/scholarly/creative contributions, and

4.3.1.3. service and extension activities.

4.3.2. Educational Preparation - Regular full time tenure track faculty will have earned the appropriate terminal degree for their field and specialty.

4.3.3. Teaching Loads and Research Activities - Average teaching loads are expected to be lower than that of faculty in Type II and Type III institutions, reflecting their necessary involvement with research/scholarly/creative contributions. Teaching loads will average 18 credit hour equivalents each year. ~~or 9 credit hours each semester.~~

4.4. Student Admission - Students are admitted on the basis of their projected ability to succeed at the institution. Projected ability to succeed is based primarily on past performance, e.g., grade point average, and standardized test scores. Satisfactory completion of prerequisite courses and work experience may also be factors.

4.4.1. Land Grant Institution – When a land-grant institution is acting as a community college through its extension efforts, students are granted open admission to associate degree programs with appropriate academic preparatory support.

4.5. Support Services - The institution provides library services, support services, equipment, and other resources to support undergraduate and graduate programs, and student and faculty research.

4.6. University of Utah Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

4.7. Utah State University Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised)

R312-5. Master's Colleges and Universities: Type II.
(Weber State University, Southern Utah State University)

5.1. Type II institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. Master's granting institutions generally award 40 or more master's degrees per year across three or more disciplines. No awards above the master's level are offered.

5.1.1. Mission - The institution's mission is to transmit knowledge and skills primarily through undergraduate programs at the associate and baccalaureate levels, including applied technology education programs; and

selected graduate programs in high demand areas.. Emphasis is placed on teaching, scholarly/creative effort and community service. Scholarly/creative effort is complementary to the teaching role. The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the state and the metropolitan area or region. Student success is supported through developmental programs and services associated with a comprehensive community college.

5.2. Programs

5.2.1. Instructional Programs - The institution offers certificates, diplomas, general education, associate degrees including applied technology education, baccalaureate degree programs including those built upon strong associate degree programs, and selected professional master's programs. The institution also provides specialized training programs for business and industry. No doctoral programs are offered.

5.2.2. Accreditation - ~~National, Regional, and specialized and~~ state accreditation is a goal for programs for which such accreditation is available and appropriate for the institution's mission and role.

5.2.3. Scholarly and Creative Efforts - Faculty scholarly and creative efforts which complement and support the teaching and regional/ community service and economic development functions are expected.

5.2.4. Community College Function – Within the organization of the institution there is evidence that the community college function within the institutional mission is identifiable, ~~and~~ supported through programs and services, and includes transfer education, applied technology education, customized training for business and industry, developmental education and strong student services to support these primary components of the comprehensive community college mission. Oversight of and advocacy for this function are discrete components of position descriptions.

5.3. Faculty

5.3.1. Criteria for Selection, Retention and Advancement - It is of primary importance that faculty are selected, retained and promoted on the basis of evidence of effective teaching. Additional criteria include scholarship/professional/creative efforts and service, which complement the teaching role.

5.3.2. Educational Preparation - Regular full time tenure track faculty will have earned/be working toward the appropriate terminal degrees for their field and specialty. Faculty in applied technology or professional fields also have practitioner work experience.

5.3.3. Teaching Loads - Average teaching loads are higher than those of faculty in Type I institutions and somewhat lower than those of faculty in Type III institutions. This is due to the institution having fewer graduate programs and less emphasis on research/scholarship than Type I institutions. Teaching loads will average 24 credit hour equivalents each year ~~or 12 credit hours each semester~~.

5.4. Student Admission - Students are granted admission primarily on the basis of their projected ability to succeed at the institution. Projected ability to succeed is based in part on past performance (i.e., grade point average) and standardized test scores. Satisfactory completion of developmental courses, prerequisite courses, and work experience may also be factors.

5.5. Support Services - The institution provides library services, support services, equipment, and other resources to support undergraduate programs, a limited number of master's programs, and the intellectual needs of students and faculty.

5.6. Weber State University Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

5.7. Southern Utah University Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

R312-6. Baccalaureate/Associate Colleges: Type III (A and B)
(Utah Valley State College; Dixie State College of Utah)

6.1. Type III institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with a major emphasis on associate and baccalaureate programs. Certificate programs and business and industry training are also emphasized. No graduate level course work or awards above the baccalaureate level are offered

6.A.1. Type IIIA (Utah Valley State College) institutions generally award 500 or more baccalaureate degrees per year across at least 20 disciplines, continuing to offer select certificates and associate degrees in response to the requirements of business and industry and the community. ~~(Utah Valley State College)~~

6.A.1.1. Mission - The institution's mission is to transmit knowledge and skills through undergraduate programs at the associate and baccalaureate levels, including applied technology education programs.. Certificate programs are also offered. Emphasis is placed on teaching, scholarly/creative effort, training, and community service. Scholarly/creative effort is complementary to the teaching role. The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the state and the community. Student success is supported through developmental programs and services associated with a comprehensive community college.

6.A.2. Programs

6.A.2.1. Instructional programs - The institution offers certificates, diplomas, general education, associate degrees including applied technology education, lower division major transfer programs, and baccalaureate degree programs including those built upon strong associate degree programs. Specialized training programs for business and industry are also provided. In addition, where need has been demonstrated and costs are not prohibitive, additional degree programs beyond the baccalaureate degree are offered on Type IIIA campuses by working with Type I and Type II institutions through cooperative agreements or university centers.

6.A.2.2. Accreditation - Regional, state and some specialized accreditation is a goal for programs for which this accreditation is available and appropriate for the institution's mission and role.

6.A.2.3. Community College Function – Within the organization of the institution there is evidence that the community college function within the institutional mission is identifiable, ~~and~~ supported through programs and services, and includes transfer education, applied technology education, customized training for business and industry, developmental education and strong student services to support these primary components of the comprehensive community college mission. Oversight of and advocacy for this function are discrete components of position descriptions.

6.A.3. Faculty

6.A.3.1. Criteria for Selection, Retention and Advancement - Faculty are selected, retained and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of effective teaching. Secondary criteria include scholarship/professional/creative efforts and service, which complement the teaching role.

6.A.3.2. Educational Preparation - Regular full time tenure track faculty will have earned/be working toward the appropriate terminal degrees for their field and specialty. Faculty in applied technology or professional fields also have practitioner work experience.

6.A.3.3. Teaching Loads - Average teaching loads are higher than those of faculty in Type I and Type II institutions and somewhat lower than those of faculty in Type IIIB institutions. Teaching loads will average 27 credit hour equivalents each year.

6.A.4. Student Admission - All incoming students are tested for course placement and advising purposes. Satisfactory completion of developmental and/or prerequisite courses and work experience may also be factors. Lower division courses are primarily open admissions, while students must meet admissions criteria for upper division courses and programs.

6.A.5. Support Services - The institution provides library services, support services, equipment, and other resources to support lower division programs in applied technology and general education, selected baccalaureate programs, and the intellectual needs of students and faculty.

6.A.6. Utah Valley State College Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

6.B.1. Type IIIB [\(Dixie State College of Utah\)](#) institutions generally award at least 30 baccalaureate degrees per year across at least three disciplines, with an ongoing emphasis on the community college mission. ~~-(Dixie State College of Utah)~~

6.B.1.1. Mission - The institution's mission is to transmit knowledge and skills primarily through education and training programs at the certificate and associate degree level, including applied technology education programs; and select baccalaureate programs in high demand areas. Emphasis is placed on teaching, training and community service. The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the community and the state. Student success is supported through developmental programs and services associated with a comprehensive community college.

6.B.2. Programs

6.B.2.1. Instructional programs - The institution offers certificates, diplomas, general education, associate degrees including applied technology education, lower division major transfer programs, and high demand, baccalaureate degree programs including those built upon strong associate degree programs. Transfer programs are intended to prepare graduates to begin upper division work. Specialized training programs for business and industry are also provided. In addition, where need has been demonstrated and costs are not prohibitive, additional degree programs beyond the associate degree are offered on state college campuses by working with Type I and Type II institutions through cooperative agreements or university centers.

6.B.2.2. Accreditation - Regional, state and some specialized accreditation is a goal for programs for which this accreditation is available and appropriate for the institution's mission and role.

6.B.2.3. Community College Function – Within the organization of the institution there is evidence that the community college function within the institutional mission is identifiable, and supported through programs and services, and includes transfer education, applied technology education, customized training for business and industry, developmental education and strong student services to support these primary components of the comprehensive community college

mission. Oversight of and advocacy for this function are discrete components of position descriptions.

6.B.3. Faculty

6.B.3.1. Criteria for Selection, Retention and Advancement - Faculty are selected, retained and promoted primarily on the basis and evidence of effective teaching and training. Other criteria complementary to the teaching role include service and scholarly/professional/creative efforts.

6.B.3.2. Educational Preparation - Regular full time tenure track faculty will have the appropriate work experience and recognized professional credentials for their discipline and teaching level. To teach courses in general education or other special transfer programs, the master's degree is a standard requirement. Faculty teaching upper division courses will have earned/be working toward the appropriate terminal degrees for their field and specialty.

6.B.3.3. Teaching Loads - Teaching loads will average 30 credit hour equivalents each year, or 15 credit hours each semester, for lower division instruction, and will average 27 credit hour equivalents each year for upper division instruction. ~~the same as those of faculty in Type IV institutions.~~

6.B.4. Student Admission - All incoming students are tested for course placement and advising purposes. Satisfactory completion of developmental and/or prerequisite courses and work experience may also be factors. Lower division courses are primarily open admissions, while students must meet admissions criteria for upper division courses and programs.

6.B.5. Support Services - The institution provides library services, support services, equipment, and other resources to support lower division programs in applied technology/vocational training and general education, selected baccalaureate programs, and the intellectual needs of students and faculty.

6.B.6. Dixie State College of Utah Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

R312.7. Community Colleges/Associate's Colleges: Type IV (Snow College; College of Eastern Utah; Salt Lake Community College)

7.1. Type IV institutions offer associate degrees and certificate programs. No upper division course work or awards above the associate degree-level is offered (Snow College, College of Eastern Utah, Salt Lake Community College)

7.1.1. Mission - The institution's mission is that of a comprehensive community college, transmitting knowledge and skills through transfer education at the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degree level; applied technology

education; customized training for business and industry; developmental education; and strong student services to support these functions.~~to transmit knowledge and skills primarily through general education; education and training programs at the certificate, diploma, and associate degree levels, including applied technology education programs; and selected lower division major transfer programs.~~ Transfer programs are intended to prepare graduates to begin upper division work. Emphasis is placed on teaching, training, and community service. The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the state and the community. Student success is supported through developmental programs and services associated with a comprehensive community college.

7.2. Programs

7.2.1. Instructional Programs - The institution offers general education; certificates, diplomas, and ~~less than baccalaureate~~ Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, and Associate of Applied Science degrees, in applied technology education and, and lower division major transfer programs. Transfer programs are intended to prepare graduates to begin upper division work. Specialized training programs for business and industry are also provided. Where need has been demonstrated and costs are not prohibitive, selected degree programs beyond the associate degree are offered on community college campuses by working with Type I and Type II other USHE institutions through cooperative agreements or university centers.

7.2.2. Accreditation - Regional, state and some specialized accreditation is a goal for programs for which this accreditation is available and appropriate for the institution's mission and role.

7.3. Faculty

7.3.1. Criteria for Selection, Retention and Advancement - Faculty are selected, retained and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of effective teaching and training. Other criteria complementary to the teaching role include service and scholarly/professional/creative efforts.

7.3.2. Educational Preparation - Regular full time tenure track faculty will have the appropriate work experience and recognized professional credentials for their discipline and teaching level. To teach courses in general education or other special transfer programs, the master's degree is a standard requirement.

7.3.3. Teaching Loads - Average teaching loads are somewhat higher than those of faculty in Type II and Type IIIA institutions, because faculty are not involved in upper division and graduate level instruction. Teaching loads will average 30 credit hour equivalents each year, or 15 credit hours each semester, the same as

those of faculty in Type IIIB institutions.

7.4. Student Admission - While comprehensive community colleges traditionally have open admissions, incoming students may be tested for course placement, advising, and the ability to benefit from specific courses for financial aid purposes. Satisfactory completion of other developmental and/or prerequisite courses, and work experience may also be factors.

7.5. Support Services - The institution provides library services, support services, equipment, and other resources to support lower division programs in applied technology and vocational training and general education, and the intellectual needs of students and faculty.

7.6. Snow College Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

7.7. College of Eastern Utah Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

7.8. Salt Lake Community College Institutional Mission and Roles Statement (being revised).

R313-8. Technical Colleges: Type V
(Utah College of Applied Technology)

8.1. Type V institutions award certificates and ~~a~~Associate of ~~a~~Applied ~~t~~Technology ~~d~~Degrees. General education courses are provided, in partnership, through other Utah System of Higher Education institutions. No general education courses (or prerequisites), nNo upper division course work or awards above the associate degree-level are offered. ~~(Utah College of Applied Technology)~~

8.1.1. Mission - The institution's mission is to transmit knowledge and skills, to both high school and adult students, to meet the needs of business and industry primarily through education and training programs, whether long term, short term or custom designed for specific business and industry needs. These programs provide students with opportunities to enter, re-enter, upgrade, or advance in the workplace. To meet this mission the institution also helps students enhance the necessary basic skills to succeed in technical training programs and provides both short-term and long-term, at the certificate and associate degree levels, through customized short-term training for business and industry, and by providing life-long learning opportunities designed to meet the individual needs of Utah's citizens. Programs are offered in an open-entry, open exit competency-based environment, as an alternative to traditional instruction, using a flexible approach to meet individual student and business/industry needs.

8.2. Programs

8.2.1. Instructional Programs - The institution offers competency-based

certificates and associate of applied technology degrees that result in appropriate licensing, certification, or skill training to qualify students for specific employment in business and industry. The general education components of the associate of applied technology degrees are offered by the other USHE institutions. The institution also provides rapid response to training needs of Utah employers through several programs including specifically designed custom fit training. Competency-based high school diplomas will be offered. In performing these responsibilities, the applied technology college cooperates with local school districts and other higher education institutions.

8.2.2. Accreditation - Regional, state, [national](#) and some specialized accreditation is a goal for programs appropriate for the institution's mission and role.

8.3. Faculty

8.3.1. Criteria for Selection, Retention and Advancement - Faculty are selected, retained and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of [appropriate levels of technical knowledge and skills, related industry experience and](#) effective teaching and training. Other criteria complementary to the teaching role include service and creative efforts.

8.3.2. Educational Preparation - Regular full time faculty will have the appropriate work experience and recognized professional credentials for their discipline and teaching level.

8.3.3. Teaching Loads - Teaching loads of technical faculty ~~typically conform to a standard business day;~~ and ongoing daily student contact ~~is are~~ at a [somewhat higher level than traditional academic instruction. at a Type IV institution. Teaching loads will average 30 clock hours per week.](#)

8.4. Student Admission - All applied technology colleges have open admissions, though incoming students may be tested for placement, advising, and the ability to benefit from specific courses for financial aid purposes.

8.5. Support Services - The institution provides support services, equipment, and other resources to support applied technology education programs.

8.6. Utah College of Applied Technology Mission [and Roles](#) Statement (to be inserted).

(Approved September 14, 1990, amended May 14, 1993. Proposed merger of Policies and Procedures R311 and R313, submitted November 8, 2002.

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2003

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Student Success Task Force and the Noel-Levitz Consulting Team - Report

Issue

In 2002, the Board of Regents established the Student Success Task Force in order to extend discussion beyond the Regents' Master Plan 2000, which had as its main priority the education and training of students. The Task Force, which met throughout the Fall of 2002, identified issues of retention, persistence, completion, and other factors that impact or are impacted by student success.

Background

The Student Success Task Force, which included Regents, institutional Presidents, General Education faculty, academic advisors, and members of the Commissioner's staff, made six recommendations, one, of which, was a request to bring to Utah a consultant who could assist with the identification and resolution of retention and persistence issues statewide. Commissioner Cecelia H. Foxley arranged for Lee Noel, a founder of the educational enrollment management consultant firm Noel-Levitz (N-L), and Lana Lowe to conduct statewide diagnostic procedures. In their "Enrollment Opportunity Analysis," N-L identified within the USHE many strengths, such as enlightened leadership at the system and institutional levels and relatively low tuition. Challenges, too, were identified and included: limited incentives for improving retention while rewarding enrollment, and no systematic effort to meet remediation/developmental needs of students. In addition, the N-L analysis identified opportunities and made recommendations to strengthen student recruitment and persistence.

Findings from the Student Success Task Force and those from N-L consultants were complementary and blended into three major recommendations: (1) establish institutional and systemwide priorities; (2) from information gathered, develop concrete and practical action plans; and (3) develop communication strategies to reach potential returning students. The first two recommendations contain several action steps to facilitate the recommendations, such as improving student tracking systems, establishing a K-16 initiative, and providing a systemwide approach to remediation/developmental programs.

The issue of student success is being addressed throughout higher education. In a new report, "Understanding University Success," issued by the Association of American Universities

and The Pew Charitable Trusts, standards for success are defined for new students entering both community colleges and universities. These standards, while clearly articulated for all core subjects, also include themes that emerged through discussions among participants nationwide. Habits of the mind which include critical and analytical thinking, problem solving, an inquisitive nature, ability to accept critical feedback, and openness to possible failures from time to time are thought to be more even more important than the content knowledge brought by new students. This report will inform discussions among the High School/College Articulation Committee, as it works to develop a K-16 initiative, and other related committees wanting to improve the quality and success of new and continuing college students.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Regents review the Summary of Recommendations from Noel-Levitz and the Student Success Task Force, raise questions, and discuss systemwide priorities which would determine which of the recommendations should be implemented in the short and long term in order to support student success.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/PCS
Attachment

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM NOEL-LEVITZ AND THE STUDENT SUCCESS TASK FORCE

Recommendations made by the Student Success Task Force and the Noel-Levitz consultants were complementary to one another. The former's recommendations included strategies for student intervention and tracking. The N-L recommendations included proven suggestions for data gathering in order to learn more about student need and institutional priorities. Both stressed accountability. The following recommendations and action steps blend together the conclusions from both the N-L consultants and the Student Success Task Force. It should be noted that many of the USHE institutions are engaged in one or more of the following activities.

Recommendation 1. Establish institutional and systemwide priorities and goals.

Base benchmarks on data from a statewide assessment of student expectations and satisfaction. These benchmarks will enable institutions to set institution-specific priorities and assess if these priorities are being actualized for accountability.

Recommendation 1A: Improve systems for tracking students.

The new Banner system, once fully operational and compatible with PeopleSoft, will enable the institutions and Commissioner's office to track all students more efficiently. After student satisfaction data are gathered, the USHE will be able to assist the individual institutions to review institution-specific findings and determine priorities and benchmarks. Other data relevant to student support would be tracked as well.

Student Task Force members asked: How do we know if students are successful? Performance measures, suggested in the N-L report and contained in the USHE Biennial Assessment include the following:

- Retention rates
- Graduation rates
- Time to graduation
- FTE students per dollar expended for instruction (ROI indicator)
- Percent of students continuing their education
- Number of degrees granted at all levels per student population
- Percent of students finding employment, by discipline

Reliable data lead to better accountability and, as the N-L report indicates, will ultimately support student success. Adding data on employer satisfaction would inform the USHE on how well it prepares its graduates for success in the workplace.

In addition, the Task Force recommends that tracking be improved in the following areas:

- Completion success of transfer students compared to native students
- Completion success of students who complete remediation compared to non-remedial students

- Completion success of minority students
- Completion success of New Century Scholarship recipients
- Success of graduate students in finding assistance and health insurance during their studies and employment subsequent to graduation
- Utah's success in retaining students after graduation

Recommendation 1B: Determine completion, participation, and affordability goals of institutions by conducting a preliminary assessment of their plans, strategies, and tactics.

Data gathered at the system level would supply information on institution-specific participation and completion patterns, particularly during this period of economic uncertainty. Institutional assessments of their own plans and strategies regarding participation and completion goals would be shared among the Regents and Presidents. The goals should be tied to Regents' Policy R312 to make them congruent with institutional missions.

To address affordability goals, an assessment of financial aid practices should be conducted systemwide to determine how, and if, these practices impact participation and completion. Once the assessment is complete, institutions could develop strategies to alert potential and current students to maximize responsible borrowing so that students can complete their education more efficiently. Communication strategies should target parents of middle and high school students to think about responsible borrowing for their childrens' postsecondary education. The UtahMentor Website could assist in this effort.

Recommendation 1C. Analyze the return on investment (ROI) associated with various levels of enrollment (recruitment) and re-enrollment (retention) for each institution.

For those institutions that have not already conducted an ROI, the Commissioner's Staff could develop a statistical model to assist institutions to determine the ROI on recruitment and retention. Analysis of these data would inform institutional discussions on what strategies to use to maximize student recruitment and retention and the resources that would be necessary to accomplish these institutional goals.

Recommendation 2: From information gathered, develop concrete and practical action plans.

The Student Success Task Force proposes a set of action plans that are consistent with those suggested in the "Opportunities" section of the N-L report and the general findings from other N-L materials. In addition, the plans are based on the system's ability to collect relevant data to support the action plans. Again, conversion to the Banner system will greatly enhance data gathering potential.

Recommendation 2A: Establish a K-16 initiative.

The Task Force recommends that each institution review its admission standards and increase these standards where appropriate. The Utah State Board of Education has already approved increased high school graduation standards. The Task Force believes that increased expectations for high school students will result in their being prepared more fully for their college experience. In addition, college student government leaders should be surveyed for their perspective on preparation for college. Both

higher performance expectations and college student input will inform practice and are likely to result in higher persistence rates as students work towards their education goals.

The High School/College Articulation Committee, with representatives from the Office of the Commissioner, the State Office of Education, the USHE General Education Task Force, and the school districts, met to discuss: (1) achieving congruence between core curricula standards and general education learning goals; and (2) addressing congruence between high school graduation standards and college/university admission standards, among other items.

During two subsequent meetings, high school and college faculty reviewed competencies in mathematics and writing to determine learning expectations for high school and college students. The goal is to raise the level of performance of both groups and achieve congruence between core curriculum standards and college admission expectations. Findings and recommendations from these meetings will be reported to both the High School/College Articulation Committee and the Regents' Academic, Applied Technology, and Student Success Committee.

Recommendation 2B. Develop institutional strategic plans to increase geographic, low income, and minority student enrollments.

Utah has a relatively small (15 percent) ethnically diverse population. Yet, it is the USHE's responsibility to prepare its graduates to function in a global, multi-cultural society.

Outreach efforts to attract students from diverse backgrounds are essential. Early awareness programs such as Gear Up, TRIO, summer camp, and other orientation programs introduce high school students to higher education in a positive and facilitative manner. These programs also identify students with potential who may not have considered college as a possibility. When these students come to college, they bring with them a unique perspective borne of their ethnicity and experience. This is also true for graduate education.

Recommendation 2C. Provide a systemwide approach to remediation/developmental programs.

The USHE needs to develop a systemwide approach primarily among community colleges to invest in student success by providing remedial/developmental programs.

In 2001, approximately 9,800 first time students entering the USHE were placed in remediation classes; 75 percent of these students were placed in mathematics. This number did not include the students who chose not to register for remediation even though their ACT test scores suggested they should. An estimated 30 to 50 percent of entering community college students need remediation. Although more data are needed, it appears that after taking remedial courses, students are able to succeed along with their follow students. Academic advisors believe that those refusing remediation do not persist. Remediation is an investment not only in retaining students, but having them persist successfully to graduation, or to reach their educational goals.

Recommendation 2D. Develop institutional programs to mentor new students.

The Task Force recommends that each institution develop a formal plan for mentoring first year and all new students.

Integration of first year and all new students into the life of the institution is critical if students are to persist. It was determined by the Student Success Task Force that mentoring also should occur naturally as faculty meet new students and develop classroom-centered relationships. Establishing student cohorts and student study groups, faculty would assist students to bond and create support systems. Upper-division students should also be encouraged to mentor new students with similar interests. Academic advisors also play this role.

Recommendation 2E. Eliminate institutional barriers.

The Task Force recommends that the Regents and each institution review budget priorities to support the following goals:

- Increase the number of sections of required courses to reduce any bottlenecks that prevent students from completing their education in a timely manner.
- Increase opportunities to obtain credits through competency-based means, such as AP, CLEP, Challenge Examinations, etc.
- Consider mandatory orientation for first-year students that would assist them to understand the expectations and opportunities of their higher education journey. This would include: training in the use of UtahMentor and the links to academic majors, transferring courses from one institution to another, obtaining financial information, and identifying advising options.

First year students who cannot obtain their required courses may leave the institution or enroll in courses that are not required and which lengthen their time to graduation. In addition, there are too few academic advisors to assist students to choose essential courses. Missing are institutional policies that support the availability of required courses for first- and second- year students and resources to hire more academic advisors. The Utah Electronic College (UEC) offers lower-division courses, provided by USHE institutions, and is an alternative to campus-specific, bottle-necked courses. In addition, students should have options to demonstrate competency in courses for which they are already prepared. Finally, orientation programs have been shown by research to assist students to more successfully navigate their first-year college experience.

Recommendation 2F. Improve ease of transfer.

The Task Force recommends that formalized procedures be established to create more interaction between and among faculty from the colleges and universities. The current informal interaction of Presidents has resulted in general dual admission agreements between some institutions. This will promote effective transfer articulation. More faculty interaction would benefit students through increased program articulation agreements.

Currently, students who complete their general education requirements at one USHE institution will have met the general education requirements at all other USHE institutions. However, pre-major to major articulations continue to be developed. Faculty from two- and four-year institutions are convening during the

statewide Majors Meetings for the purpose of identifying courses that will transfer as pre-requisites to high demand major programs. Dual admission agreements allow students to enroll at a community college, and, if they maintain a prescribed GPA while completing specific course requirements, they will be admitted into the four-year institution with junior status, although placement in a specific department is dependent upon departmental approval. Also, efforts should be made by faculty to align general education learning goals with those of the majors. If there is coherence in the general education curriculum and learning goals align with those of the majors, the college/university experience is likely to be more integrated and greatly enhanced.

Recommendation 3. Develop communication strategies to reach potential returning students.

The N-L report strongly suggests that the USHE develop communication strategies to target Utahns who have some college experience but who have not completed a degree. While some of these students typically take longer to complete their degrees because of work and family commitments, institutions could assist them with appropriate advisement and course-taking strategies. In addition, different communication strategies could be developed to reach students who have interrupted their education to serve religious missions or military assignments. These strategies would encourage completion of educational goals by offering appropriate advisement and institutional incentives such as scholarships, work-study, and loan forgiveness opportunities.

SUMMARY

The recommendations from both the Student Success Task Force and Noel-Levitz Reports clearly stress that we address student retention and persistence issues. An improved student tracking system would provide the data necessary to query students and determine priorities and strategies to improve retention, persistence, and attendant affordability goals. Reliable data and data analyses would support the following action steps: continuing a K-16 initiative to improve the competencies of graduating high school and first-year college students, encouraging minority students to enroll in the USHE institutions to add greater diversity to the student body systemwide, developing a systematic approach to remediation and developmental courses primarily at the community colleges and institutions with community college missions, formalizing on-campus mentor programs, eliminating barriers to courses and services to new and continuing students, and improving course transfer between and among institutions. In addition, system-wide communication strategies are needed to invite the return of those whose education has been interrupted. All of the recommendations will require additional resources. If recruitment, retention, and persistence are to be improved, additional resources or reallocated resources must be invested in the State's students to assure their success.

April 8, 2003

To: State Board of Regents
From: Cecelia H. Foxley
Subject: Report on Nursing

Issue

The attached report provides information regarding the current Utah nursing shortage, the efforts currently underway to address this issue, and proposed actions to avoid an increasing problem in the future.

Background

During the March, 2003 Board meeting, the Regents requested information on the nursing shortage in the State of Utah. The major participants in providing and supporting nursing education in Utah are the Utah System of Higher Education, the health-care industry, and the Utah State Legislature. All of these entities, which fulfill different roles in nursing education, continue to seek solutions to this problem. These solutions include nursing program partnerships, health-care industry and education partnerships, RN refresher/reactivation programs, delaying faculty retirements, and accelerating existing programs. However, the best solution to addressing the nursing shortage for the long-term in Utah is to increase access to existing nursing programs.

USHE nursing programs are in the unusual position of having far more qualified applicants for admission than there are seats available. Additional state funding in the amount of \$6.6 million would enable the USHE to double the number of registered nursing graduates without the need for additional facilities. The Utah Nursing Leadership Forum (NLF) has, for the past two years, sponsored a legislative initiative to obtain the necessary funding to increase nursing faculty. The attached report provides additional information regarding current efforts to address the nursing shortage in Utah, as well as on the NLF initiative.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the members of the Academic, Applied Technology and Student Success Committee review the report on the nursing shortage in Utah and encourage institutions with nursing programs to explore all possibilities for increasing the numbers of students admitted, including internal reallocations and additional partnerships with the health care industry.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/LF
Attachment

The Nursing Shortage at the State and National Levels

The United States is in the midst of a nursing shortage that is expected to intensify as baby boomers age and the need for health care grows. Compounding the problem is the fact that nursing colleges and universities across the country are struggling to maintain enrollment levels which remain insufficient to meet the projected demand for nursing care.

American Association of College of Nursing: *Nursing Shortage Fact Sheet*.
<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Media/Backgrounders/shortagefacts.htm>

The State of Utah is currently experiencing a shortage of registered nurses that is expected, as indicated in the quote above, to intensify as the general population ages. However, unlike the problem referenced above related to maintaining enrollment levels at nursing schools nationwide, Utah Colleges of Nursing have large numbers of qualified applicants for each seat available in nursing programs. In fact, all public colleges of nursing in Utah routinely turn qualified applicants away as indicated in the table below:

Table I: Current Nursing Applicant Pool Compared to Program Capacity

	U of U	WSU	Dixie	CEU	UVSC	SLCC	Totals
Current RN Graduates (Capacity)	100	250	19	30	72	100	571
Number of Applicants *	266	379	50	60	152	450	1,357

* Data provided by the Utah Nursing Leadership Forum

The following information, provided by the Utah Nursing Leadership Forum (NLF), demonstrates the severity of the current and expected nursing shortages in Utah:

- Nurse executives in acute care hospitals report a vacancy rate of approximately 8% to 10% for RN positions. This represents about 1,000 open (unfilled) RN positions.
- The Utah Health Care Association reports a 24% vacancy rate in long-term care facilities (AHCA Health Services Research and Evaluation, October 2001). Additional nurses are needed for the growing number of long-term care facilities in Utah.
- The University Critical Care Pavilion opened in March, 2003. Only 18 of 32 beds can be occupied due to a shortage of nurses.
- The Huntsman Cancer Hospital will open in 2004. An additional 126 RNs will be needed.
- A new Intermountain Health Care (IHC) hospital in St. George will open in 2003. An additional 100 RNs (approximately) will be needed.
- IHC plans to open a new facility in 2006. An additional 150 RNs will be needed.

The Utah System of Higher Education (USHE), the health care industry, and the Utah State Legislature all have responsibilities related to nursing education in Utah. Although each of these entities has a different role, all are called upon to provide resources for the education of the nursing workforce. In order to address the current and

anticipated shortages in nursing, it is important to consider what is currently being done by each, and what is needed in order to address the problem of educating an adequate number of nurses to meet current and projected workforce needs.

The Utah System of Higher Education

The responsibility of the Utah System of Higher Education in addressing the nursing shortage in Utah is to provide quality nursing education programs within the guidelines of accrediting agencies that require low faculty to student ratios. The following USHE institutions currently operate nursing programs that educate registered nurses at the associate and baccalaureate degree levels:

- The University of Utah (Baccalaureate)
- Weber State University (Associate and Baccalaureate)
- Dixie State College of Utah (Associate)
- The College of Eastern Utah (Associate)
- Utah Valley State College (Associate and Baccalaureate)
- Salt Lake Community College (Associate)

As illustrated in Table I above, these institutions currently graduate 517 registered nurses per year, compared to 1,357 applications for admission.¹ Faculty positions are insufficient to allow these USHE programs to enroll additional students. In addition, 98 of the 250 current nursing faculty in the USHE are over the age of 50, and one-third plans to retire within the next five years.

Nursing Program Partnerships

Nursing program partnerships between USHE institutions maximize state resources and provide access for students. Examples of such partnerships include:

- The Utah College of Applied Technology Davis Campus (DATC) and Weber State University (WSU) partnership, which provides a seamless transition for DATC practical nursing students into WSU's Registered Nursing Program.
- A partnership between the University of Utah and the Salt Lake Community College University Center, which offers the opportunity for associate degree nurses to obtain a Bachelor's Degree in Nursing.
- The Weber State University Nursing Program located on the Southern Utah University campus, which provides an articulated RN to BSN Program with multiple entrance and exit points.

Recruiting Non-practicing Nurses Back into the Field

Approaches to addressing the nursing shortage that have been considered include recruiting licensed, non-practicing nurses back into the field. Data provided by the Utah Medical Education Council (MEC) in January, 2003 indicate that there are 4,309 licensed nurses who are not currently practicing in Utah. Although this number is high,

¹ Brigham Young University and Westminster College graduate an additional 139 nurses per year

there are many reasons that licensed nurses may choose not to practice, including family responsibilities (many are between the ages of 20 and 44), stressful working conditions, and inadequate salaries. The MEC is conducting ongoing research to determine why this group of licensed nurses is not currently working in the nursing field.

Implementing Interim Measures

USHE institutions have also implemented interim measures such as RN refresher/reactivation programs, delaying faculty retirements, and accelerating existing programs, and have created the types of nursing program partnerships discussed previously. However, increasing the number of students that can be educated in our existing colleges of nursing is the best solution to meeting workforce needs for the long term.

Increasing Program Access to Existing Nursing Programs

During the past two years, the Utah Nursing Leadership Forum, comprised of health care industry and education representatives, has sponsored a legislative initiative targeted at hiring and retaining faculty in order to increase nursing class size. The focus of the plan is two-fold:

1. The preparation of registered nurses at the associate degree level at all institutions (with the exception of the University of Utah, which does not have an associate-level program).
2. The preparation of additional nursing faculty at the University of Utah, the only USHE institution that educates nursing faculty.

The following table outlines the projected increase in class size, and the associated projected cost:

Table II: Projected Increase in USHE Nursing Class Size and Related Cost

	U of U	WSU	Dixie	CEU	UVSC	SLCC	Totals
Proposed Increase							
RN (Bachelor's)	80						80
RN (Associate)		200	29	30	68	80	407
Master's	38						38
Ph.D.	6						6
Totals with Increase:	490	829	98	120			1,537
Projected Cost:	\$1,875,000	\$2,163,000	\$325,000	\$476,152	\$853,122	\$891,000	\$6,583,274

Data provided by the Utah Nursing Leadership Forum

USHE institutions are ready to meet the need. With an increase of \$6.6 million in state funding for faculty, the six nursing programs at USHE institutions could increase class size to nearly double the number of nursing graduates in the state, and increase the number of new Master's and Ph.D. graduates (potential faculty) by two-thirds.

The Health Care Industry

The health-care industry employs approximately 69,000 people in Utah, including nurses. Nursing is listed in the top 50 occupations with the most new jobs in Utah, and the top 50 occupations in demand in Utah.² The health care industry – hospitals, clinics, long-term care facilities, etc. – not only employs the graduates of nursing programs, but also provides significant support for nursing education including:

- Sites for the clinical component of nursing education
- Preceptors, who serve as mentors for student learning
- Space for student and faculty conferences
- Participation in the coordination of student placements
- Tuition reimbursement for employees who are advancing their careers as health care workers, including entry to nursing and obtaining advanced nursing degrees

Intermountain Health Care (IHC), in an effort to address nursing workforce requirements at IHC facilities, has contributed over \$1.5 million during 2002 and 2003 through a contractual arrangement with Salt Lake Community College to educate 120 new nurses over a three-year period, and a contractual arrangement with Utah Valley State College to train 20 nurses in the Practical Nursing (PN) to Registered Nursing (RN) Program. These students will be employed by IHC when they enter training. Intermountain Health Care also contributed \$100,000 to the University of Utah College of Nursing in 2002 – the fourth year in which this amount has been contributed by IHC.³

IASIS Healthcare, which operates the Davis Hospital and Medical Center, Jordan Valley Hospital, Pioneer Valley Hospital and Salt Lake Regional Medical Center in Utah, contributed \$88,000 in 2003 to the Utah College of Applied Technology Davis Campus (DATC) Practical Nursing Program as well as sites for nursing clinical placements. This partnership arrangement allowed DATC to hire additional faculty and increase enrollment in the Practical Nursing Program by 20 students. These students are employed by IASIS, and have a two-year employment commitment to that organization.⁴

Recognizing the University of Utah's critical role in both the training of specialized nurses and in the preparation of nurse educators who serve as faculty in all nurse training programs in the state, the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics donated \$500,000 to the University's College of Nursing in September, 2002. The funds are being used to hire additional faculty and provide scholarships for nursing students.

The Utah State Legislature

The Legislature provides approximately 67 percent of the funding for instructional costs at USHE institutions.⁵ This amount has declined, as a percentage of the total state budget, as state revenues have also declined. The fiscal situation in the State of Utah, particularly over the past two years, has impacted the ability of the Legislature to fund the NLF request for approximately \$6.6 million to increase the number of faculty and, correspondingly, the number of graduates of USHE nursing programs. Increasing faculty, however, is the most effective way to address the projected nursing shortage in the State of Utah. Recognizing that the Legislature is dealing with many critical needs in the State within the constraints of limited fiscal resources, continuing to pursue funding for nursing faculty still appears to be the most effective approach to addressing the nursing shortage.

² *Utah Job Outlook: Statewide And Service Delivery Areas 2000-2005*, pp 15-24. <http://jobs.utah.gov/wi/pubs/UtahJobOutlook-2001.pdf>.

³ Information provided by Paul Jackson, Asst. Vice President for Human Resources, Intermountain Health Care.

⁴ Information provided by Jay Greaves, VP for Instruction, Davis Applied Technology College Campus.

⁵ *Utah System of Higher Education Facts at a Glance Report Card*, updated April, 2003.

Summary

The aging population, aging nursing workforce, and projected opening of new health-care facilities in the state will clearly exacerbate the current nursing shortage in Utah. Solutions such as RN refresher/reactivation programs, deferred faculty retirements, and accelerating existing programs will assist in addressing current nursing needs. In addition, further research may provide insight into why a significant number of licensed nurses is not currently employed in the profession in Utah.

Continued partnerships between nursing programs and with health-care providers will also assist in addressing the nursing shortage, although cash contributions by the health-care industry to nursing programs seem to be, not surprisingly, directed at addressing the shortage for specific providers. However, increasing nursing graduates by expanding capacity in current programs is the most effective way to meet the shortage anticipated for the future. An increase of \$6.6 million in state funding for faculty would allow this expansion, doubling the number of nursing graduates in the state, and increasing the number of new Master's and Ph.D. graduates (potential faculty) by two-thirds – a solution that will prevent a more severe crisis in the coming years.

Until the time comes when additional state resources are made available for nursing education, it is incumbent upon USHE institutions with nursing programs to do what they can to internally reallocate resources to expand their nursing programs, if at all possible. Exploring the possibility of additional partnerships with and support from the health care industry would also be a mutually beneficial way of continuing to help address the nursing shortage.

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2003

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Administrative Efficiencies – Consolidation/Clustering of Some Functions

Issue

There may be some cost savings with certain consolidation or clustering of some administrative functions among groups of institutions. The Council of Presidents agreed to explore several areas where groups of institutions may want to collaborate or form partnerships in order to become more efficient.

Background

During the 2000 and 2002 Regents' master planning processes, the issue of centralizing or consolidating some administrative functions in order for the USHE to become more efficient was discussed. At the March 14, 2003, Board of Regents meeting, Chair Nolan Karras requested the Council of Presidents (COP) to take the leadership for this effort and make recommendations to the Regents at the appropriate time. At the April 1, 2003, COP meeting, the Presidents agreed to form the following working groups to explore the possibility of consolidating certain administrative functions. An asterisk (*) by an institution indicates that the President of that institution has agreed to convene the Presidents of that particular group.

1. Administrative Data Processing – WSU, Snow, Dixie, CEU*, and SLCC
(Includes registration issues)
2. Facilities Management – UVSC* and CEU
3. Purchasing – UVSC, Snow and CEU*
4. Human Resources – U of U*, USU, WSU, Snow, CEU, UVSC and SLCC
(Includes legal issues)
5. Financial Aid Processing – WSU, SUU, Snow, Dixie*, CEU, UVSC and UHEAA
6. Voluntary Academic Program Partnerships – various institutions as appropriate

During the COP discussion of the above, the Presidents indicated that it is not likely that much progress would be made with this effort until after commencements. They also agree that once a working group has a tentative agreement, that agreement will be shared with the full COP and other institutions may opt to join in. Utah College of Applied Technology President Greg Fitch indicated that the UCAT campus administrators are in the process of determining which administrative functions are appropriate to consolidate among the various campuses of that institution. At the appropriate time, formal reports will be made to the Board of Regents.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Regents review the above working groups for possible consolidation of administrative functions, raise questions, make suggestions, and encourage the Presidents to begin their working group discussions as soon as possible.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

April 8, 2003

TO: Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Progress Report on Health Benefits Study

Issue

The Commissioner's March 14, 2003, Progress Report on Health Benefits included a copy of Attachment 1 consisting of a matrix which combined the relative richness of institutional plan design with extent of premium cost sharing to establish a target numeric benchmark for institutional plans. The Regents affirmed the utility of such a matrix but requested additional information regarding current industry practice in premium cost sharing and plan design.

The April 18, 2003, progress report will reflect ongoing efforts to determine "best practices" and "benchmarks" in health benefits for employees. Commissioner's staff have made numerous inquiries in an attempt to understand current industry practice. Because several of the organizations which have been contacted have not responded in time for their responses to be compiled with the advance agenda materials, this compilation of information will be hand-carried to the Committee meeting on April 18.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/MHS
Attachment

Utah System of Higher Education

March 13, 2003

Health Insurance Relativities, 2002-2003

Red = Highest Relativity

Green = Lowest Relativity

University of Utah				USU	WSU	SUU	Snow	DSC	CEU	UVSC	SLCC	State of Utah
BCBS Indemnity	VC Basic	VC Preferred	UUHP									

I. Benefit Plan Relativities - Value of Net Employer Paid Benefits ⁽¹⁾

Hospital In-Patient	0.904	0.906	1.006	1.010	0.950	0.950	1.057	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.061	0.912	1.000
Hospital Out-Patient	0.913	0.915	0.981	0.984	0.940	0.938	1.091	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.023	0.925	1.000
Physician/Professional	0.996	1.001	1.090	1.092	1.051	1.006	1.107	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.082	0.996	1.000
Pharmacy	1.087	1.090	1.017	1.017	1.000	1.078	1.008	0.847	1.000	1.000	1.018	0.922	1.000
All Employer Paid Benefits	0.977	0.978	1.032	1.037	0.995	1.002	1.068	0.972	1.000	1.000	1.061	0.949	1.000

II. Premium Contributions

Employer Contribution	81%				93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%
Employee Contribution	19%				7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Employer Premium Relativity Index	0.871				1.000	1.075	1.075	1.075	1.075	1.075	1.075	1.075	1.000

III. Average Benefit and Premium Index

Employer Benefit/Premium Index	0.924	0.924	0.951	0.954	0.998	1.039	1.072	1.024	1.038	1.038	1.068	1.012	1.000
---------------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

IV. Demographic Relativity Factors ⁽²⁾

Per Covered Person Relative Cost Factor	0.977				1.022	1.110	0.924	0.975	1.063	0.973	1.026	1.038	1.038
Per Covered Employee Relative Cost Factor	0.924				1.013	1.285	1.092	1.357	1.362	1.223	1.071	1.152	1.152

Notes:

(1) Assumes a constant demographic mix and provider network. The PEHP plan at DSC and CEU is used as the standard 1.0 plan, since it is nearly identical to the PEHP plan offered to state employees. Source: Milliman USA, *Utah System of Higher Education Benefit Relativity and Demographic Study*, January 2003.

(2) Assumes a constant plan benefit (DSC/CEU plan) and provider network. Source: Milliman USA, *Utah System of Higher Education Benefit Relativity and Demographic Study*, January 2003.

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2003

TO: State Board of Regents
FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley
SUBJECT: Early Retirement

Issue

In conjunction with interest in health insurance and other benefits programs, the Board of Regents' Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee has asked for additional information on early retirement programs at USHE institutions. The information presented in this agenda item provides additional background with regard to these early retirement programs, along with benchmark comparisons for how this benefit is handled in other organizations.

Background

Through institutional policy and procedures, USHE institutions currently provide early retirement programs that allow employees who meet specified criteria to receive a stipend and insurance coverage until the employee is eligible for full retirement benefits. These programs have not been instituted primarily for cost-saving purposes, although cost savings can be realized in some circumstances. The greatest advantage to institutional officials of early retirement programs is the administrative flexibility realized through potential reallocations that would not have been possible without early retirees. This has a similar purpose to severance or buy-out packages used in the private sector.

Attachment 1 outlines the eligibility requirements, cash incentives, and medical insurance benefits provided by the nine two- and four-year institutions for early retirement. The policies outlined in this document do not include limited early-retirement windows containing additional incentives, such as the one offered by Salt Lake Community College in 2002. UCAT campuses are not included at this time, although those with their own personnel functions typically have an early retirement option along the lines of those offered by USHE institutions. Additional details on UCAT early retirement programs will be reported when they are received. The range of eligibility requirements, cash incentives, and insurance benefits are summarized below:

- **Eligibility Requirements** – Most institutions require that age plus years of service total 75, with a minimum age ranging from 56 to 60. A few institutions also have minimum years of service requirements, such as 10 or 15. Weber State University requires an employee to have 15 years of service and be within 10 years of full retirement age.

State Board of Regents
 April 9, 2003
 Page 2

- **Cash Incentives** – A stipend of generally 20 percent of the employee's salary for the previous 12 months is the common standard for most institutions. Some institutions limit the length of time the stipend can be awarded even though an employee may not have reached full retirement age, and others limit the amount of the stipend to the maximum Social Security bridge benefit at age 65. In addition, policies provide for the stipend to increase annually at some institutions to coincide with salary increases given to current employees.
- **Insurance Benefits** -- The type of insurance coverage offered to early retirees varies from medical only to medical, dental, vision, and life. The length of the coverage typically lasts for five years or until the early retiree is eligible for Medicare. Coverage is subject to the same changes in plan design and premiums that affect other institutional employees.

Attachment 2 provides a report on the number of employees who took advantage of these early retirement benefits during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. In total, 244 employees, including 106 faculty and 138 staff, initiated early retirement benefits during this two-year period. Of the 244 vacancies resulting from this action, institutional officials were able to identify 108 positions (44 percent) that were refilled. Other positions may have been left vacant or reallocated to another area. The annual salary and benefit costs associated with the 244 early retirees prior to their retirement averaged just under \$65,000.

Additional information on benchmarks for early retirement policies in state government agencies, public education, other colleges and universities, and the private sector continues to be assembled. For instance, Utah state agency employees do not have access to an early retirement program. However, they receive up to 5 years of health and life insurance coverage if they retire under age 65. In addition, they are able to cash out specified amounts of sick leave and converted sick leave upon retirement and use a portion of these proceeds to pay for health insurance costs if they are not yet Medicare-eligible when the 5 years of health coverage expires. Another example is the University of Colorado, which provides an early retirement benefit for employees whose age and years of service total 70 if at least 60 years of age, with additional years of service required for those ages 55 to 60. A more comprehensive supplement on early retirement benchmarks and practices will be hand-carried to the April 18 meeting.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This is an information item only; no action is needed.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/MHS/BLM
 Attachment

SUMMARY OF USHE EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

April 9, 2003

Institution	Eligibility	Cash Incentive	Insurance Benefits
University of Utah	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 75% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 60 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lesser of 20% of participant's annual salary at the time of early retirement <u>or</u> the estimate social security bridge maximum benefit at age 65 2. Cash incentive increases annually if University receives personal services appropriation increases from Legislature. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees for five years or until age 65
Utah State University	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 50% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 56 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lesser of 20% of participant's annual salary at the time of early retirement <u>or</u> the estimate social security bridge maximum benefit at age 65 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical and Dental Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees for six years or until age 65
Weber State University	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 15 years of full-time continuous service and within 10 years of Full Retirement Age (FRA) 2. Phased retirement available in which the retiree forfeits a portion of his or her full-time position for a year of eligibility for early retirement. 3. The total period in years of phased and total early retirement cannot exceed the period for which the stipend and benefits are paid. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depends on the point of entry into the program (years to FRA). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less than 1 – 3 years, 30% of base salary (Cannot exceed Social Security at FRA) b. 3-4 years, 25% c. 4-8 years, 20% d. 8-9 years, 16.67% e. 9-10 years, 14.28% 2. Stipend will be paid a maximum of 7 years 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depends on the point of entry into the program (years to FRA). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less than 1-8 years, University pays 100% Health Insurance Premium - 80% of Dental Insurance Premium b. 8-9 years, 83% - 66.6% c. 9-10 years, 71.4% - 57.1%

SUMMARY OF USHE EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

April 9, 2003

Institution	Eligibility	Cash Incentive	Insurance Benefits
Southern Utah University	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed full-time for 9 months or more per year 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 57 4. Employed a minimum of 6 years of University qualifying service credit, with service of full time for 9 months per year under institutional appointment at any other USHE institution will qualify for University service on a one-year for one-year basis 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lesser of 22% of participant's annual salary at the time of early retirement <u>or</u> the estimate social security bridge maximum benefit at age 65 – maximum of 6 year period 2. Cash incentive will be adjusted annually if University receives personal services appropriation increases from Legislature <u>or</u> any increase in the estimated Social Security maximum benefit for which the retiree will be eligible at 65 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical and Dental Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees until the first day of the month following the 65th birthday
Snow College <i>(as of July 1, 2003, Snow College South employees will be on the same plan as Snow College Ephraim)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 75% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 52 for Snow College South, 56 years of age for Snow College Ephraim 4. Up to 5 years full-time service at any USHE institution will qualify for credit 5. At least the last 10 years of service must be from Snow College Ephraim and/or Snow College South 6. Phased retirement available in which the retiree forfeits a portion of his or her full-time position for a year of eligibility for early retirement. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snow College Ephraim early retirement increases will continue for 6 years or age 65, the amount of stipend will be 20% of the last year's salary 2. For Snow College South those retiring with up to a 10 year bridge to Social Security at age 62 may have a reduced stipend. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Age 52, 12% of last salary b. 53, 13.33% c. 54, 15% d. 55, 17.14% e. 56-65, 20% 3. No yearly increases for Snow College South 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical, Dental, Vision, and Life Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees for 6 years or until age 65

SUMMARY OF USHE EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

April 9, 2003

Institution	Eligibility	Cash Incentive	Insurance Benefits
Dixie College	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 75% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 56 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equivalent to 20% of employees contracted salary for the 12 month period prior to the actual date of early retirement 2. Paid for a maximum of 6 years or age 65 3. Cash incentive will be adjusted annually at a rate determined by College administration and at the same rate received by college employees performing at a satisfactory level 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical and Dental Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees until the last day of the month following the 65th birthday, or the last day of the month which totals 6 years
College of Eastern Utah	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 75% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 56 4. Minimum of 15 years of full-time service at the College 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20% of participant's annual salary at the time of early retirement 2. Maximum of 5 years 3. Stipend will be adjusted annually according to the College's standard base salary and cost of living increase 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health and Dental Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees for five years or until the retiree becomes eligible for Medicare
Utah Valley State College	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 75% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 57 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20% of participant's annual salary at the time of early retirement 2. Maximum of 5 years 3. Stipend will be adjusted annually according to the College's standard base salary and cost of living increase 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents equal to that provided to regular full time employees until the retiree becomes eligible for Medicare

SUMMARY OF USHE EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

April 9, 2003

Institution	Eligibility	Cash Incentive	Insurance Benefits
Salt Lake Community College	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employed 75% or greater 2. Age combined with years of service totals 75 or more 3. Minimum age 57 4. Minimum of 15 years of full-time service at the College, <u>or</u> related employment with the USHE 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depends on the point of entry into the program (years to FRA). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less than 1 – 5 years, 20.5% of base salary b. 5-7 years, Pro-rated: stipend amount for 5 years divided by number of months employee selects to be paid c. 7 years, 14.3% 2. The stipend will be adjusted annually at a rate determined by the College administration, normally it will be at the same base increase as that given to faculty or staff, whichever employee group the early retiree worked under 3. Stipend will be paid a maximum of 7 years 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical and Dental Insurance provided to participant and eligible dependents at the same level provided to regular full time employees for seven years or until age 65 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Up to 5 years, 100% of premium b. 5.5 years, 90.9% c. 6 years, 83.3% d. 6.5 years, 76.9% e. 7 years, 71.4%

Utah System of Higher Education

Report on Early Retirees at USHE Institutions

Total Appropriated and Non-appropriated, 2000-2001	UU	USU	WSU	SUU	SNOW	SNOW RICHFIELD	DSC	CEU	UVSC	SLCC	USHE TOTAL
Section I. Faculty											
A. Faculty Early Retirees											
1. Number of Early Retirees	8	15	13	5	3	4	2	0	4	4	58
2. Early Retiree Position Vacancies Filled	n/a	13	10	4	1	0	2	0	4	4	38 ⁽¹⁾
B. Average Salary and Benefits of Faculty Early Retirees											
1. Average Annual Salary	\$61,278	\$60,122	\$54,278	\$64,041	n/a	n/a	\$47,523	\$0	\$46,680	\$46,698	\$47,578 ⁽²⁾
2. Average Annual Benefits	\$18,027	\$22,846	\$20,797	\$22,064	n/a	n/a	\$19,276	\$0	\$11,089	\$16,172	\$16,284 ⁽²⁾
3. Subtotal - Average Compensation	\$79,305	\$82,968	\$75,075	\$86,105	n/a	n/a	\$66,799	\$0	\$57,769	\$62,870	\$63,861 ⁽²⁾
Section II. Staff											
A. Staff Early Retirees											
1. Number of Early Retirees	22	11	9	6	7	0	3	2	3	6	69
2. Early Retiree Position Vacancies Filled	n/a	10	5	5	2	0	3	0	2	4	31 ⁽¹⁾
B. Average Salary and Benefits of Staff Early Retirees											
1. Average Annual Salary	\$51,769	\$82,389	\$40,731	\$43,082	n/a	\$0	\$35,508	\$59,878	\$40,822	\$43,611	\$44,199 ⁽²⁾
2. Average Annual Benefits	\$15,910	\$31,307	\$15,478	\$16,732	n/a	\$0	\$15,617	\$20,331	\$10,151	\$16,188	\$15,746 ⁽²⁾
3. Subtotal - Average Compensation	\$67,678	\$113,696	\$56,209	\$59,814	n/a	\$0	\$51,125	\$80,209	\$50,973	\$59,799	\$59,945 ⁽²⁾
Total Appropriated and Non-appropriated, 2001-2002	UU	USU	WSU	SUU	SNOW	SNOW RICHFIELD	DSC	CEU	UVSC	SLCC	USHE TOTAL
Section I. Faculty											
A. Faculty Early Retirees											
1. Number of Early Retirees	11	8	5	5	3	4	1	2	6	3	48
2. Early Retiree Position Vacancies Filled	n/a	2	1	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	15 ⁽¹⁾
B. Average Salary and Benefits of Faculty Early Retirees											
1. Average Annual Salary	\$66,700	\$83,313	\$52,809	\$61,770	n/a	n/a	\$54,305	\$36,095	\$45,165	\$48,125	\$56,035 ⁽²⁾
2. Average Annual Benefits	\$19,534	\$32,075	\$20,067	\$22,282	n/a	n/a	\$20,833	\$13,582	\$13,014	\$16,993	\$19,798 ⁽²⁾
3. Subtotal - Average Compensation	\$86,235	\$115,388	\$72,876	\$84,052	n/a	n/a	\$75,138	\$49,677	\$58,179	\$65,118	\$75,833 ⁽²⁾
Section II. Staff											
A. Staff Early Retirees											
1. Number of Early Retirees	22	25	4	2	3	0	0	5	2	6	69
2. Early Retiree Position Vacancies Filled	0	15	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	24 ⁽¹⁾
B. Average Salary and Benefits of Staff Early Retirees											
1. Average Annual Salary	\$39,993	\$75,385	\$40,197	\$50,161	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$41,039	\$75,287	\$73,785	\$43,983 ⁽²⁾
2. Average Annual Benefits	\$13,588	\$29,024	\$15,275	\$18,080	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$13,701	\$26,530	\$25,448	\$15,738 ⁽²⁾
3. Subtotal - Average Compensation	\$53,580	\$104,409	\$55,471	\$68,241	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$54,739	\$101,817	\$99,233	\$59,721 ⁽²⁾

Notes:

(1) USHE Total number of "Early Retiree Position Vacancies Filled" does not reflect possible positions filled at the University of Utah. This data was not available.

(2) USHE Total number represents simple averages of institutional data.

April 9, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Financial Controls and Auditing Practices

Issue

Recent events in higher education and corporate America have brought renewed attention to the importance of ethical business practices, effective systems of internal control, and appropriate action by auditors and audit committees. This agenda item will suggest a program of training for institutional staff and faculty to emphasize internal control, and will begin discussions of potential changes to Regents' policy to direct the work of Audit Committees of the Board of Regents and Boards of Trustees.

Discussion

The Utah System of Higher Education takes seriously its stewardship of public resources and wishes to demonstrate a renewed commitment to responsible management. After consultation with Presidents, the Commissioner is recommending that every institution undertake a program of training during the next twelve months for all management and supervisory personnel to ensure knowledge and compliance with effective internal financial control. Mr. Greg Fisher, Director of Internal Audit in the Office of the Commissioner, will present to the Committee examples of training materials which could be used by institutions for this purpose. He will also provide examples of warning signs of fraud, and will be prepared to discuss other programs already in use in the USHE to improve internal financial control. (Attachments 1 and 2)

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 was enacted by Congress after public outcry against corporate scandals. The Act mandates more public disclosure, strengthens corporate governance, makes senior management more accountable, heightens auditor independence, and increases oversight of auditors. At present, the new rules apply only to public companies, and the effects on colleges and universities will be indirect. However, institutional fiduciaries will find it difficult to justify practices which fall short of these new standards. Speaking on behalf of a working group of internal auditors from five institutions, Ms. Lynne Cartwright from Salt Lake Community College will lead a brief discussion of the implications of Sarbanes-Oxley for the USHE. (Attachments 3, 4 and 5)

Associate Commissioner Mark Spencer will begin discussion of potential policy changes to strengthen the oversight role of audit committees for the Board of Regents and Boards of Trustees. It is anticipated that the new language will encourage audit committees to interact more effectively with institutional administration, external auditors, and internal auditors. A representative of the Utah State Auditor will attend the Committee meeting on April 18, 2003, to participate in this discussion and respond to questions.

Regents' Policy R565, *Audit Review Subcommittee*, currently provides the functions and responsibilities of the Audit Review Subcommittee of the Board. Regents' Policy R566, *Audit Review Process*, currently provides direction for the efficient and orderly review of audits made at institutions and stipulates that such review is under the direction of the Audit Review Subcommittee. Attached for consideration by the Committee is a replacement R565, *Audit Committees*, which combines the previous R565 and R566 and also suggests a change in focus of Regent and Trustee Audit Committees. (Attachment 6)

Under the new R565, the Regent's Audit Committee would continue to function as a subcommittee of the Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee, but would shift its focus from reviewing numerous internal audits in favor of focusing on institution-level financial and internal control matters. This Committee would review annual financial statements of each institution, with appropriate analysis and explanation from institutional administration and external auditors, and would receive reports on the quality of internal controls at each institution. The Regents' Committee would also receive an annual report from Board of Trustees' Audit Committees regarding the internal audit program at each institution.

The new R565 also provides for an Audit Committee as a subcommittee of each institutional Board of Trustees. The Trustees' Audit Committee would assume responsibility for internal department-level audits within the institution. This committee would also review the annual financial statement and external audit before forwarding those documents to the Regents' Audit Committee.

These changes anticipate a closer working relationship among external auditors (statutory authority of the State Auditor), internal auditors, administration, and audit committees of Regents and Trustees. These changes are also intended to ensure that a process will exist for the receipt, retention, and treatment of complaints, including anonymous complaints, received by the institution regarding accounting, internal controls, or auditing practices.

Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee consider the proposed mandate for internal financial control training, ask questions, and consider recommending to the full Board that such training be required at all USHE institutions. It is also recommended that the Committee consider replacing existing Regents' policies R565 and R566 with a replacement policy R565, pose questions as needed, and request comment from institutions before placing it on the action agenda for the Board of Regents at its May 30 meeting.

A Short Summary of Sarbanes-Oxley: How it may apply to higher education institutions

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 primarily addresses deficiencies in relationships between publicly traded companies and their external audit firms. The act also attempts to control faulty financial reporting and auditing to protect shareholders. The new law amends other laws (primarily the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934) rather than actually creating a completely new law.

This act does not apply to non-profits or higher education institutions. However, the issues raised provide guidance to any institution desiring to assure stakeholders of the integrity of its operations. Although Sarbanes-Oxley specifically targets the relationship between the external auditors and the organization, the issues could equally apply to the internal audit function. The general intent of Sarbanes-Oxley improves the auditing function and internal control structure of any institution.

The table below shows relevant portions of Sarbanes-Oxley and current controls, practices, and structure within Utah's higher education system.

Section of Sarbanes-Oxley	Current Status in Utah
<p>Sec. 103 <u>Auditing, quality control, and independence standards and rules</u></p> <p>The Board shall establish standards for auditing, quality control, and independence. Besides the board-established rules, this section says: the audit standards shall include preparing and maintaining audit work papers and other information related to any audit report sufficient data to support the conclusions reached in the report for at least 7 years. The reports shall describe the audit scope, and test of the internal control structure and procedures. The Board shall establish independence rules.</p>	<p>Under the Utah State Constitution, the Utah State Auditor has authority to audit all public accounts and establish the standards for these audits. The State Auditor determines compliance with these standards. The Board of Regents and its audit sub-committee have established rules for review of audit reports and for internal auditors.</p>
<p>Sec. 108 <u>Accounting standards</u></p> <p>The section recognizes "generally accepted accounting standards" established by a standard setting body and based on accepted principles.</p>	<p>The State Auditor follows Generally Accepted Audit Standards for their financial audits and <i>The Yellow Book</i>, written by the General Accounting Office for Federal single audits. Internal Auditors follow a number of standards, most notably those promulgated by the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA).</p>

<p>Sec. 204 <u>Auditor reports to audit committees</u></p> <p>The Chief Audit Executive (CAE) reports to the committee on a timely basis regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · all critical accounting policies it will use · all alternative treatments of financial information and the ramification of that treatment · material written communication to or from the auditor such as a management letter or schedule of unadjusted differences. 	<p>The State Auditor has infrequent communication with the Regents. The Regents Audit Review Subcommittee reviews all institutions' annual audit reports. The Subcommittee receives reports from the internal audit departments at each institution and meets with the internal auditors periodically.</p> <p>Business officers primarily discuss the audit results with the State Auditor at each institution.</p> <p>Other provisions of this section have yet to be addressed by the Regents.</p>
<p>Sec. 301 <u>Public company audit committees</u></p> <p>Establishes standards for audit committees, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Committee maintains direct responsibility for the appointment, compensation, and oversight of audit work. · Auditors report to the Audit Committee. · Committee members must be independent · Independence includes no consulting or advisory services and working for the organization. · Audit Committee establishes complaint procedures · Committee may engage advisors 	<p>The current Regents' Audit Subcommittee does not fulfill any of the roles envisioned here. The State Auditor controls the appointment, compensation and audit work oversight for external auditors. The Regents may provide input to the State Auditor on use of certain audit firms or issues of concern for the external auditor to evaluate. Existing Regent policy provides for Trustee approval of a President's action related to hiring or termination of Internal Audit CAEs.</p> <p>On an individual institution level, this type of structure remains inconsistent. Most larger institutions have an audit committee of their Boards of Trustees. SLCC and the smaller institutions do not have audit committees from the Trustees.</p> <p>The relationship between the Internal Audit CAE and the committee depends primarily upon the committee chairperson. These committees do not comply with the provisions specified.</p>
<p>Sec. 302 <u>Corporate responsibility for financial reports</u></p> <p>Requires the principal executive officer and the principal financial officer to certify in each report filed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the signing officer reviewed the report 	<p>Current USHE reporting falls short of these recommended practices.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · to the best of the signing officer's knowledge the report does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact · the financial statements fairly reflect in all material respects the financial condition and results of the operation · the signing officers acknowledge establish and maintain internal controls and those controls ensure management knows of material information · they have evaluated the effectiveness of the internal controls within 90 days prior to the report · the officers have made conclusions about the effectiveness of their internal controls · they have noted any significant deficiencies in the design or operation of the internal controls · the officers have disclosed to the auditors any fraud among those who play a significant role in the internal control structure · the officers noted any changes to the internal controls that could affect the controls subsequent to the evaluation. 	
<p>Sec. 303 <u>Improper influence on conduct of audits</u> It shall be unlawful to for any officer or director of an institution to take any action fraudulently influence, coerce, manipulate, or mislead auditors.</p>	<p>No statute or Regents guidance specifically addresses the influence issue.</p>
<p>Sec. 404 <u>Management assessment of internal controls</u> Management must make and report, to be included in the annual audit, the effectiveness of the internal control structure and procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · state the responsibility for management for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control structure and procedures for financial reporting · contain an assessment, at the end of each fiscal year, of the effectiveness of those internal controls. · the external auditor attests to the effectiveness of those controls 	<p>No management team at any Utah higher education institution performs this function as described.</p>

<p><u>Sec. 406 Code of Ethics for senior financial officers</u></p> <p>Companies must disclose if they have a code of ethics for senior financial officers. Standards must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · honest and ethical conduct, including any possible conflicts of interest · full, fair, accurate, timely, and understandable disclosures · compliance with government rules and regulations 	<p><i>The Utah Public Officers and Employees Ethics Act (Utah Code §67-16) applies to all employees. However, only the conflict of interest portion within Sarbanes-Oxley match with the conflict of interest mandates in §67-16. The law does not address ethics in general.</i></p> <p>Responsibility for full codes of ethics rests with individual institutions currently. Some have codes and others do not.</p> <p>Reporting, investigating, and adjudicating violations vary widely and often follow no set procedures.</p>
<p><u>Sec. 407 Disclosure of audit committee financial expert</u></p> <p>The audit committee of the institution has at least one member who is a financial expert. The expert has, through education and experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · knowledge of generally accepted accounting principles and financial statements · experience in preparing or auditing financial statements · experience with internal accounting controls · understanding audit committee functions 	<p><i>Utah Code §64-91-301(2) says:</i></p> <p>The appointing authority shall ensure that audit committee members have the expertise to provide effective oversight of and advice about internal audit activities and services.</p> <p>The Utah Code does not specifically require financial expertise, nor does Regent guidance or individual institutional policy.</p>
<p><u>Sec. 802 Criminal penalties for altering documents</u></p> <p>Penalties for those who knowingly alter, destroy, mutilate, conceal, cover up, falsify, or make a false entry in any record, document, or tangible object with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the investigation or proper administration of any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States or any case filed. Audit workpapers remain available for five years from the end of the fiscal period audited.</p>	<p><i>Utah Code §76-8-412, 413, and 511 provide criminal penalties for those who steal, destroy, mutilate, deface, alter, falsify, remove, or secret government documents.</i></p> <p>§502 and 503 have criminal penalties for making false or inconsistent statements.</p>
<p><u>Sec. 806 Protection for employees . . . who provide evidence of fraud</u></p> <p>No one may discharge, demote, suspend, threaten, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against an employee for any</p>	<p>State statute and Regent guidance do not mention any whistle-blower protections. Individual institutions may have some protections.</p>

lawful act done by the employee to provide information or assist in an investigation regarding any conduct that violated to law relating to fraud.	
<p>Sec. 1107 <u>Retaliation against informants</u></p> <p>A person may not knowingly, with the intent to retaliate, take any action harmful for those providing information to law enforcement or other similar bodies.</p>	<p>State statute and Regent guidance do not mention any whistle-blower protections. Individual institutions may have some protections.</p>

R565 Audit Committees

R565-1. Purpose

To provide for the functions and responsibilities of Audit Committees within the Utah System of Higher Education (System).

R565-2. References

- 2.1. Utah Code [§53B-6-102](#) (Standardized Systems Prescribed by the Board)
- 2.2. Utah Code [§53B-7-101](#) (Financial Affairs Under the General Supervision of the Board)
- 2.3. Utah Code [Title 52, Chapter 4](#) (Utah Open and Public Meeting Act)
- 2.4. Policy and Procedures [R561](#), Accounting and Financial Controls
- 2.5. Policy and Procedures [R567](#), Internal Audit Program

R565-3. Creation of Audit Committees

- 3.1. **Creation of Regents Audit Committee** – There is hereby created a Regents Audit Committee as a standing subcommittee of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee.
- 3.2. **Creation of Trustee Audit Committees** - Each Board of Trustees will create a standing Audit Committee to assist the full board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities for financial matters.

R565-4. Audit Committee Charters

4.1 Purpose

- 4.1.1 **Regents Audit Committee** - To assist the Board of Regents in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities for the financial reporting processes, the system of internal control, audit processes, and processes for monitoring compliance with laws and regulations. This includes assessing each institution's control environment.
- 4.1.2 **Trustee Audit Committee** -To assist the Board of Trustees in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities for financial matters.
- 4.2 **Authority** –
 - 4.2.1 **Regents Audit Committee** - The Regents Audit Committee has authority to:
 - 4.2.1.1 Collaborate with the State Auditors in the appointment of principal external auditor(s).

4.2.1.2 Seek information from institutional trustee audit committees and administrations, all of whom are directed to cooperate with Committee requests.

4.2.1.3 Meet with external auditors, legal counsel, or others as necessary.

4.2.2 **Trustee Audit Committee** - The Trustee Audit Committee has authority to:

4.2.2.1 Meet with institutional officers, external auditors or legal counsel as considered necessary.

4.2.2.2 Coordinate the work of the principal external auditor(s) to conduct the annual audit(s).

4.2.2.3 Mediate any disagreements between the administration and the principal external auditor(s) regarding financial reporting.

4.2.2.4 Seek information from the administration, faculty, or staff—all of whom are directed to cooperate with committee requests—or external parties.

4.2.2.5 Conduct or authorize investigations into any matters considered necessary to achieve its purpose.

4.2.2.6 Retain independent counsel, accountants, or others to advise the Committee or assist in the conduct of an investigation.

4.3 Composition

4.3.1 **Regents Audit Committee** - The Regents Audit Committee will consist of at least three and no more than six members of the Board of Regents. The members, individually, will be independent and free from any relationship the Board of Regents believes would interfere with the exercise of each member's judgment as a member of the Committee. All members of the Committee will have a working familiarity with basic finance and accounting practices, and at least one member of the Committee will have accounting or related financial management expertise. Committee members may enhance their familiarity with finance and accounting by participating in educational programs conducted by the institution or an outside consultant. The Committee members will be appointed by the Chair of the Regents. Unless a Committee chair is appointed by the Board chair, the members of the Committee may designate a Chair by majority vote.

4.3.2 **Trustee Audit Committee** - The Audit Committee will consist of at least three and no more than six members of the Board of Trustees, each of whom shall be independent and free from any relationship that, in the opinion of the Board of Trustees, would interfere with the exercise of his or her independent judgment as a member of the Committee. All members of the Committee shall have a working familiarity with basic finance and accounting practices, and at least one member of the Committee shall have accounting or related financial management

expertise. Committee members may enhance their familiarity with finance and accounting by participating in educational programs conducted by the institution or an outside consultant. The Committee members will be appointed by the Chair of the Trustees. Unless a Committee chair is appointed by the Board chair, the members of the Committee may designate a Chair by majority vote.

4.4 Meetings

4.4.1 Regents Audit Committee - The Committee will meet at least once a year with each institution's Trustees Audit Committee, with the authority to convene additional meetings as required. It may also meet separately with institutional administrations, internal auditors, or external auditors. Meeting agendas will be prepared and provided in advance to members, along with appropriate briefing materials. Minutes will be prepared.

4.4.2 Trustee Audit Committee - The Committee shall meet at least three times a year, with authority to convene additional meetings, as required. The Committee will invite members of the administration, auditors, or others to attend meetings and provide pertinent information. Meeting agendas will be prepared and provided in advance to members, along with appropriate briefing materials. Minutes will be prepared.

4.5 Responsibilities

4.5.1 External Audits and Financial Statements

4.5.1.1 Regent Audit Committee

4.5.1.1.1 Ensure there is regular, independent communication and information flow between the Audit Committee and principal external auditor(s). The Committee will regularly schedule such meetings or correspondence whether or not irregularities or other problems have been identified.

4.5.1.1.2 Review significant accounting and reporting issues and understand their impact on the financial statements.

4.5.1.1.3 Review with institutional administrations and principal external auditor(s) the results of each audit, including any difficulties encountered. This review will include the audit scope and approach, any restrictions on the independent auditor's activities or on access to requested information, and any significant disagreements with institutional administration.

4.5.1.2 Trustee Audit Committee

4.5.1.2.1 Review the external auditors' audit scope and approach, including any coordination of audit effort with internal audit.

4.5.1.2.2 Ensure there is regular, independent communication and information flow between the Audit Committee and the principal external auditor(s). Such meetings or correspondence shall be regularly scheduled regardless of the identification of any irregularities or problems.

- 4.5.1.2.3 Review significant accounting and reporting issues and understand their impact on the financial statements. This includes reviewing the administration's discussion and analysis of the financial statements, along with any analyses prepared by institutional administration and/or external auditors setting forth significant financial reporting issues and judgments made in connection with the preparation of the financial statements.
- 4.5.1.2.4 Review with the administration and the principal external auditor(s) the results of annual financial statement audits, including any difficulties encountered. This review will include identification of any restrictions on the scope of the auditor's activities, access to requested information, and any significant disagreements with the administration.

4.5.2 Internal Control

4.5.2.1 Regent Audit Committee

- 4.5.2.1.1 Review reports from institutional administrations regarding the quality of their respective systems of internal control—as defined by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO). This includes assessing the institution's control environment, means of communicating standards of conduct, and practices with respect to risk assessment and risk management.
- 4.5.2.1.2 Review reports from external and internal auditors regarding the quality of institutional systems of internal control.
- 4.5.2.1.3 Ensure that an appropriate process exists for the receipt, retention, and treatment of complaints, including anonymous complaints, received by any institution regarding accounting, internal controls, or auditing matters.

4.5.2.2 Trustee Audit Committee

- 4.5.2.2.1 Review the effectiveness of the institution's system of internal control, including assessment of the institution's risks and control environment.
- 4.5.2.2.2 Receive and review reports from the administration regarding the internal control system and any breaches in internal control, including the control environment and risk assessment processes.
- 4.5.2.2.3 Ensure that an appropriate process exists for the receipt, retention, and treatment of complaints, including anonymous complaints, received by the institution regarding accounting, internal controls, or auditing matters.

4.5.3 Compliance

4.5.3.1 Regent Audit Committee

- 4.5.3.1.1 Review reports from institutional administrations regarding the effectiveness of their system for monitoring compliance with laws and regulations.

- 4.5.3.1.2 Obtain regular updates from institutional administration and/or institutional legal counsel regarding instances of noncompliance with material implications for the System.

4.5.3.2 **Trustee Audit Committee**

- 4.5.3.2.1 Review the effectiveness of the administration's system for monitoring compliance with laws and regulations.
- 4.5.3.2.2 Obtain regular updates from the administration and/or institutional legal counsel regarding instances of noncompliance with material implications for the institution.

4.5.4 **Internal Audit**

4.5.4.1 **Regent Audit Committee**

- 4.5.4.1.1 Receive summary reports from chief internal audit executives, at least annually, regarding the results of the internal auditing program at each institution. Such reports may include plans, activities, staffing and organizational structure, and the results of audits.
- 4.5.4.1.2 Evaluate whether there are any unjustified restrictions or limitations on internal auditing programs.
- 4.5.4.1.3 Review and concur in the appointment, replacement, or dismissal of chief internal audit executives.
- 4.5.4.1.4 Ensure there is regular, independent communication and information flow between the Committee and the chief internal audit executives. The Committee will regularly schedule such meetings or correspondence whether or not any irregularities or other problems have been identified.

4.5.4.2 **Trustee Audit Committee**

- 4.5.4.2.1 Review with the administration and the chief audit executive the charter, plans, activities, staffing and organizational structure of the internal audit function.
- 4.5.4.2.2 Ensure there are no unjustified restrictions or limitations on internal auditing programs.
- 4.5.4.2.3 Review and concur in the appointment, replacement, or dismissal of the chief audit executive.
- 4.5.4.2.4 Receive and review internal audit reports and/or periodic summaries of internal audit activities prepared by the chief internal audit executive.
- 4.5.4.2.5 Ensure there is regular, independent communication and information flow between the Committee and the chief internal audit executive. Such meetings

or correspondence shall be regularly scheduled regardless of the identification of any irregularities or problems.

4.6 Reporting

4.6.1 Regent Audit Committee

4.6.1.1.1 At least annually, the Committee will provide a report or minutes of meetings to the full Board of Regents detailing the Committee's activities and recommendations.

4.6.1.2 Trustee Audit Committee

4.6.1.2.1 At least annually, the Audit Committee shall provide a report or minutes of meetings to the full Board of Trustees detailing the Committee's activities and recommendations and forward this report to the Regents Audit Committee.

R565-5 Necessary Actions Not Contemplated by R565-4

5.1. To assure appropriate institutional or System governance, the **Regents Audit Committee** is authorized to pursue other actions which the Committee believes are needed.

5.2 The **Trustee Audit Committee** may pursue other courses of action which the Committee believes are needed.

(Adopted ???????,2003)

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2003

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Refinement of "Report Card"

Issue

During discussions of the 2002 Master Planning Task Force on Funding, Regents and Presidents discussed refining the USHE Facts at a Glance pamphlet. The objective was to create more of a "report card" that includes historical comparisons and indicators of change for key indicators in the USHE. With the completion of the 2003-2004 USHE Data Book, the data and format of the Facts at a Glance pamphlet has been updated to reflect a "Report Card." Because of differences in comparability and the ongoing development of data collection processes for the Utah College of Applied Technology (UCAT), data for UCAT are not included in the Report Card at this time.

Background

The Report Card includes nine indicators. The most current data is listed for each, along with percentage increases over one-year and five-year periods (or fewer than five-years if data are not available). A brief explanation of each indicator is described below:

- I. **2002-2003 USHE Total Enrollments** – Headcount and full-time equivalent enrollments for budget-related and self-supporting students by residency are listed for each institution.
- II. **2003-2004 Annual Undergraduate Tuition and Fees** – The resident and nonresident undergraduate tuition and fees approved by the Regents for 2003-2004 are listed, along with the one-year and five-year percentage changes for undergraduate resident tuition and fees.
- III. **2001-02 Tuition as a Percent of Total Instructional Costs** – Based on the 2001-02 USHE Cost Study, this calculation shows the percentage of total instructional costs that are financed with tuition revenue, including the amount this percentage has increased over one and five years.
- IV. **2001-02 USHE Full Cost of Instruction per FTE** – Shows the full cost of instruction per FTE at each level of instruction (vocational, lower division, upper division, basic graduate,

State Board of Regents
 April 9, 2003
 Page 2

and advanced graduate) and in total for each institution. The percent change refers to the institutional total for all levels compared to earlier periods.

- V. **2001-02 USHE Student-Faculty Ratios** – Calculated as part of the USHE Cost Study, student-faculty ratios are listed by level of instruction and in total for each institution, along with the corresponding one- and five-year percentage changes.
- VI. **2001-02 USHE Degrees and Awards** – The number of degrees and awards provided by each institution is broken down by type of award, along with the associated total increase over one- and five-year periods.
- VII. **2002 Fall Faculty Teaching Load** -- Three measures of faculty teaching load are included: (1) average instructional credit hours, (2) average student credit hours, and (3) percent of instruction done by part-time faculty, including teaching assistants, adjuncts, and regular faculty overload. Indicators of change over one-year and four-year periods are also provided for each measure.
- VIII. **2002 Fall USHE FTE Employees** – Provides a report of the number of full-time equivalent USHE employees. The first table includes appropriated and non-appropriated employees, the second table includes appropriated employees only, and the third table includes a calculation reflecting the number of FTE students per appropriated employee. One-year and three-year percentage changes are indicated for the institutional totals in each table.
- IX. **2002 Fall USHE Space Inventory** – Shows the total gross square feet in each institution's inventory, as well as the "Q&P" net square feet. The Q&P net square feet refers to the Regents Qualification and Prioritization process and the square footage that is compared to a calculated need for each institution to assess requests for additional space. The amount of Q&P net square feet is divided by FTE student enrollment to calculate Q&P net square feet per student at each institution. The percentage change in the calculated-space-per-student indicator is shown over one- and three-year periods.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This is a discussion item only; no action is needed. Regents may wish to advise staff regarding the formatting of the report card or the indicators that are presented.

CHF/MHS/BLM
 Attachment

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

VIII. 2002 Fall USHE FTE Employees**Appropriated and Non-appropriated**

	Regular Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Teach. Assist.	Exec.	Staff	Total	1-yr change	3-yr change	
UU	1,573	857	819	44	10,420	13,713	0.4%	3.7%	↑
USU	816	90	366	29	2,979	4,280	0.5%	9.9%	↑
WSU	461	72	0	17	1,014	1,564	-12.1%	-10.5%	↓
SUU	203	38	0	20	630	891	-0.8%	1.6%	•
SC	144	54	0	8	304	510	3.0%	22.7%	↑
DSC	89	92	0	8	380	569	-6.7%	17.3%	•
CEU	66	3	0	6	235	310	-24.1%	-15.3%	↓
UVSC	344	492	0	25	1,075	1,936	8.9%	30.5%	↑
SLCC	318	548	0	15	1,219	2,100	10.6%	13.0%	↑
OCHE	0	0	0	9	177	186	2.2%	n/a	•
USHE	4,014	2,246	1,185	181	18,433	26,059	0.4%	7.0%	↑

Source: 2003-2004 USHE Data Book Tab J

Appropriated Only

	Regular Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Teach. Assist.	Exec.	Staff	Total	1-yr change	3-yr change	
UU	997	305	324	40	2,503	4,169	-1.3%	7.7%	•
USU	734	84	210	26	1,495	2,549	1.2%	6.6%	↑
WSU	452	72	0	17	707	1,248	-7.2%	-2.3%	↓
SUU	200	18	0	20	364	602	-1.8%	0.3%	•
SC	134	54	0	8	231	427	5.7%	15.8%	↑
DSC	89	91	0	8	207	395	-9.2%	11.6%	•
CEU	61	2	0	5	125	193	-26.9%	-17.9%	↓
UVSC	342	492	0	24	724	1,582	13.3%	43.0%	↑
SLCC	311	485	0	14	831	1,641	9.1%	12.2%	↑
OCHE	—	—	—	4	22	26	4.0%	n/a	•
USHE	3,320	1,603	534	166	7,209	12,832	0.8%	10.0%	↑

Source: 2003-2004 USHE Data Book Tab J

FTE Students per Appropriated Employee

	Regular Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Teach. Assist.	Exec.	Staff	Total	1-yr change	3-yr change	
UU	23.3	76.3	71.8	581.9	9.3	5.6	6.0%	11.1%	↑
USU	23.6	206.4	82.6	666.9	11.6	6.8	2.3%	8.3%	↑
WSU	31.5	197.8	—	837.5	20.1	11.4	16.1%	23.4%	↑
SUU	27.9	309.7	—	278.8	15.3	9.3	1.8%	3.6%	↑
SC	19.8	49.1	—	331.6	11.5	6.2	-12.1%	-19.1%	↓
DSC	44.9	43.9	—	499.9	19.3	10.1	15.3%	5.9%	↑
CEU	34.5	1,053.5	—	421.4	16.9	10.9	35.3%	26.8%	↑
UVSC	46.8	32.5	—	666.6	22.1	10.1	-4.3%	-6.1%	↓
SLCC	54.9	35.2	—	1,220.3	20.6	10.4	-4.5%	4.0%	•
OCHE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	•
USHE	30.8	63.8	191.5	616.1	14.2	8.0	3.8%	7.7%	↑

IX. 2002 Fall USHE Space Inventory

	TOTAL GSF	Q & P NSF ⁽¹⁾	Q&P NSF/ per student ⁽²⁾	1-year change	3-yr change	
UU	10,654,729	3,216,891	117.0	-3.4%	2.7%	↑
USU	4,048,558	1,821,769	92.4	-3.3%	-12.0%	↓
WSU	2,345,263	993,248	64.4	-3.1%	-14.9%	↑
SUU	1,208,696	576,314	94.0	0.2%	14.8%	•
SC	650,792	328,887	112.6	-17.9%	-14.2%	↓
DSC	675,695	387,842	88.0	-13.4%	-18.0%	•
CEU	548,735	231,804	106.6	1.3%	-18.9%	↓
UVSC	1,527,391	690,223	37.2	-7.4%	-1.4%	↑
SLCC	1,631,892	1,107,791	62.9	5.3%	-4.4%	•
Total	23,291,751	9,354,769	85.2	-4.1%	-6.7%	↓

Source: 2003-2004 Data Book Tab L

(1) All assignable net square feet of space except auxiliary, hospital, and institutional unique.

(2) Q&P Net Square Feet per FTE Student.

Utah System of Higher Education

Facts at a Glance Report Card



USHE 1% Compensation (2003-2004)	\$6,898,457
USHE 1% Tuition (2003-2004)	\$2,359,500

Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education
Board of Regents Building, The Gateway
60 South 400 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1284
(801) 321-7100
www.utahsbr.edu
Updated April 2003

Updated April 2003

I. 2002-03 USHE Total Enrollments**Fall Headcount (Budget-related and Self-Support)**

	Resident	Nonres	Total	1-yr change	5-yr change	
UU	25,977	3,944	29,921	8.2%	14.3%	↑
USU	20,435	2,413	22,848	-0.7%	7.6%	•
WSU	17,302	1,352	18,654	8.1%	24.9%	↑
SUU	5,360	521	5,881	-3.5%	-2.1%	↓
SC	3,493	275	3,768	-8.0%	13.3%	↑
DSC	6,722	751	7,473	3.0%	35.8%	•
CEU	2,584	62	2,646	-3.6%	-25.8%	↓
UVSC	21,070	2,539	23,609	4.4%	47.6%	↑
SLCC	23,212	613	23,825	-1.6%	-2.0%	↓
Total	126,155	12,470	138,625	2.7%	14.5%	↑

Annualized FTE (Budget-related and Self-Support)

	Resident	Nonres	Total	1-yr change	5-yr change	
UU	23,274	4,211	27,485	4.7%	24.6%	↑
USU	17,339	2,387	19,726	3.6%	15.7%	↑
WSU	14,238	1,192	15,430	7.7%	25.7%	↑
SUU	5,575	554	6,129	-0.1%	8.6%	•
SC	2,653	267	2,920	-7.0%	3.9%	•
DSC	3,999	410	4,409	4.7%	30.1%	↑
CEU	2,107	67	2,174	-1.1%	9.9%	•
UVSC	15,999	2,542	18,541	8.4%	62.6%	↑
SLCC	17,084	514	17,598	4.2%	21.3%	↑
Total	102,268	12,144	114,412	4.7%	25.6%	↑

Source: 2002-2003 Data Book Tab C

II. 2003-04 Annual Undergraduate ⁽¹⁾ Tuition and Fees

	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident 1-yr change	Resident 5-yr change	
UU	\$3,650	\$11,296	9.8%	34.6%	↑
USU	\$3,141	\$8,946	8.4%	39.9%	↑
WSU	\$2,632	\$8,704	8.4%	32.5%	↑
SUU	\$2,794	\$8,158	18.9%	46.4%	↑
SC	\$1,670	\$6,372	9.7%	30.4%	↑
DSC	\$1,778	\$6,554	10.3%	26.8%	↑
CEU	\$1,740	\$6,228	6.7%	29.2%	↑
UVSC	\$2,450	\$7,630	11.6%	55.7%	↑
SLCC	\$2,035	\$6,277	7.7%	32.0%	↑

(1) Undergraduate Tuition and Centrally Administered Fees for 2 semesters at 15 credit hours.

III. 2001-02 Tuition as % of Total Instructional Costs

	Percent	1-year change	5-year change	
UU	32.0%	10.1%	15.5%	↑
USU	34.6%	9.0%	8.9%	↑
WSU	32.3%	5.5%	19.1%	↑
SUU	27.9%	3.5%	-15.4%	•
SC	23.8%	10.6%	-1.9%	•
DSC	29.1%	12.7%	18.2%	↑
CEU	18.8%	10.0%	18.9%	↑
UVSC	43.1%	0.2%	13.1%	↑
SLCC	31.9%	2.6%	6.1%	↑
USHE	32.8%	7.4%	12.0%	↑

Source: 2001-2002 USHE Cost Study (Appropriated), Data Book Tab I

IV. 2001-02 USHE Full Cost of Instruction per FTE

	Vocat-tional	Lower Div.	Upper Div.	Basic Grad.	Adv. Grad.	All Levels	1-yr chg.	5-yr chg.	
UU	\$0	\$6,738	\$8,656	\$13,156	\$21,430	\$9,451	-0.5%	6.2%	•
USU	6,136	5,162	8,004	10,576	15,345	6,988	7.0%	16.8%	↑
WSU	6,659	5,331	8,386	9,021	0	6,421	1.5%	2.1%	↑
SUU	6,788	5,690	6,798	8,576	0	6,309	3.9%	14.9%	↑
SC	8,572	5,959	0	0	0	6,667	-1.7%	17.0%	•
DSC	6,958	4,577	6,951	0	0	5,062	7.7%	7.3%	↑
CEU	7,207	6,488	0	0	0	6,754	-1.6%	12.1%	•
UVSC	5,925	3,963	4,230	0	0	4,505	4.9%	5.8%	↑
SLCC	6,356	4,259	0	0	0	5,070	5.6%	19.3%	↑
USHE	\$6,480	\$5,140	\$7,921	\$11,912	\$20,378	\$6,677	2.3%	8.1%	↑

V. 2001-2002 USHE Student Faculty Ratios

	Vocat-tional	Lower Div.	Upper Div.	Basic Grad.	Adv. Grad.	All Levels	1-yr chg.	5-yr chg.	
UU	0	23.2	17.4	11.7	7.2	16.2	6.6%	9.5%	↑
USU	21.6	32.8	19.4	13.4	9.9	22.4	-0.4%	8.2%	•
WSU	20.6	30.5	13.6	13.3	0.0	21.4	4.9%	17.6%	↑
SUU	21.0	25.0	18.9	18.0	0.0	21.8	0.9%	-1.4%	•
SC	17.4	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.6	16.1%	6.4%	↑
DSC	9.8	20.6	12.7	0.0	0.0	17.0	-0.6%	-15.8%	↓
CEU	14.4	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.9	-1.2%	5.0%	•
UVSC	15.7	23.3	25.8	0.0	0.0	20.9	3.5%	10.6%	↑
SLCC	14.1	25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.3	4.9%	9.7%	↑
USHE	15.6	25.2	17.7	12.5	7.5	19.4	4.3%	9.0%	↑

Source: 2001-2002 USHE Cost Study (Appropriated), Data Book Tab I

VI. 2001-2002 USHE Degrees and Awards

	Cert.	Assoc.	Bacc.	Masters	Doct.	1st Prf	Total	1-yr %	5-yr %	
UU	160	0	4,261	1,155	218	240	6,034	10.8%	19.9%	↑
USU	5	100	2,582	806	69	0	3,562	0.1%	6.9%	↑
WSU	80	1,442	1,803	86	0	0	3,411	1.5%	13.7%	↑
SUU	17	62	862	111	0	0	1,052	-3.1%	13.7%	•
SC	134	765	0	0	0	0	899	10.0%	36.2%	↑
DSC	211	801	37	0	0	0	1,049	0.8%	22.7%	↑
CEU	86	464	0	0	0	0	550	9.8%	9.8%	↑
UVSC	163	2,086	732	0	0	0	2,981	18.4%	91.1%	↑
SLCC	220	2,556	0	0	0	0	2,776	10.8%	30.7%	↑
USHE	1,076	8,276	10,277	2,158	287	240	22,314	7.1%	24.0%	↑

Cert.=Certificate, Short-term certificates, other awards; 1st Prf=first professional, e.g. MD, JD, etc.

VII. 2002 Fall Faculty Teaching Load

	Average Instructional Credit Hours	1-year change	4-year change		Average Student Cr. Hrs	1-year change	4-year change	
UU	9.70	-16.3%	-7.8%	↓	233.3	4.2%	11.0%	↑
USU	10.36	-6.2%	-2.0%	↓	246.0	-10.0%	-1.8%	↓
WSU	12.70	1.0%	2.6%	↑	304.1	6.8%	10.1%	↑
SUU	12.45	-0.2%	-2.9%	↓	288.1	-3.0%	-8.0%	↓
SC	18.06	-0.2%	24.0%	•	298.9	-7.8%	-18.5%	↓
DSC	17.16	14.3%	1.8%	↑	383.2	0.0%	-2.6%	•
CEU	17.72	5.0%	28.4%	↑	320.2	4.0%	20.0%	↑
UVSC	13.46	-0.7%	-10.1%	↓	308.0	-4.1%	-6.5%	↓
SLCC	13.64	-5.7%	-3.9%	↓	283.2	1.3%	14.2%	↑
USHE	11.84	-6.3%	-2.1%	↓	269.9	-0.7%	3.9%	•

Source: 2003-2004 USHE Data Book Tab J

	Part-time Instruction	1-year change	4-year change	
UU	29.0%	-2.0%	-11.6%	↓
USU	46.0%	8.2%	36.9%	↑
WSU	37.4%	-3.9%	10.3%	•
SUU	22.6%	-1.7%	32.2%	•
SC	34.3%	17.1%	39.4%	↑
DSC	54.2%	18.1%	29.0%	↑
CEU	30.8%	3.7%	14.9%	↑
UVSC	56.4%	5.2%	7.4%	↑
SLCC	60.7%	2.5%	8.8%	↑
USHE	43.5%	4.3%	14.5%	↑

Source: 2003-2004 USHE Data Book Tab J

Report Card Key

- ↑ = upward trend
- ↓ = downward trend
- = no trend

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2003

TO: Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: USHE – Proposed Operations and Maintenance Budget Request Model

Issue

On September 12, 2002, the Board of Regents considered a list of capital development projects to propose to the Legislature for 2003-2004. At that time, questions were raised as to how institutions determined the dollar amount to be requested for Operations and Maintenance (O & M) for new capital development projects. The same question arose in a subsequent presentation to the State Building Board. Because there was considerable variation in the institutional responses to the question, staff from the State Division of Facilities and Construction Management (DFCM), the Commissioner's Office, and USHE institutions agreed to form a working group to pursue the feasibility of a standard statewide budget request model for O&M budget requests for new space.

Discussion

There is currently a wide range of actual costs for O&M among USHE institutions. This range can be attributed to a long history of differences among institutions, including the following: historical pattern of funding levels, differences in age of buildings, differences in types of buildings and uses of space, and differences in climate, utility use, and utility providers. The common pattern for determining the amount of O&M to be requested has been that of each institution adding some desired dollar amount per square foot to current costs to arrive at an ideal projected level of future funding. This pattern has persisted through the years with little System or DFCM guidance.

The O&M Working Group, initially composed of representatives from DFCM, the Office of the Commissioner, and three institutions (UofU, USU, CEU) began several months ago looking in the literature for existing models for O&M costs. The Working Group found no one single source to have the answer, but by using elements of three sources, plus recent cost information from the institutions, the Working Group was able to construct a mathematical model for determining O&M costs for new facilities.

Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee
April 9, 2003
Page 2

As suggested by the Federal Facilities Council¹, and described in Attachment 1, the model proposes using Current Replacement Value (CRV) as the base for calculations. Maintenance and Operations costs are calculated separately as percentages of the current replacement value of the capital asset. Varying percentages are used for five different building types. A standard percentage is used in calculating the operations value for all building types. Because of variations of utilities costs among building types, the model provides utility cost differentiation.

This budget request model has been discussed in a statewide meeting of institutional facilities administrators, the Utah Association of Physical Plant Administrators (UAPPA). That group also developed a worksheet (Attachment 2) which can be used by institutions to test the model. It is suggested that all USHE institutions test the model between now and the May 30 Board of Regents meeting where the model may be considered for action. If the model is endorsed in principle by the Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee, it is anticipated that the model will also be presented in draft form to the State Building Board on May 7, 2003.

Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee review the attached O&M Budget Request Model, ask questions which may arise, and endorse the draft model in principle prior to its possible consideration for action at the Board's May 30, 2003, meeting.

CHF/MHS
Attachments

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

¹ *Budgeting for Facilities Maintenance and Repair Activities*, Federal Facilities Council Standing Committee on Operations and Maintenance, Report Number 131, 1996.

**Proposed
Operations and Maintenance
Budget Request Model
*Draft (4/8/03)***

The following funding model is being proposed to the Board of Regents and the State Building Board for determining the amount of funding requests for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) of higher education capital projects. This model will be implemented for a five-year period with provision for annual adjustment to fuel and power values. The model will be used for all future O&M requests during the proposed trial period. In unusual circumstances where a project request does not fit into one of the building types described below, the institution, the Commissioner's Office, and the State Division of Facilities and Construction Management (DFCM) will jointly determine an appropriate O&M funding level.

It is recognized that different institutions may have different approaches for internal responsibility, budgeting and expenditure of these O&M funds. For example, the majority of funding for the maintenance and repair and the operations components may be allocated to the Physical Plant operation while a portion may be allocated to another internal organization for security or environmental and safety reasons. The fuel and power component may also be administered by a central administration office. It is not the intent of this model to limit this internal allocation of budgets and responsibilities.

Requests for renovation or replacement O&M funding will be reduced by existing funding levels. This deduction will be determined by the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education on a campus average cost per square foot. The average cost is then multiplied by the square footage being renovated or replaced and subtracted from the following calculation.

The proposed formula uses the Current Replacement Value (CRV) as the base for maintenance and operations calculations. Maintenance and Operations are calculated separately as percentages of the current replacement value of the capital asset. Varying percentages are used in calculating the maintenance value for the five different building types. A standard percentage is used in calculating the operations value for all building types. Because of the variation of power and natural gas costs between building types, the formula provides utility cost differentiation. Fuel and power costs are entered in the formula on a cost per square foot basis rather than as a percentage of CRV.

Proposed Operations and Maintenance Formula:

Building Type	Maintenance/Repair	Operations	Fuel & Power	Total Dollars Requested
Classroom/Office	$.0130 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ .0095 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ \$1.25 \times (\text{sq ft})$	$= \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$$
Library/Student Ctr.	$.0145 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ .0095 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ \$1.25 \times (\text{sq ft})$	$= \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$$
Service/Shop/Vocational	$.0160 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ .0095 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ \$2.00 \times (\text{sq ft})$	$= \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$$
Physical Education	$.0165 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ .0095 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ \$0.90 \times (\text{sq ft})$	$= \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$$
Laboratory	$.0135 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ .0095 \times (\text{CRV})$	$+ \$2.50 \times (\text{sq ft})$	$= \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$$

Requests for O&M funding may be split between up to two building types only if the second building type comprises more than 25% of the total gross square footage.

Example O&M calculations for several building types are attached. Percentages used in maintenance and repair are estimated from Whitestone Maintenance Costs Data.

Definition of Terms

Current Replacement Value

Current replacement value (CRV) is the total cost of construction excluding design fees and furnishings. The CRV does not include value of the property or other site improvements. For new buildings, the Current Replacement Value will be the construction budget for the project. For renovation projects, the Current Replacement Value will be the cost to construct similar space as estimated by DFCM.

Fuel and Power

Purchased fuel and power are those utilities required for proper operation of building systems and central energy plants. Fuel and power costs are expected to be adjusted annually to reflect market changes.

Maintenance and Repair Includes:

Preventative Maintenance

Preventive maintenance is the planned, scheduled periodic inspection, adjustment, cleaning, lubricating, parts replacement, and minor repair of equipment and systems.

Programmed major maintenance

Programmed major maintenance includes those maintenance tasks whose cycle exceeds one year. Examples of programmed major maintenance are painting and similar functions. This may include carpet replacement.

Maintenance repairs or corrective maintenance

Maintenance repairs are actions taken to restore a system or piece of equipment to its original capacity, efficiency, or capability. Maintenance repairs extend a system's life expectancy but generally do not increase its capacity. Such repairs usually involve overhaul, reprocessing, or replacement of constituent parts or materials that have deteriorated.

Trouble calls or service calls

Service calls are requests for system or equipment repairs that, unlike preventive maintenance work, are unscheduled and unanticipated. Service calls generally are received when a system or component has failed. If the problem has created a hazard or involves an essential service, an emergency response might be necessary. Conversely, if the problem is not critical, a routine response is adequate.

Operations Includes:**Facilities Administration**

Leadership and staff to oversee and support facilities operations including work entry, scheduling, cost accounting and related support functions.

Custodial Services

Custodial services generally include the cleaning of floors and other surfaces, emptying of trash, and care of restrooms.

Landscape Services

Landscape services generally include the planting and care of woody and annual plants, planting and mowing of lawns, snow removal on walkways and parking areas, and sprinkler system operation.

Security Services

Security services include the necessary locking of doors etc. to protect the building asset. Law enforcement and parking services are not included in the security services.

Non-delegated project planning and engineering services

Planning and engineering services required to administer projects smaller than the level that requires DFCM administration or delegation, and to provide campus coordination for larger projects.

Waste Removal Services

Waste removal services include the gathering and disposal of solid waste materials.

Environmental Health and Safety Services

Environmental health and safety services may include the collection and disposal of hazardous materials requiring special disposal processes.

Fire Protection Services

Fire protection services include the operating and monitoring of sprinkler and alarm systems, maintenance of fire extinguishers, and other associated activities of a campus fire prevention official.

Furniture Repair

Furniture repair and moving services include activities associated with repairs of non-fixed furniture and appurtenances.

Utility Infrastructure Services

Utility infrastructure services include the operation of campus utility supply systems such as: central heating plant, central chilled water system, electrical cogeneration system, substation and high voltage distribution system, sewer and water system. Infrastructure system operations also include monitoring and meter reading associated with delivery of the utility to the building or structure.

Water and Sewer

Water and sewer includes the cost of the utility and is generally provided by others.

Building Types Include:

Classroom/Office

Classroom/Office buildings generally have sections of office suites, support space, and classrooms. The classrooms often vary in seating capacity and may seat several hundred in the larger lecture rooms. Computer rooms (labs) are also often associated with the classroom type building. This category also includes space that is primarily classrooms and offices but which may include a limited number of labs. Building operating hours vary between 12 and 20 hours, up to six days per week, and are utilized 12 months per year. Effective cooling and heating systems are critical to this type learning and teaching environment.

Libraries/Student Centers

Libraries and Student Centers usually have large open areas with associated offices, storage, and other miscellaneous spaces. Campus cafeteria and food service facilities are usually located in the Student. Auxiliary operations should fund the O&M costs for space they occupy. Hours of operation in this type of buildings may be 20 hours a day, seven days a week. Cooling and heating systems may operate 24/7.

Service/Shop/Applied Technology Education or Vocational

Service, Shop and ATE/Vocational buildings typically have large areas of shop space with high ceilings and several large overhead doors. Some offices and classrooms are usually included in this type of space. Cooling and heating systems in the open shop space are necessary for student and instructor comfort. Often these systems have a high use of energy due to overhead doors and other ventilation equipment. Building occupancy varies between 12 and 18 hours, up to six days a week.

Physical Education

Physical Education buildings are generally designed with many large rooms and few offices. This category may include activity centers. Heating and cooling systems are normally designed to more moderate standards compared to other building types. Operating hours typically run from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. six days per week.

Laboratory Buildings

Laboratory buildings are the most complex of all the building types and consume extreme amounts of energy. This type of building is often designed with one or more offices attached to each lab space. Administrative office and support spaces are frequently located in these buildings. Electrical capacity required for research buildings is much larger than other building types. Power usage is high because of the large cooling and heating systems and lab equipment connections. Cooling and heating systems are critical to the operation of research buildings. Air quality standards for lab space require nearly 100 percent make-up air. Higher energy consumption is required for air quality and occupants' health and safety. Often the people doing research in these spaces work into the evenings and weekends.

MEMORANDUM

April 8, 2003

TO: Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Salt Lake Community College – Expansion of Leased Space of Sandy Center

Issue

Regent Policy R710 requires that the Board of Regents review and approve institutional requests for leases which exceed \$50,000 per year or commit the institution for a duration of five or more years.

Background

Salt Lake Community College proposes a 44 percent expansion in the amount of space leased from Mariemont Holdings, LLC, for the College's Sandy Center. As described in the attached letter from Donald L. Porter, Vice President of Business Services, the demand for education in the Sandy area has outgrown the existing space. The existing leased space is 16,151 square feet with a capacity of 393 seats per hour. The expanded lease will add 12,910 square feet with seven new classrooms and additional support space. The total space will have a capacity of 718 seats per hour.

A copy of the proposed seven-year lease amendment is attached. The initial triple net base rent is \$10.30 per square foot plus \$2.44 per square foot for common area maintenance. O&M costs are estimated to be an additional \$4.00 per square feet. Because the base rent for the existing leased space will be reduced from \$13.39 per square foot to the same rate as the new space, the total first-year lease increase is only \$114,576. Total first-year cost of the new lease will be \$370,237, with an estimated increase in O&M costs of approximately \$51,640. This lease agreement is scheduled to be approved by the SLCC Board of Trustees on April 9, 2003.

Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Committee approve the proposed expansion of leased space of the Salt Lake Community College Sandy Center and forward the proposal for action to the Executive Committee of the Board at its earliest convenience.

CHF/MHS
Attachments

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

April 9, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Cecelia H. Foxley

SUBJECT: Purchase of Two Lots – Project Placement for Mountainland Applied Technology College (MATC) Construction Technology Program

Issue

Regent Policy R710 requires the Board of Regents to review and approve all institutional land purchases. Mountainland Applied Technology College officials request Regent approval of the purchase of two building lots for the MATC Construction Technology Program.

Background

MATC (as well as other Utah Applied Technology College campuses) purchase lots to place home building projects as part of the Construction Technology Program. Upon completion, projects are sold to benefit the college.

The two building lots are as follows: Lot 151 is the last available lot in the Sunrise Ridge Subdivision in Springville. The lot is 80' x 100' (approximately 1/6 acre). Previous lots sold for \$47,900 to \$53,900. The owner is offering the MATC the lot for \$45,000. Other lots in the immediate area are being sold for \$60,000. The second lot is in the Heritage Cove Subdivision located in Spanish Fork. Seven lots remain in that subdivision. Lot 21 is listed at \$48,000. The lot is 93' x 108' (approximately 1/5 acre). Surrounding lots are priced in the \$50,000+ range.

This is the first request of this kind for UCAT. The MATC Regional Board has approved the purchase (attachment). The UCAT Executive Committee has reviewed the project request. The request is before the Regents because land is not considered a "facility" subject to direct submission to the Building Board under HB 1003 (HB 232 revision).

Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the Commissioner that the Regents' Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee approve MATC's purchase of two building lots, and forward the request to the Executive Committee of the Board for final approval.

Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner

CHF/GGF/sgk
Attachment