

HIGHER EDUCATION

Building a Stronger State of Minds

AGENDA

MEETING OF THE UTAH STATE BOARD OF REGENTS TO BE HELD AT UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH OLPIN STUDENT UNION

June 8, 2007

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

STATE BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH OLPIN STUDENT UNION June 8, 2007

<u>Agenda</u>

7:30 a.m. -9:00 a.m.

BREAKFAST MEETING – STATE BOARD OF REGENTS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH BOARD OF TRUSTEES, Parlor A

9:00 a.m. -9:15 a.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE Saltair Room

Welcome and overview

9:15 a.m. -10:45 a.m.

MEETINGS OF BOARD COMMITTEES

ACADEMIC, CTE AND STUDENT SUCCESS (PROGRAMS) COMMITTEE Regent Katharine B. Garff, Chair

West Ballroom

ACTION:

| 1. 2. 3. | Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science Degree in Biotechnology Utah Valley State College – Associate of Applied Science Degree in Mechatronics Technology Salt Lake Community College – Associate of Applied Science Degree in Engineering Technology | Tab A Tab B Tab C |
|----------------|--|-------------------------|
| CON | SENT | |
| 4. | Consent Calendar. Programs Committee | Tab D |
| | A. University of Utah – Discontinue Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science Degrees in Communication Skills | |
| | B. Weber State University – Community Involvement Center | |
| | C. Southern Utah University – Center for Applied Research and Advanced Technologies | |
| INFO | RMATION: | |
| 5. | Information Calendar, Programs Committee | Tab E |
| | A. Utah State University | |
| | New Specialization in Speech-Language Pathology within the Ph.D. Program in Disability Disciplines | |
| | ii. Combination of all Bachelor of Science Degrees in the Department of Animal, Dairy, And Veterinary Sciences into a Single Degree with Four Emphases | |
| | iii. Name change for the Western Region SARE Program | |
| | B. Southern Utah University – Name Changes | |
| 6. | Chief Academic Officers' Report on Concurrent Enrollment | Tab F |

FINANCE, FACILITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE

Regent Jerry C. Atkin, Chair Saltair Room

| ACTI | ON: | |
|------|--|----------------|
| 1. | USHE – Proposed Presidential Salaries for 2007-2008 | Tab G |
| 2. | University of Utah – Campus Master Planning Process | Tab H |
| 3. | University of Utah – Approving Resolution, Research Facilities System Revenue Bonds, | Tab I |
| | Series 2007A (383 Colorow Way Building Acquisition Project) | |
| 4. | University of Utah – Statement of Responsibilities and Code of Conduct, Trustee Disclosure | Tab J |
| _ | Statement, Conflict of Interest Policy | |
| 5. | Dixie State College – Building and Property Purchase | l ab K |
| CON | SENT | |
| 6 | JENT. Consent Calendar, Einance Committee | Tabl |
| 0. | A USHE 2006 2007 Final Work Drogram Davisions | TAUL |
| | A. USHE - 2000-2007 Filial Work Program | |
| | B. USHE – 2007-2008 IIIIIdi WOIK Programmentation Deports | |
| | C. USHE – 2007-2008 Budget Implementation Reports | |
| | D. USHE – Money Management Reports | |
| | E. Uoru and USU – Capital Facilities Delegation Reports | |
| INFO | RMATION/DISCUSSION | |
| 7 | USHE – Impact of Information Technology | Tah M |
| 8 | USHE – Undate of Employee Health Plans | Tab N Tab N |
| Q. | USHE – Legislative Auditor General: A Performance Audit of Compliance with LIMIEA | Tab N Tab O |
| 10 | Itah State University – Report on Sale of Buildings Approved by Regents' Executive Committee | Tah P |
| 10. | oran state on versity report on sale of banangs Approved by Regents Executive committee | |

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Regent James S. Jardine, Chair West Ballroom

ACTION:

| 1. | Proposed Revisions to Policy R513, <i>Tuition Waivers for Dependents of Military Personnel Who Die</i> <i>in the Line of Duty</i> | Tab Q |
|------|--|---------|
| 2. | Proposed Revisions to Policy R512, Determination of Resident Status | Tab R |
| INFO | RMATION/DISCUSSION: | |
| 3. | Minority Task Force Reports (University of Utah and Weber State University) | Tab S |
| 4. | Chief Academic Officers' Report on Concurrent Enrollment | (Tab F) |
| 5. | Communication and Messaging Strategies | Tab T |
| 6. | Legislative Update | Tab U |

10:45 a.m. -REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS12:00 noonSaltair Room

- 1. General Consent Calendar
 - Reports of Board Committees Programs Committee – Tabs A - F Finance Committee – Tabs G - P Planning Committee – Tabs Q - U
- 3. Report on UCAT's Role and Mission
- 4. Resolutions of Appreciation
- 5. Report of the Commissioner
- 6. Report of the Chair

12:00 noon -

2.

2:00 p.m.

LUNCHEON MEETINGS

(Buffet in Ballroom)

STATE BOARD OF REGENTS (EXECUTIVE SESSION) – Parlor A Chief Academic Officers – West Ballroom Business Officers – Collegiate Room Others – Center Ballroom

Projected times for the various meetings are estimates only. The Board Chair retains the right to take action at any time. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify ADA Coordinator, 60 South 400 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84180 (801-321-7124), at least three working days prior to the meeting. TDD # 801-321-7130.

Tab V

Tab W

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology Effective Fall 2007 –</u> <u>Action Item</u>

lssue

Utah Valley State College requests approval to offer a Bachelor of Science Degree in Biotechnology effective Fall Semester 2007. This program was approved by the institutional Board of Trustees on April 12, 2007.

Background

The Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology was reviewed by the Program Review Committee (PRC) and determined to be sufficiently developed to come before the full Board on the 'Abbreviated Track' as per Regents' policy R 401-7.1.4.1. This means that the UVSC Letter of Intent demonstrated sufficient academic quality, considerable employer demand, and the recipient of a \$628,700 appropriation from the Utah Legislature to begin the program. In addition, the proposed program would serve Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) students who completed their AAS degree in Biotechnology or an AS with a Biotechnology pre-major. SLCC was also a recipient of an equal appropriation.

Utah Valley State College (UVSC) has developed a vibrant sciences program with growth in biology, chemistry and physics and continues to cultivate the life science industries in Utah County. To serve the community, the College developed a Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology that would prepare graduates for immediate employment in industries requiring laboratory knowledge and skills and for graduate education. In addition, UVSC and Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) have partnered so that the proposed program would be taken to SLCC's West Jordan campus and made available to SLCC associate degree graduates who want to earn a baccalaureate in Biotechnology. The program would subsequently be offered on UVSC's campus while it continues on the SLCC West Jordan campus.

The legislative appropriation will enable UVSC to build the Biotechnology program. While new faculty will be added over the next five years, both colleges already have Ph.D. prepared faculty who are qualified and capable to begin the program. An administrative assistant and academic advisor will be added.

UVSC reported that within Salt Lake and Utah Counties there are between 1,200 and 1,800 jobs available for Biotechnology graduates and the need will continue to grow. Additionally, no other Utah institution offers a BS in Biotechnology although the University of Utah and Utah State University have related graduate and professional programs should graduates from the proposed program decide to pursue additional education.

The proposed program has the potential to provide technical, hands-on science education to SLCC graduates and UVSC students thereby contributing to the preparation of the workforce.

Policy Issues

Officials from the other USHE institution were supportive of the proposal. No policy issues were raised.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends that the Regents approve Utah Valley State College's request to offer a Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology effective Fall 2007.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/PCS Attachment Academic, Applied Technology. And Student Services Committee

Action Item

Request to Offer the Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology

Utah Valley State College

Prepared for Richard E. Kendell by Phyllis C. Safman

May 30, 2006

Section I: The Request

Utah Valley State College requests approval to offer a Bachelor of Science Degree in Biotechnology effective Fall Semester 2007. This program was approved by the institutional Board of Trustees on April 12, 2007.

Section II: Program Description

Complete Program Description

The proposed Biotechnology degree is designed primarily to serve two groups of students: (1) those that have completed an Associate of Science Degree pre-major in Biotechnology at Salt Lake Community College and who desire to continue their studies and complete a BS in Biotechnology; and (2) students at Utah Valley State College who wish to complete a BS in Biotechnology. The proposed program has been designed in consultation with local industry leaders and is consistent with Biotechnology programs at similar institutions outside of Utah.

The Biotechnology program differs from the more traditional biology degree in that it requires significantly greater time in hands-on laboratory experience. Students in this program will be trained to use many state of the art biochemical and biological procedures and instruments currently in use in research and in life science industries. The objective of this degree program is to produce graduates who have both theoretical and practical training that allows them to be competitive and proficient applicants in the Biotechnology market and prepares them for post-graduate programs across the country.

Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) provides an AAS Degree in Biotechnology and an AS Degree with a pre-major in Biotechnology. Graduate degrees in biotechnical fields can be sought at the University of Utah and Utah State University, but no BS in Biotechnology is offered at any institution of higher education in Utah. The proposed program will be initiated on the SLCC campus beginning Fall 2007 by offering the third and fourth year major coursework to students who have completed an AS pre-major in Biotechnology or who have fulfilled the entrance requirements for admission into the BS Degree. A four-year program will be initiated on the UVSC Orem campus the following Fall Term (2008). Enrollment will be restricted on the UVSC campus due to limited laboratory space until the new science and heath facility is completed.

Suggested Course Sequence: B.S. in Biotechnology

For students transferring from SLCC with an AS Degree:

Assumptions: transfer students have had all general education and distribution courses, GEN BIOL with Iab, BTEC 1010, BTEC 2010, CHEM I and II with Iabs, MATH 1050, MATH 2040 (or equivalent), ORGANIC-CHEM I and II with Iabs, MICRO 2060 with Iab, at least 64 credits transferred (all lower division). If more than 64 credits transfer, then the 3 credit elective listed in Semester 6 or 7 is not needed (a 3 credit upper-division elective is needed). If fewer than 64 credits are transferred, then additional UVSC credits must be earned. If students take Physics with the SLCC program (10 credits total), there are still sufficient required UVSC credits to meet the 30 credit residence requirement.

Although the program is designed for the credits to be taken as shown in four semesters, transfer students will be made aware that an additional semester may be needed to meet the BS upper-division credit requirement if schedule conflicts, such as overlapping lectures / labs of different courses and/or scheduled internship time with an external

agency/company, are not resolved and requirements completed.

Courses requiring prerequisites should not be taken until prerequisites have been met. Prerequisites cannot be taken concurrently with courses requiring the prerequisite (See Appendix B for transfer and four-year curriculum).

Purpose of Degree

UVSC and SLCC developed a partnership that builds upon the first two years of study for SLCC students in Biotechnology which is in high demand today. The collaboration serves both UVSC and SLCC: SLCC will be able to move students to the baccalaureate on its campus; and UVSC will offer the same program on its own campus in Fall of 2008. The proposed degree will prepare students to be competitive in the workplace and prepared for graduate education.

Institutional Readiness

UVSC is prepared to begin the proposed program. Legislative funding of \$628,700 to UVSC and to SLCC and doctorally-prepared faculty on both campuses will support the first few years of the program. UVSC has listed Biotechnology as a top priority since 2004. Administrative units are in place and clear agreements between UVSC and SLCC will support the program.

Faculty and Staff

Full-time tenured and tenure track faculty members in the UVSC Department of Biology and from SLCC are listed in Appendix C. All seventeen Biology faculty have doctoral degrees in a variety of biologically related fields. UVSC and SLCC have faculty with expertise in chemistry, biochemistry, and physics which are necessary to offer the support courses required to fulfill the core curriculum of the proposed program.

Five new faculty and two laboratory instructors/managers over the next five years will be required to offer this program on both campuses. An academic advisor will be needed to advise and assist students at SLCC to matriculate from the two-year program into the four-year program. An additional administrative assistant will be needed to coordinate and manage the student enrollment, course scheduling and other administrative duties.

The first two faculty will be hired to teach on the SLCC campus with the understanding that they also will teach on the UVSC campus as UVSC's four-year program develops. Both faculty and an administrative assistant will be funded by the legislative appropriation. The new hires will be required to have expertise in bioinformatics, molecular biology and biochemistry. One of the two will serve as the program director and will oversee curriculum development and coordinate the programs on both campuses. A third faculty member with expertise in maintaining eukaryotic cell cultures will be hired at the beginning of the second year and will teach on both campuses. Two additional faculty will be hired to work mainly on the UVSC campus as student enrollments grow. Adjunct faculty may be hired to represent specialized areas of expertise, and/or to meet temporary needs.

Library Resources

The library expects to add appropriate journals at the cost of \$8,600 per year which will be covered by the legislative appropriation.

Program Evaluation

Currently, there is no accreditor for Biotechnology programs. However, UVSC will assemble an advisory committee composed of faculty from appropriate USHE graduate programs and representatives from Biotechnology industries to advise on curriculum and provide guidance on the quality of the program and its future graduates.

SECTION III: Need

Market Demand

Graduates with a Bachelor Degree in Biotechnology can pursue a variety of careers and positions both in Utah and the nation. Companies that make up the life science industry are varied and include, but are not limited to, Biotechnology, pharmaceutical, medical devices, medical diagnostics, forensics, secondary education, and natural products. The projected growth for the Utah life science industry is high and the need for a well-trained workforce is imperative for the growth of this industry. The workforce needs of these companies are diverse and range from entry-level technicians to scientists with advanced training who can fill positions requiring technical training, problem-solving ability and independence. Employees entering the current bioscience industry must be able to function in a regulated environment with skills in quality assurance, validation and instrument qualification. Many Utah life science companies are projecting growth that will require large numbers of trained scientists.

The service areas for Utah Valley State College and Salt Lake Community College not only encompass the fastest growing populations in Utah but also include the largest number of Biotechnology companies in the state and perhaps the intermountain west. Even so, no opportunities for students to obtain a bachelor degree in Biotechnology exist within the state.

Based upon survey information of local industries located in Salt Lake County, there will be a need for between 1,200 and 1,800 workers trained in Biotechnology in the next three to five years (See below). All of the surveyed companies indicated that there was a need for a BS Degree and 67 percent of the companies surveyed indicated that a BS Degree would help meet their employment needs. It must be noted that this survey did not include all of the Biotechnology industries in the service areas of UVSC and SLCC.

Utah Biotechnology industry personnel demands in the next 3-5 years:

| 200-300 |
|---------|
| 365 |
| 35-50 |
| 300-500 |
| 300-500 |
| 40-65 |
| |

Currently, Biohealthmatics.com is advertising 161 job openings in Utah for potential employees with expertise in Biotechnology and health informatics with 12 new jobs posted within the last 24 hours.¹

According to the Job Outlook from the US Department of Labor.

¹ http://jobs.biohealthmatics.com/JobSearch.aspx?state=44

Job Outlook²

"Employment of biological scientists is projected to grow about as fast as the average for all occupations over the 2004-14 period, as biotechnological research and development continues to drive job growth. However, doctoral degree holders face competition for basic research positions."

"Opportunities for those with a bachelor's or master's degree in biological science are expected to be better. The number of science-related jobs in sales, marketing, and research management for which non-Ph.D.s usually qualify is expected to exceed the number of independent research positions. Non-Ph.D.s also may fill positions as science or engineering technicians or as medical health technologists and technicians. Some may become high school biology teachers."

Student Demand

Students are very interested in having a BS Degree in Biotechnology offered on both the SLCC and UVSC campuses. In 2005, SLCC had one-year Biotechnology programs in 13 different high schools which enrolled over 600 students in Salt Lake County. The SLCC applied technology program had 61 students enrolled in its AAS Biotechnology Degree. Survey data collected on students who graduated from SLCC's Biotechnology program indicated that 73 percent immediately pursued BS Degrees other than Biotechnology at four- year institutions, 87 percent perceived a BS Degree as very important to their future, and 78 percent were interested in pursuing a BS Degree in Biotechnology if locally offered.

In a separate cross sectional survey of 154 of the approximately 500 biology majors at UVSC, 19.5 percent of the respondents indicated they would be interested in enrolling in a Biotechnology degree if it were offered on UVSC's campus.

Enrollment projections, estimated in the Budget section, are based on the interest of students who are now engaged in the Biotechnology feeder program managed by SLCC in 13 high schools.

Similar Programs

The proposed BS Degree in Biotechnology will be the only program of its kind offered in Utah. The University of Utah and Utah State University offer graduate programs with masters' and doctoral degrees in related disciplines. Thus, students who graduate with a BS in Biotechnology could pursue advanced degrees. The proposed program fills the gap between the two-year AS Degree offered at SLCC and the graduate programs offered at the two universities by providing a two plus two program leading to a baccalaureate degree. The proposed program complements existing two-year and graduate programs.

Mission Fit

Utah Valley State College and the Department of Biology are committed to meeting "student and

² US Dept. of Labor, http://www.bls.gov/oco/pdf/ocos047.pdf

community lower-division and upper-division needs for occupational training; providing developmental, general, and transfer education; meeting the needs for continuing education for personal enrichment and career enhancement; and providing diverse social, cultural and international opportunities, and student support services." The approval of the proposed baccalaureate degree in Biotechnology will allow students the opportunity to develop the skills necessary to meet a growing need in the life science industries of local communities, the state of Utah, and the nation.

The proposed Biotechnology degree has been specifically developed at the request of local industry and students. The degree will provide a unique program that enables Utah to attract and foster life science industries. And, it provides an important avenue for biology students to be competitive in this growing and challenging field.

SECTION IV: Program and Student Assessment.

Program Assessment

- a. **Program Goals:** The goals of the UVSC BS Biotechnology program are: 1) To prepare students for immediate productive employment in the Biotechnology workforce; and 2) To provide appropriate preparation for further study in graduate and/or professional programs. This will include a theoretical foundation for the science and math that are routinely encountered in a Biotechnology laboratory setting.
- b. **Program Assessment:** Program goals will be assessed by the following means:
 - 1. Student Performance on Standardized Exams:
 - i. Major Fields Assessment Test (MFAT). The Biology MFAT will be administered to students in their final semester of the program. This national standardized exam will provide sub-scores for cell biology, and molecular biology and genetics. Student performance on subsections of these exams will allow for comparison of the quality of preparation the program provides in the theoretical foundations of these fields to the preparation provided by other programs throughout the country. This exam will assist faculty to determine the relative strengths of preparation in different subject areas such as cell biology, biochemistry, molecular biology, and genetics, to help identify any specific areas where the program may need to be improved.
 - ii. Graduate Record Exam (GRE): Reports will be obtained from the GRE to monitor the performance of Biotechnology students who take the GRE in preparation for graduate training. These scores will also allow comparison to other students nationwide and provide an indication of student preparation for graduate studies.
 - 2. **Student Placement Rates:** Placements of students in Biotechnology jobs, graduate, and professional programs will be tracked. Placement rates and locations will be used as an indicator to determine whether the program is successful in providing students with marketable skills.

- 3. **Student Follow-Up:** Graduates will be surveyed one year after graduation to determine whether they feel that the program provided adequate and appropriate preparation for their jobs and/or graduate/professional programs. The survey will also seek to determine whether the students would recommend program modifications to require additional course work, or eliminate courses that were not useful.
- 4. **Employer Follow-Up:** Employers of program graduates will be surveyed one year after graduation to determine whether the program provided adequate and appropriate preparation for the graduates to perform their jobs. The survey will also seek to determine whether the employers would recommend program modifications.
- 5. Annual Reports to Program Advisory Board: A program advisory board will be assembled. The advisory board will be composed of representatives from other Biotechnology programs and from the Biotechnology industry. Data accumulated from assessments 1 to 4 (above) will be incorporated into an annual report that will be provided to the program advisory board for its review and recommendations regarding program goals and achievement.

Standards of Performance

Graduates will be expected to possess a theoretical foundation for the science and math that are routinely encountered in a Biotechnology laboratory setting. Students will be expected to have the laboratory skills and competencies necessary to work productively, safely, and independently in a Biotechnology laboratory.

These competencies have been chosen to reflect the goals of the program, and to ensure that the students will acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the job market.

Formative Evaluation of Students: Mastery of theoretical foundations and laboratory skills and competencies will be assessed regularly through the program - through exams, assignments, presentations and laboratory notebooks in each course, and reflected in the grades awarded to each student at the end of each course. An achievement card will be developed that lists the many laboratory skills and methods that students will be expected to master. When students achieve competency in laboratory skills and methods, their instructors will indicate the achievement on the students' methods cards, with ratings of satisfactory, good, or superior. At the end of the program, the achievement cards will provide students a comprehensive list of the methods they have mastered for inclusion in their resumes.

Summative Evaluation of Students: The achievement cards, because they are a cumulative record of achievement throughout the program, also will serve as a form of summative evaluation. Cumulative GPAs will provide a second form of evaluation. Students are required to complete an internship in the last year of the program, and the students' accomplishments, as reflected in their final evaluations and presentations, will serve as "capstone" evaluations, which will reflect the student's capacity to work independently in a laboratory setting.

SECTION V: Budget

The UVSC Biotechnology program will be offered in two locations: Salt Lake Community College West Jordan Campus, effective Fall 2007; and on UVSC's main campus, effective Fall of 2008.

Table 1 shows the projected costs for each program location, and for the combined costs of both projected over the first five years of the program.

Table 1. New Program Budget: BS Biotechnology

| | | Year 1 | | | Year 2 | | | Year 3 | | | Year 4 | | | Year 5 | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| EXPENSES | SLCC | UVSC | Total | SLCC | UVSC | Total | SLCC | UVSC | Total | SLCC | UVSC | Total | SLCC | UVSC | Total |
| Salaries & Wages | \$232,865 | \$12,288 | \$245,153 | \$226,918 | \$144,088 | \$371,006 | \$244,502 | \$149,360 | \$393,862 | \$254,282 | \$163,690 | \$417,972 | \$264,453 | \$188,148 | \$452,601 |
| Benefits | \$130,168 | \$1,278 | \$131,446 | \$168,357 | \$58,613 | \$226,970 | \$175,976 | \$60,907 | \$236,883 | \$183,015 | \$64,212 | \$247,227 | \$190,336 | \$102,873 | \$293,209 |
| Total Personnel Costs | \$363,033 | \$13,566 | \$376,599 | \$395,275 | \$202,701 | \$597,976 | \$420,478 | \$210,267 | \$630,745 | \$437,297 | \$227,902 | \$665,199 | \$454,789 | \$291,021 | \$745,810 |
| Current (office, prof. dev., service) | | \$28,140 | \$28,140 | | \$38,640 | \$38,640 | | \$38,640 | \$38,640 | | \$38,640 | \$38,640 | | \$38,640 | \$38,640 |
| Travel | | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| Capital | | \$335,490 | \$335,490 | | \$180,000 | \$180,000 | | | \$0 | | | \$0 | | | \$0 |
| Library | | \$8,600 | \$8,600 | | \$8,600 | \$8,600 | | \$8,600 | \$8,600 | | \$8,600 | \$8,600 | | \$8,600 | \$8,600 |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | \$363,033 | \$386,796 | \$749,829 | \$395,275 | \$432,941 | \$828,216 | \$420,478 | \$260,507 | \$680,985 | \$437,297 | \$278,142 | \$715,439 | \$454,789 | \$341,261 | \$796,050 |
| FTE Students | 28.00 | 0.00 | 28.00 | 77.17 | 5.00 | 82.17 | 101.33 | 6.67 | 108.00 | 101.33 | 20.00 | 121.33 | 101.33 | 39.67 | 141.00 |
| Cost Per FTE | \$12,965 | NA | \$26,780 | \$5,122 | \$86,588 | \$10,079 | \$4,150 | \$39,057 | \$6,305 | \$4,316 | \$13,907 | \$5,897 | \$4,488 | \$8,602 | \$5,646 |
| Student/Faculty Ratio | 11 | NA | 11 | 15 | 5 | 14 | 18 | 7 | 17 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 18 | 11 | 16 |
| Headcount | 30 | NA | 30 | 80 | 30 | 110 | 100 | 70 | 170 | 100 | 120 | 220 | 100 | 170 | 270 |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Legislative Appropriation | | | \$628,700 | | | \$628,700 | | | \$628,700 | | | \$628,700 | | | \$628,700 |
| Gross Tuition Revenue | \$84,000 | NA | \$84,000 | \$ 231,510 | \$ 15,000 | \$246,510 | \$303,990 | \$ 20,010 | \$324,000 | \$303,990 | \$ 60,000 | \$ 363,990 | \$303,990 | \$119,010 | \$ 423,000 |
| TOTAL REVENUES | | | \$712,700 | | | \$875,210 | | | \$952,700 | | | \$992,690 | | | \$1,051,700 |
| DIFFERENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revenues - Expenses * | | | (\$37,129) | | | \$46,994 | | | \$271,715 | | | \$277,251 | | | \$255,650 |

* The projected budget exceeds the projected revenue for Year 1. Given the timing of the program approval, Year 1 implementation may be slightly delayed and positions may not be filled the entire 12 months as projected (later hiring). Additionally, UVSC and SLCC continue to negotiate the staff hiring needs (in particular, the administrative assistant and lab manager positions). While those positions have been included in this budget, some or all of these positions may be funded by SLCC. It may also be possible to phase some of the equipment purchases in order to balance the budget. The most critical components of the BioTech degree budget—faculty, advising, and critical equipment needs—are fully supported through the legislative appropriated funds.

Funding Sources

The 2007 Utah Legislature appropriated \$628,700 in on-going funds to UVSC to support this program. An additional \$628,700 was allocated to SLCC to support aspects of this program and related activities. Only costs associated with UVSC's BS Biotechnology are provided in the Table. As indicated, UVSC's share of the appropriation will not fully support the expenses outlined. However, UVSC and SLCC will continue to work collaboratively on the staff positions and operating expenses. Should the anticipated enrollments produce net growth at UVSC, tuition revenues (calculated above) could be made available to Biotechnology through UVSC's PBA process.

Reallocation not anticipated

There is no anticipated need for reallocation of funds to support this program. Positive impacts will accrue through the hiring of new faculty, acquisition of new equipment, and offering of new courses, which will benefit existing biology students and programs.

Phased hiring and equipment acquisition

The program was designed to hire faculty and staff as the program becomes established (Tables 2 and 3). During the first two years of the program, a significant portion of the legislative appropriation will be directed towards acquisition of equipment necessary to establish the program at UVSC. (The SLCC site is already equipped). In the third year of the program, the appropriated funds are projected to be fully allocated to personnel and program support costs.

| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Faculty #1, Program Director, Molecular Biology | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Faculty # 2, Bioinformatics | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Faculty #3, Eukaryotic Cell Culture, Virology | | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Lab Instructor / Manager | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Academic Advisor | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Administrative Assistant | Х | Х | Х | Х | Х |

Table 2. Salaried Hires for UVSC employees on SLCC campus

UVSC hires for SLCC campus are outlined and sequenced in Table 2. The program director and molecular biologist will be the first to be hired and will have the responsibility for curriculum development and program coordination on both campuses. The second faculty member will be hired by Fall 2007 in anticipation of courses to be taught in the Spring and the first semester of the senior year. A lab instructor/manager with at least a Master's Degree in Molecular Biology will be hired to prepare and teach the specialized laboratories in genetics, molecular biology, and biochemistry. In anticipation to the number of students to begin the program the first year, an administrative assistant will also be needed to oversee budgets, order supplies, and assist with scheduling. The academic advisor will meet with and assist students to matriculate into the bachelor degree program, advise students in their academic pursuits, and act as a liaison between both colleges and the high schools in both service districts.

| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Faculty #1, Molecular Genetics and Cell Biology | | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Laboratory Instructor / Manager | | Х | Х | Х | Х |
| Faculty # 2 Microbiology | | | | | Х |

Table 3. Salaried Hires for UVSC employees on UVSC campus

The four-year BS program will not begin on UVSC's campus until Fall 2008. Only one additional faculty member will be hired initially because many of the needed courses can be taught by existing faculty. Both faculty hires on UVSC's campus will alleviate the increased teaching load of the faculty who are directly impacted by the Biotechnology program. A lab instructor/manager for the UVSC campus will prepare and teach specialized laboratories in genetics, molecular biology, and biochemistry. The expectation is that the initial enrollments in the Biotechnology program on UVSC campus will be from the existing pool of biology majors. But it is anticipated that as high school programs similar to those in Salt Lake County are developed in Utah County, the overall student FTE's enrolled in biology and Biotechnology will increase.

Appendix A: Program Curriculum

New Courses to be Added in the Next Five Years:

| Course Number | Title & Description | Credit Hours |
|------------------|--|-----------------|
| BTEC 1010 | Fundamentals of Biotechnology I Career Survey Explores careers in biotechnology with emphasis on central dogma of biology, DNA techniques, applications in biotech, and bioethics. Examines forensics and human cloning. Includes lab work. | 3 |
| BTEC 2010 | DNA Manipulation and Analysis Master lab skills relevant to DNA technology; including recombinant DNA cloning, DNA gel electrophoresis, polymerase chain reaction and DNA mutagenesis. Explore cutting-edge techniques such as DNA micro arrays. | 3 |
| BTEC 2020 | Protein Purification and Analysis Teaches current techniques with protein production, purification, and analysis. Includes instruction and practice with polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), chromatography, western blot, and FPLC analysis. | |
| BTEC 2030 | Cell Culture Techniques Teaches basics of prokaryote and eukaryote cell culture; includes handling, storage, and maintenance of bacterial, mammalian and yeast stocks. Emphasizes media preparation and sterile techniques. Includes in vitro labeling and transfection. | 3 |
| BTEC 2040 | Advanced Nucleic Acid Laboratory Teaches current techniques with protein production, purification, and analysis. Includes instruction and practice with polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE), chromatography, western blot, and fast protein liquid chromatography (FPLC) analysis. | 3 |
| BTEC 290R | Special Topics In Biotechnology Explores and examines special topics relating to the field of Biotechnology. Emphasizes areas of rapid growth in Biotechnology or current importance to society. May be repeated for a total of six credits toward graduation. | 1 to 3 |

| BIOL | 4550 | Molecular Evolution and Bioinformatics Focuses on the concepts of evolution as a fundamental principle of biology with emphasis on change at the molecular level. Teaches how natural selection shapes the evolution of genes, gene systems, macromolecules, and organisms. Explores the roles of mutation, natural selection, population size and subdivision, and genetic recombination | 3 |
|--------|------|---|--------|
| | | Introduces different approaches for testing hypotheses about how molecules evolve by using phylogenetic analysis. | |
| BTEC | 481R | Biotechnology Internship Allows biotechnology majors to earn credit while obtaining practical and research experience as an intern in a government, nonprofit, private agency, or with an approved employer. Must be supervised by agency representative and faculty advisor. Department chairperson approval required and written contracts must be completed and signed. May be repeated for a maximum of 10 credits. | 1 to 8 |
| BTEC 4 | 490R | Special Topics in Biotechnology Explores and examines special topics relating to the field of biotechnology. Emphasizes areas of rapid growth in biotechnology or current importance to society. May be repeated for a total of six credits toward graduation. | 1 to 4 |
| BTEC 4 | 4XXR | Intercampus Symposium Provides students with experience in presentation of their work. Maintains rapport and consistency between programs on different campuses. Showcases student accomplishments to other students, | 1 |

faculty, and potential employers.

Appendix B: Suggested Course Sequence: B.S. in Biotechnology

TRANSFER CREDITS FROM SLCC: at least 64

| Year 3 | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| Semester 5 | | Semester 6 | |
| BIOL 3400 Cell Biology | 3 | BIOL 3600 Biological Chemistry | 3 |
| BIOL 3405 Cell Biology Lab | 1 | BIOL 3605 Biochemistry Lab | 1 |
| BIOL 3500 Genetics | 3 | BIOL 3550 Molecular Biology | 3 |
| BIOL 3515 Genetics Lab | 2 | BIOL 3555 Molecular Biology lab | 1 |
| BTEC 2020 Protein Separations | 2 | BTEC 2040 Adv. Nucleic Acids Lab. | 3 |
| BTEC 2030 Cell Culture Techniques | 3 | Elective** | 3 |
| TOTAL | 14 | TOTAL | 14 |

| Year 4 | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| Semester 7 | | Semester 8 | |
| PHYS 2010 College Physics I | 4 | PHYS 2020 College Physics II | 4 |
| PHYS 2015 College Physics I Lab | 1 | PHYS 2025 College Physics II Lab | 1 |
| BIOL 4550 Molecular Evolution and | 3 | BIOL 482R Biology Internship | 5 |
| Bioinformatics | | or BIOL 495R Student Research (4) | |
| BIOL 482R Biology Internship | 5 | And BIOL 499R Senior Thesis (1) | |
| Elective** | 2 | Electives** | 5 |
| TOTAL | 15 | TOTAL | 15 |

TOTAL UVSC credits: 58

Total Program Credits 122** Select electives to meet the minimum Departmental, upper division credit, and residency requirements.

^{1, 2} SLCC BIOL 2020 and 2025 may be substituted for UVSC BIOL 3400 and 3405, and SLCC BIOL 2030 and 2035 may be substituted for UVSC BIOL 3500 and 3515, but students will need to take additional electives to meet the BS graduation requirement of 40 upper division credits.

SUGGESTED COURSE SEQUENCE: B.S. in Biotechnology

--For students doing all course work at UVSC.

Courses requiring prerequisites should not be taken until prerequisites have been met. Prerequisites cannot be taken concurrently with courses requiring the prerequisite.

| Year 1 | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------------------|----|
| Semester 1 | | Semester 2 | |
| BIOL 1610 College Biology I | 4 | BTEC 1010 Career Survey | 3 |
| BIOL 1617 Biology Methods Lab I | 1 | BTEC 2010 DNA Methods | 3 |
| ENGL 1010 Intro to Writing | 3 | ENGL 2020 Inter Writing | 3 |
| | | Science/Technology | |
| CHEM 1210 Principles of Chemistry I | 4 | CHEM 1220 Principles of Chemistry II | 4 |
| CHEM 1215 Prin. of Chemistry Lab I | 1 | CHEM 1225 Prin. of Chemistry Lab II | 1 |
| MATH 1050 College Algebra | 4 | American Institutions Course | 3 |
| TOTAL | 17 | TOTAL | 17 |

Year 2

| Semester 3 | | Semester 4 | |
|------------------------------------|----|------------------------------------|----|
| CHEM 2310 Organic Chemistry I | 4 | CHEM 2320 Organic Chemistry II | 4 |
| CHEM 2315 Organic Chemistry Lab I | 1 | CHEM 2325 Organic Chemistry Lab II | 1 |
| MATH 2240 Principles of Statistics | 4 | PHIL 2050 Ethics & Values | 3 |
| MICR 2060 Microbiology for Health | 4 | Humanities Course | 3 |
| Professions | | | |
| Fine Arts Course | 3 | Social /Behavioral Science Course | 3 |
| | | PE-S 1300 Fit for Life | 2 |
| | | or HLTH 1100 Personal Health | |
| TOTAL | 16 | TOTAL | 16 |

Year 3

| i cui c | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| Semester 5 | | Semester 6 | |
| BIOL 3400 Cell Biology | 3 | BIOL 3600 Biological Chemistry | 3 |
| BIOL 3405 Cell Biology Lab | 1 | BIOL 3605 Biochemistry Lab | 1 |
| BIOL 3500 Genetics | 3 | BIOL 3550 Molecular Biology | 3 |
| BIOL 3515 Genetics Lab | 2 | BIOL 3555 Molecular Biology lab | 1 |
| BTEC 2020 Protein Separations | 2 | BTEC 2040 Adv. Nucleic Acids Lab. | 3 |
| BTEC 2030 Cell Culture Techniques | 3 | Elective** | 3 |
| TOTAL | 14 | TOTAL | 14 |

Year 4

| Semester 7 | | Semester 8 | |
|-----------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| PHYS 2010 College Physics I | 4 | PHYS 2020 College Physics II | 4 |
| PHYS 2015 College Physics I Lab | 1 | PHYS 2025 College Physics II Lab | 1 |
| BIOL 4550 Molecular Evolution and | 3 | BIOL 482R Biology Internship | 5 |
| Bioinformatics | | or BIOL 495R Student Research (4) | |
| BIOL 482R Biology Internship | 5 | And BIOL 499R Senior Thesis (1) | |
| Elective** | 2 | Electives** | 5 |
| TOTAL | 15 | TOTAL | 15 |

Total Program Credits 124** Select electives to meet the minimum Departmental, upper division credit, and residency requirements.

Electives

| Course Number | Title & Description | Credit Hours |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| BOT 4600 | Plant Physiology | 3 |

| | Covers the physiological processes occurring in plants. Includes experimental techniques used in the investigation of processes such as photosynthesis, water and solute transport, tissue culture, growth regulation and responses and plant hormones. Involves problem solving and critical thinking skills. Students can not receive credit for both BOT 4600 and BOT 3340. | |
|-----------|---|--------|
| BOT 4605 | Plant Physiology Laboratory | 1 |
| | 4600. Covers experimentational methods for studying plant physiological processes such as respiration, photosynthesis, mineral nutrition, transpiration and tissue-water relations. | |
| BOT 4700 | Plant Tissue Culture | 3 |
| | Teaches principles of plant micro propagation techniques. Prepares the student to design and carry out their own micro propagation systems for the cultivation of a particular plant species. | |
| BTEC 490R | Special Topics in Biotechnology Explores and examines special topics relating to the field of biotechnology. Emphasizes areas of rapid growth in biotechnology or current importance to society. May be repeated for a total of six credits toward graduation. | 1 to 4 |
| CHEM 3000 | Analytical Chemistry | 4 |
| | For Chemistry majors and others interested in the basic principles of chemical measurement. Studies principles of quantitative analysis, stoichiometry, equilibrium theory, volumetric and gravimetric analysis. Includes introduction to instrumental methods and error analysis. Includes lectures and laboratory exercises. | |
| MICR 4300 | Pathogenic Microbiology | 4 |

Discusses fundamentals of immune mechanisms, pathogenesis, replication, and infection. Explores bacterial, viral, fungal, protozoan, and helminth pathogens. Discusses identification, control, and treatments. Includes weekly laboratory.

ZOOL 4700 H

Human Physiology a Cell Biology Approach

Addresses physiological principles and functions of the human body systems at the molecular level. Emphasizes cell signal transduction involved in the body maintaining homeostasis. Gives special attention to nervous, muscular, cardiovascular, urinary and respiratory systems. Students will be required to use problem solving and analytical thinking skills to be successful in the class. Includes weekly laboratory.

Appendix C: Faculty

*Asterisks indicate faculty who will teach core courses in the Biotechnology program. Others teach survey and elective courses that may be taken by students enrolled in the program.

| Name | <u>Title</u> | Sub-discipline(s) | Highest Degree(s) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Virginia Bayer | Asst. Professor | Neurobiology | Ph.D., D.V.M., Cornell University |
| Mark Bracken | Assoc. Professor | Physiology | Ph.D., Brigham Young University |
| Paul Bybee | Professor | Zoology | Ph.D., Brigham Young University |
| Lawrence Gray | Professor | Zoology | Ph.D., Arizona State University |
| James Harris | Professor | Botany | Ph.D., University of Alberta |
| James Jensen | Visiting Professor | Parasitology | Ph.D., Cornell University |
| Jorma Kirsi* | Assoc. Professor | Microbiology | Ph.D., Brigham Young University |
| Olga Kopp* | Asst. Professor | Cell Biology, Plant Physiology | Ph.D., University of Tennessee |
| Ruhul Kuddus* | Asst. Professor | Microbiology, Molecular Biology | Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh |
| James Price* | Professor | Genetics, Molecular Biology | Ph.D., University of Colorado |
| Robert Robbins | Professor | Plant Anatomy | Ph.D., University of Illinois |
| Michael Shively | Professor | Anatomy | Ph.D., D.V.M., Purdue University |
| Catherine Stephen.* | Asst. Professor | Evolution, Genetics | Ph.D., Texas A&M University |
| Richard Tolman | Professor | Science Education | Ph.D., Oregon State University |
| Craig Thulin* | Asst. Professor | Biochemistry | Ph.D., University of Washington |
| Renee Van Buren | Professor | Botany | Ph.D., Arizona State University |
| Wayne Whaley | Professor | Zoology | Ph.D., Brigham Young University |
| Heather Wilson- Ashworth | Assoc. Professor | Physiology | Ph.D., Brigham Young University |

The following are full time faculty and staff in the Department of Biotechnology at SLCC:

Tamara Goetz Ph.D.Staff/DirectorBiochemistry & Biophysics, Washington State UniversityCraig Caldwell Ph.D.StaffBiochemistry, Texas A&M UniversityCharles Rettberg Ph.D.Assistant ProfessorGenetics, University of Utah

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Utah Valley State College – Associate of Applied Science Degree in Mechatronics</u> <u>Technology - Action Item</u>

lssue

Officials at Utah Valley State College request approval to offer an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Mechatronics Technology, effective Fall Semester 2007. The proposed program was approved by the Utah Valley State College Board of Trustees on January 19, 2007, and by the Regent's Program Review Committee on February 2, 2007.

Background

In the Fall of 2005 the UVSC Trustees and USHE Regents approved a UVSC request to delete the AAS electronic and computer technology degree because of lack of student interest and to provide for time to reformat an appropriate program to meet current needs. This proposed Mechatronics Technology degree is that new program.

Mechatronics is defined as the synergistic combination of mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, and software engineering, all integrated through the design process. Mechatronics involves the application of complex decision making to the operation of physical systems. Mechatronics systems depend, for their unique functionality, on computer software. Mechatronics is an interdisciplinary combination of a set of existing high technology disciplines.

The AAS Mechatronics Technology program at UVSC will prepare students to work in the maintenance and support of mechatronics systems in a variety of applications. Mechatronics technicians are involved in robotics, automated manufacturing and packaging, automobiles, airplanes, gas pumps, vending, gaming, ATM machines, heating and cooling systems, renewable energy systems and a growing number of other applications.

UVSC anticipates a significant demand for the graduates of the program from the over 400 existing high technology companies in Utah county. The current UVSC AAS program in Electrical and Robotics Technology (EART) places all of their graduating students and has a waiting list of employers seeking their graduates. A similar demand for Mechatronics Technology graduates is expected.

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the Mechatronics Technology program a majority of the coursework required is drawn from existing computer science, electronics, and computer engineering courses already being taught in the CNS department. Only 13 hours (four courses) of new coursework is required to be able to cover the required material for this MT AAS degree.

Policy Issues

USHE institutions have reviewed the proposal and there were no objections expressed to the approval of the proposed degree.

Commissioner's Recommendation

<u>The Commissioner recommends that the Regents approve the Request to Offer an Associate of Applied</u> <u>Science in Mechatronics Technology, effective Fall Semester 2007.</u>

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/GW Attachment Academic, Applied Technology and Student Success Committee

Action Item

Request to Offer an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Mechatronics Technology

Utah Valley State College

Prepared for Richard E. Kendell By Gary Wixom

May 30, 2007, 2006

SECTION I: The Request

Utah Valley State College requests the approval to offer an AAS degree in Mechatronics Technology effective Fall Semester 2007. This program has been approved by the Institutional Board of Trustees on November 6, 2006. The Region CTE Committee gave approval January 19, 2007. The Board of Regents Program Review Committee (PRC) approved development of this full proposal at its February 2, 2007 Meeting.

SECTION II: Program Description

Mechatronics is defined as the synergistic combination of mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, and software engineering, all integrated through the design process. Mechatronics involves the application of complex decision making to the operation of physical systems. Mechatronics systems depend, for their unique functionality, on computer software. Mechatronics is an interdisciplinary combination of a set of existing high technology disciplines.

The AAS Mechatronics Technology program at UVSC will prepare students to work in the maintenance and support of mechatronics systems in a variety of applications. Mechatronics technicians are involved in robotics, automated manufacturing and packaging, automobiles, airplanes, gas pumps, vending, gaming, ATM machines, heating and cooling systems, renewable energy systems and a growing number of other applications.

Students will study the fundamentals of computer science, the fundamentals of electronics, the fundamentals of mechanical devices, and will build and exercise mechatronic systems such as small robots and computer-controlled model vehicles. Students will become proficient in the construction, operation, and programming of computer controlled sensors, controllers, and mechanical devices working together as a system.

| | | Credit |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------|
| Course Number | Title | Hours |
| General Education | | |
| ENGL 1010 | Introduction to Writing | 3 |
| MATH 1050 | College algebra | 4 |
| COMM 1020 | Public Speaking | 3 |
| American Institutions | Select one of the five options in this category | 3 |
| | (see catalog) | |
| Physical Education/Health/safety or | Select one course | 1 or 2 |
| environment | | |
| PHYS 2010 | College Physics I (Pre-req. MAT 1010) | 4 |
| PHYS 2020 | College Physics I Lab | 1 |
| | Sub-Total | 19 |
| Core Courses | | |
| ECT 1010 | Basic Electronics DC/AC | 4 |
| CS 1400 | Fundamentals of Programming | 3 |
| CS 1410 | Object-Oriented Programming | 3 |

The curriculum for the Mechatronics Technology AAS degree follows:

| | | Credit |
|---------------|--|--------|
| Course Number | Title | Hours |
| MATH 1060 | Trigonometry | 3 |
| ECT 1210 | Analog Circuits | 3 |
| ECT 1180 | Advanced Software Tools for Electronics | 3 |
| CS 2810 | Computer Organization and Architecture | 3 |
| CS 2420 | Introduction to Algorithms and Data Structures | 3 |
| PHYS 2020 | College Physics II | 4 |
| PHYS 2025 | College Physics II Lab | 1 |
| MECH 2070 | Introduction to Mechatronics | 3 |
| MECH 2250 | Technical Calculus with Analytic Geometry | 4 |
| EENG 2700 | Digital Design I | 3 |
| EENG 2705 | Digital Design I Lab | 1 |
| MECH 2520 | Programmable Logic Controllers | 3 |
| MECH 3170 | Mechatronics Foundations | 3 |
| EENG 3720 | Interfacing to Microprocessors | 3 |
| | Sub-Total | 50 |
| | Total Number of Credits | 69 |

Graduation Requirements:

- 1. Completion of 69 credit hours.
- 2. Overall grade point average of 2.0 (C) or above, with no core course below a C-.
- 3. Residency hours: minimum of 20 credit hours through course attendance at UVSC.
- 4. Completion of GE and specified departmental requirements.

Purpose of Degree

In the Fall of 2005 the UVSC Trustees and USHE Regents approved a UVSC request to delete the AAS electronic and computer technology degree because of lack of student interest and to provide for time to reformat an appropriate program to meet current needs. This proposed Mechatronics Technology degree is that new program. Over the past several years the advancements in technology have shifted away from a concentration on the components of an electronic circuit to the performance of a system. As more and more of the detailed circuit components have become part of complex integrated circuits and, while growing in power and capability, the size of the integrated circuits has become smaller and smaller. The powerful circuits on a chip that carry out a task are selected and controlled by software rather than by hardwired electronics. The small computer controlled devices are now mounted on many different types of mechanical systems. This results in a computer directed, electronically controlled, mechanical systems.

The AAS Mechatronics Technology program is designed to prepare students who can install and maintain the complex, computer controlled, electro-mechanical systems that are becoming more widespread in today's products and manufacturing environments. UVSC is planning to offer this degree to meet the current and growing need in industry and to offer students excellent preparation for their jobs and this career.

Institutional Readiness

The Mechatronics Technology (MT) program will be located administratively in the Computer and Networking Sciences (CNS) Department. This department currently administers the Computer Science and the Pre-Engineering programs. The ABET accredited computer science program has existing options in computer engineering and in software engineering. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the mechatronics technology program a majority of the coursework required is drawn from existing computer science, electronics, and computer engineering courses already being taught in the CNS department. Only 13 hours of new coursework is required to be able to cover the required material for this MT AAS degree. Laboratories currently in place supporting the existing programs in the CNS department will also serve the electronic and the computer related portions of the proposed AAS degree in mechatronics technology. Laboratory facilities in the existing Electrical Automation and Robotics Technology program (EART) will be shared with the new mechatronics program to provide facilities for programmable logic control education and experience with pneumatic and hydraulic control systems. It will be necessary to equip one laboratory with 25 mechatronics workstations at a cost of about \$750 each for a total of \$18,750.

Faculty

Faculty in the CNS department teach the courses in the pre-engineering associate degree program as well as courses in the software engineering and computer engineering options of the computer science program. Four faculty from the CNS department will lead out in the mechatronics technology AAS degree program and will develop and teach the four new courses. One of the participating faculty has a PhD in mechanical engineering, one a PhD in electrical engineering, one a PhD in computer science with extensive experience with robotics (mechatronics devices) and computer integrated manufacturing, and one is ABD in mechanical engineering. A .5 FTE faculty will be added in the second year and another .5 FTE faculty will be added to the program in the fifth year. A list of current faculty is detailed in Appendix C.

Staff

The existing staff of the School of Technology and Computing and the CNS department will be able to handle most of the needs of the new MT program. Additional clerical help that may be needed can be handled by hiring two or three part-time student assistants.

Library and Information Resources

The current library resources are adequate for the support of the proposed MT AAS degree program.

Admission Requirements

There are no special admission requirements. A potential student needs to be able to complete the mathematics (College Algebra) and the programming (Fundamentals of Programming) classes that should be taken in the first semester as they begin the program.

Student Advisement

Student advisement will be handled by the School of Technology and Computing Advisement Center. In the first four years of the program there should be no need for additional advisors in the advisement center.

Justification for Number of Credits

The number of credits proposed for the Mechatronics Technology program is within the guidelines set by Regent's Policy for AAS degrees.

External Review and Accreditation

The Mechatronics Technology program has been designed to meet the accreditation requirements of the Technology Accreditation Commission (TAC) of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). The mechatronics program was designed by Dr. Gordon Stokes, a curriculum and accreditation consultant for the School of T&C, and Dr. Abraham Teng, a mechanical engineer who is the current chair in the CNS department at UVSC. An extensive search of similar mechatronics programs in the U.S., Australia, and Europe was made and an AAS curriculum was designed that meets the definition of the mechatronics discipline as it is being practiced in the listed countries. UVSC officials checked the ABET accreditation requirements for the 2007-2008 Electromechanical Engineering Technology degree because it is certain that mechatronics technology will either come under those requirements or something very similar. At the request of the UVSC designers the program curriculums for the AAS and BS degree programs were examined by engineers in the training division of IM Flash Technologies at Lehi, Utah in October of 2006 and received a favorable review.

If the UVSC Mechatronics Technology AAS degree is approved for Fall 2007 implementation, the program will apply for an accreditation review from the Technology Accreditation Commission of ABET in the 2010 ABET accreditation year.

Projected Enrollment

Mechatronics Technology is a new discipline in Utah Valley. The Electrical Automation and Robotics Technology (EART) program is similar in scope and focus to Mechatronics but differs in content. The Mechatronics and EART programs are complementary programs and will coexist in the School of T&C. The EART program has had a very stable enrollment for the past 5 years. The following enrollment projections were generated using data from the EART program enrollment.

Student FTE (Cumulative)

| Degree | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Headcount | 20 | 45 | 75 | 90 | 105 |
| New course FTE | 4.67 | 12.50 | 17.33 | 20.67 | 23.6 |

| Faculty | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| FTE | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Cumulative | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Student to Faculty Ratio | 16 | 19 | 23 | 24 | 20 |

SECTION III: Need

Program Need

The technology used by industries in Utah Valley and the state of Utah is changing rapidly. This has been highlighted recently by the startup of IM Flash Technologies. Their facility is one of the most highly automated chip manufacturing facilities in the world. They have had a difficult time finding a technician workforce that can help maintain the computer-controlled electro-mechanical devices that implement their automated environments. The proposed AAS Mechatronics Technology degree will produce graduates skilled in the automated environments. This component of the workforce will be a valuable addition to the skilled labor pool in Utah and will help in the economic development of the area.

Labor Market Demand

Mechatronics is a relatively new discipline in the United States. It has not yet been classified as a career field by the U.S. Labor Department thus there are no employment statistics available. In the recent past most mechatronics programs in the U.S. were options in mechanical engineering departments. Mechatronics is gaining momentum and recognition in the United States as a stand-alone discipline, and a number of AAS programs in Mechatronics are offered in Community Colleges at places such as St. Clair County Community College in Michigan and Cuyahoga Community College in Ohio. The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) is in the midst of a study to determine what the accreditation standards for Mechatronics Engineering and Mechatronics Engineering Technology programs should be.

Looking at what is happening around the world in mechatronics the following reports seemed pertinent. An Australian study at Massey University declares that mechatronics is emerging as a core technology necessary for industrial activity in the 21st century. The same study states that there is a severe shortage of graduates skilled in mechatronics in Australia. A report from the Netherlands ('Top Technology Crossing Borders, moving frontiers', Programme Agency Horizon, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, 2003) provided statistics and graphs indicating that mechatronics employment in the Eindhoven region totaled over 39,000 jobs. In all of the Netherlands Mechatronics were listed as principal employers of the mechatronics workforce.

In Utah companies that hire UVSC graduates, Fairchild Semiconductors, IM Flash Technologies, L3 Communications, Heinz food products, states that the graduates they need should have a more integrated knowledge of interconnected, electronic directed, mechanically driven, sensor-based, computer controlled systems. This is the type of graduate that the mechatronics program will produce. There are no existing AAS mechatronics technology degree programs supplying the technical workforce needs in the intermountain region. Currently industries have to add significant training for existing and new employees to meet the need.

UVSC anticipates a significant demand for the graduates of the program from the over 400 existing high technology companies in Utah county. The current UVSC AAS program in Electrical and Robotics Technology (EART) places all of their graduating students and has a waiting list of employers seeking their graduates. A similar demand for Mechatronics Technology graduates is expected.

Recently a manager in the training division at IM Flash Technologies stated that the skills developed in the proposed AAS degree in Mechatronics Technology are critically needed in the technical support group of

their highly automated manufacturing facility that came on-line in February 2007. The company has been having a lot of trouble hiring skilled people for this group. The company has agreed to work with UVSC in an advisory role as the faculty continues to improve the Mechatronics Technology degree program.

Student Demand

At the current time Mechatronics Technology as a career field is unknown to the UVSC student community. The demand is expected to grow rapidly when a program is available and becomes known to the student population. An initial class of 15 to 20 students growing to an annual new enrollment of 35 students per year at the end of five years is expected.

Similar Programs

The University of Utah has a Mechatronics certificate in the Mechanical Engineering BS degree program. Utah State University offers a 5000 level Mechatronics course in the Electrical and Computer Engineering BS program. Utah Valley State College has an AAS program in Electrical Automation and Robotics Technology (EART). The proposed AAS Mechatronics Technology program at UVSC will work as a complementary program with the EART program with the Mechatronics program emphasizing the computer control and electronics approaches to systems and EART continuing to concentrate on electrical devices and control systems.

Collaboration with and Impact on Other USHE Institutions

UVSC expects that the proposed program, if approved, will have no impact on other related programs offered across the state.

Benefits

The graduates of the AAS Mechatronics Technology program are needed by area industries to assist them in maintaining their computer controlled electro-mechanical devices that assist them in competing in the global marketplace. This program will enable students with a desire to gain competence in current applications of electronics to gain skill in the electronics area. In addition they can broaden their electronics skill base with an ability to design and implement computer programs that work with the electronics to accomplish specific tasks. The combination of skills will broaden the employment opportunities for graduates of the program.

This program will also supply a skilled workforce to support the efforts of the State in economic development. The State's Engineering Initiative is designed to produce more engineers to fuel economic growth in Utah. Recent studies by the Center for Work, Technology and Society at the University of California, Berkley indicate that for every engineer in the workforce it requires one to two engineering technicians to support and enable the engineering designs produced by the engineers. It is expected that more and more engineering-focused companies will be emerging in Utah.

Consistency with Institutional Mission

The mission of Utah Valley State College is to provide "a broad range of quality academic, vocational, technical, cultural, and social opportunities designed to encourage students in attaining their goals and realizing their talents and potential, personally and professionally." UVSC accomplishes this mission by "meeting student and community lower division and upper division needs for occupational training; providing developmental, general, and transfer education"¹. The proposed mechatronics technology program supports the institutional mission through its focus on community demand and student interest. The mechatronics technology program is a technical academic degree designed to meet students' and the communities' need for technically-trained, interdisciplinary technologists.

UVSC has identified five general communities involved in realizing its institutional mission. These are the Student Community, the Faculty and Staff Community, the Diverse Community, the Industrial Community, and the Global Community. The proposed mechatronics technology program addresses the Industrial Community by supporting UVSC in its commitment "to developing, broadening, and strengthening mutually beneficial partnerships with business and industry to provide an increasingly educated workforce and to enhance economic growth and development in the community"².

SECTION IV: Program and Student Assessment

The AAS program in Mechatronics Technology that is presented in this document is designed to meet the anticipated ABET accreditation requirements for Mechatronics Engineering Technology. The pertinent engineering technology criteria from the Criteria For Accrediting Engineering Technology Programs 2007-2008 Accreditation Cycle, which must be met by all engineering technology programs is listed below.

Criterion 3. Program Outcomes and Assessment

An Engineering Technology program must demonstrate that graduates have:

- a. an appropriate mastery of the knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of their disciplines,
- b. an ability to apply current knowledge and adapt to emerging applications of mathematics, science, engineering and technology,
- c. an ability to conduct, analyze and interpret experiments and apply experimental results to improve processes,
- d. an ability to apply creativity in the design of systems, components or processes appropriate to program objectives,
- e. an ability to function effectively on teams,
- f. an ability to identify, analyze and solve technical problems
- g. an ability to communicate effectively,
- h. a recognition of the need for, and the ability to engage in life-long learning,
- i. an ability to understand professional, ethical and social responsibilities,
- j. a respect for diversity and a knowledge of contemporary professional, societal and global issues, and
- k. a commitment to quality, timeliness, and continuous improvement.

¹ UVSC Mission Statement. Retrieved November 1, 2006 from http://www.uvsc.edu/insteffect/uvscmission.html

² UVSC Statement of Community. Retrieved November 1, 2006 from http://www.uvsc.edu/insteffect/uvscmission.html
The UVSC Mechatronics Technology program has been designed to meet the ABET requirements and the goal or objective statements that follow have been derived with that intent. In addition to the ABET specified competencies the UVSC Mechatronics Technology program has four goals:

Program Goal 1: To provide graduates with a thorough grounding in the key principles and practices of mechatronics engineering technology and the basic mathematical and scientific principles that underpin them.

Program Goal 2: To provide graduates with an understanding of additional systems principles and the synergistic relationship of systems components.

Program Goal 3: To provide graduates with an understanding of the overall human context in which mechatronics engineering technology activities take place.

Program Goal 4: To prepare graduates for immediate employment in the mechatronics systems installation and maintenance activities of pertinent industries and businesses, and to continue on in BS level degree programs.

The table on the following pages relates each Mechatronics Engineering Technology program goal and performance objective or outcome with the assessment mechanisms that are used to evaluate how well the objective in question is achieved.

Program Goal 1: To provide graduates with a thorough grounding in the key principles and practices of mechatronics engineering technology and the basic mathematical and scientific principles that underpin them.

| them. | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| | ABET | |
| | Eng, | |
| | Tech. | |
| | Criterion | Assessment Methods and Feedback |
| Outcomes | 2.(a-k) | Mechanisms |
| Mechatronics Technology students will | a, b, c, d, | Evaluate student proficiency in these tasks |
| demonstrate proficiency in the areas of program | e, f | by assigning suitable graded laboratory |
| development, algorithm design, data structures | | tasks, and by conducting mid-term and final |
| implementation, analog and digital electronics | | examinations in various courses. The results |
| circuit implementation, logic controller coding, | | of these evaluations will be used by the |
| sensor and control circuit implementation, and | | individual instructors and the department |
| the functioning of selected manufacturing | | curriculum committee to improve the various |
| systems. | | courses. |
| Students will demonstrate proficiency in relevant | a, b, f | Evaluate via examinations and appropriate |
| aspects of mathematics up through a first course | | assignments how well students have |
| in calculus | | acquired the required technical knowledge. |
| | | Provide this information to the faculty |
| | | involved in teaching this material. |

| Students will successfully apply these principles and practices to a variety of problems. | a, b, c, d, e, f, g | Evaluate in advanced courses and laboratories how well the students are able to apply the principles and practices they have acquired in earlier courses. Report these results to the department curriculum committee to be used in curriculum improvement decisions. |
|--|------------------------|---|
| | | On a long term basis, use feedback from employee and supervisor surveys to gauge how well the graduates are able to apply these principles and practices in the workplace. |

| Program Goal 2: To provide graduates with an understanding of additional engineering principles, and the mathematical and scientific principles that underpin them. | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Outcomes | ABET Eng. Tech. Criterion 2.(a-k) | Assessment Methods and Feedback Mechanisms | | | |
| Students will demonstrate an understanding of introductory differential and integral calculus, physics principles, and other areas of science pertinent to engineering. | a, b, c | Evaluate via examinations and appropriate assignments, in courses where students apply these skills, as well as in courses where these skills are acquired, how well students are able to use the required technical knowledge. Provide feedback to the faculty teaching this material. | | | |
| Students will apply modern engineering tools necessary for mechatronics engineering technology practice including computer based circuit analysis, simulation, and high technology measuring devices. | a, c, f, k | Provide laboratory and classroom assignments that require the use of the engineering tools for the solution of problems. Evaluate the student's proficiency in the use of these tools. Use feedback from graduates of the program and from employers to see how well the students are able to use the tools | | | |
| Students will have the ability to work with others and on multidisciplinary teams in both classroom and laboratory environments. | а, е | Evaluate the individual and team performance in courses organized to provide team experiences. Use feedback from graduates of the program and from employers to gauge how well graduates are able to function as team members in the workplace. | | | |

| Students will demonstrate critical and abstract thinking. | a, b, c, f | Provide coursework and laboratory exercises that are designed to require critical and abstract thinking. Student performance on these exercises will be examined and evaluated for the student's ability to apply these skills. Feedback will be provided to the instructors in these courses. |
|---|------------|--|
|---|------------|--|

Program Goal 3: To provide graduates with an understanding of the overall human context in which engineering and computing activities take place.

| Outcomes | ABET Eng. Tech. Criterion 2.(a-k) | Assessment Methods and Feedback Mechanisms |
|--|---|--|
| Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively. | g, e | Assign design documents and other technical communication as part of the required work in several courses. Evaluate the student's performance in both written and oral communication. Provide feedback to the courses where the communication skills are taught. |
| Students will obtain familiarity with basic ideas and contemporary issues in the social sciences and the humanities. | g, j, | Review on a regular basis the course content of the programs required courses that cover these issues. Provide feedback to the department curriculum committee. |
| Students will obtain an understanding of social, professional, and ethical issues related to engineering. | l, j | Review on a regular basis course content and student performance in the courses required by the department that cover these issues. Provide feedback to the department curriculum committee. |

Program Goal 4: To prepare graduates for immediate employment in the mechatronics systems installation and maintenance activities of pertinent industries and businesses and to continue on in BS level degree programs.

| | ABET | |
|----------|------------|---------------------------------|
| | Eng. Tech. | |
| | Criterion | Assessment Methods and Feedback |
| Outcomes | 2.(a-k) | Mechanisms |

| The majority of the graduates will be immediately employed in high-technology companies that utilize their mechatronics engineering technology skills. | a, b, c, d, e, f, h, k | Use data from the placement office to obtain information about how actively the graduates are being recruited by high-tech companies. |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| | | Use survey data from graduates and from employers to see how successful the graduates are in the workplace. |
| Strong graduates from the program will be prepared to enter upper division BS level programs in Mechatronics Engineering Technology. | a, b, c, d, f, g | Use data from the exit surveys to see how many of the graduates are accepted to BS programs. |

The Mechatronics Technology program at UVSC will use the following program assessment mechanisms:

- Conventional assignments and exams in individual courses.
- Student Evaluation of Teaching in individual sections of courses.
- Exit Survey of student results.
- Survey of students 3 years after graduation.
- Annual Faculty curriculum committee evaluation of courses in the curriculum
- Utah Valley State College program assessment instruments
- Board of Trustees 5-year program review
- School directed Academic Audits of selected departments
- Northwest Accreditation self-study and review
- Nationally normalized major field achievement test
- ABET Accreditation self-study and review

The results of the evaluation mechanisms: conventional assignments and exams in individual courses, student evaluation of teaching in individual sections of courses, exit survey of student results, survey of students three years after graduation, and faculty curriculum committee evaluation of new or revised courses in the curriculum will be examined each year. The summaries of the evaluation instruments will be considered by the department curriculum committee and by the industrial advisory committee at regular intervals. These results combined with the curriculum documents of the professional societies will be used to modify the curriculum to keep it current and vibrant.

Student Assessment

Student assessment will be performed in a variety of different ways, many of which are mentioned in the preceding table. Since engineering technology is a performance oriented discipline, laboratory experience is an integral part of the educational process. Students will be given problems that will require analysis and design to craft a solution to the given problem. Students will be evaluated on their analytical processes as well as their design and development of the solution to the assigned problems. Written and verbal reports will be an integral part of the evaluation process. Students will also be tested on their mastery of the concepts of a particular area by using short essay, expository, and problem solving questions in a formal exam setting. Students will be required to work in teams on many projects and peer evaluation by their team members will be part of the evaluative process. The grading process will be competency based using

a set of established and certified standards drawn from professional societies and an educated, informed faculty.

| Category | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Salaries and Wages | \$4,740 | \$34,705 | \$37,802 | \$41,091 | \$76,228 |
| Benefits | \$502 | \$15,056 | \$15,840 | \$16,662 | \$33,677 |
| Total Personnel Costs | \$5,242 | \$49,751 | \$53,642 | \$57,753 | \$109,905 |
| Current Expense | \$1,500 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| Library | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 | \$500 |
| Capital Costs | \$7,500 | \$7,500 | \$10,000 | \$12,500 | \$15,000 |
| Travel | \$1,000 | \$1,500 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| TOTAL | \$15,742 | \$61,261 | \$68,142 | \$75,753 | \$130,405 |

SECTION V: Budget

Funding Sources

The program will be funded from new enrollments tuition and from specialized state and federal appropriations such as the Engineering Initiative and Perkins funds. Growth or other needs may be addressed through the UVSC Planning, Budgeting, and Accountability process each year. The Computer Science and Engineering building at UVSC is providing excellent laboratory space to support the proposed technology degree.

Reallocation

No reallocation of funds will take place.

Impact on Existing Budgets

The new program will be administratively assigned to the existing Computer Science department. The courses for the first three or four years will be taught by faculty from the existing computer science and preengineering faculty. The impact on existing budgets will be minimal.

Appendix A

Program Curriculum

New Courses to be Added in the Next Five Years

| Course Number | Title | Credit Hours |
|---------------|---|---------------------|
| MECH 2250 | Technical Calculus with Analytic Geometry | 4 |
| MECH 2070 | Introduction to Mechatronics | 3 |
| MECH 2520 | Programmable Logic Controllers | 3 |
| MECH 3170 | Mechatronics Foundations | 3 |

All Program Courses

| | | Credit |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------|
| Course Number | Title | Hours |
| General Education | | |
| ENGL 1010 | Introduction to Writing | 3 |
| MATH 1050 | College algebra | 4 |
| COMM 1020 | Public Speaking | 3 |
| American Institutions | Select one of the 5 options in this category | 3 |
| Physical Education/Health/safety or | Select one course | 1 |
| environment | | |
| PHYS 2010 | College Physics I | 4 |
| PHYS 2020 | College Physics I Lab | 1 |
| | Sub-Total | 19 |
| Core Courses | | |
| ECT 1010 | Basic Electronics DC/AC | 4 |
| CNS 1400 | Fundamentals of Programming | 3 |
| CNS 1410 | Object-Oriented Programming | 3 |
| MATH 1060 | Trigonometry | 3 |
| ECT 1210 | Analog Circuits | 3 |
| ECT 1180 | Advanced Software Tools for Electronics | 3 |
| CNS 2810 | Computer Organization and Architecture | 3 |
| CNS 2420 | Introduction to Algorithms and Data | 3 |
| | Structures | |
| PHYS 2020 | College Physics II | 4 |
| PHYS 2025 | College Physics II Lab | 1 |
| MECH 2070 | Introduction to Mechatronics | 3 |
| MECH 2250 | Technical Calculus with Analytic Geometry | 4 |

| EENG 2700 | Digital Design I | 3 |
|-----------|--------------------------------|----|
| EENG 2705 | Digital Design I Lab | 1 |
| MECH 2520 | Programmable Logic Controllers | 3 |
| MECH 3170 | Mechatronics Foundations | 3 |
| EENG 3720 | Interfacing to Microprocessors | 3 |
| | Sub-Total | 50 |
| | Total Number of Credits | 69 |

Course Descriptions:

ECT 1010 Basic Electronics--DC/AC

•Corequisite(s): ECT 1050 or equivalent recommended.

An introductory and foundation course for Electronic and Computer Technology majors. Covers fundamental DC/AC concepts. Studies basic electrical physics, DC/AC sources, resistance, basic circuits and laws, capacitance, inductance, transformers, superposition, the sine wave, reactance, impedance, resonance, and filters. Includes lecture, demonstration, computer simulation, and video presentation.

CS 1400 Fundamentals of Programming

•Prerequisite(s): MAT 0990 or higher or appropriate test scores. CNS 1030 strongly recommended Introduces concepts of object-oriented programming. Presents tools, structure, syntax, and basic OOP design techniques for designing and developing well-formed programs. Studies concepts such as classes, objects, methods, fields, datatypes, control constructs, and data I/O.

CS 1410 **Object-Oriented Programming**

Prerequisite(s): CNS 1400

Introduces concepts of object-oriented programming including classes and objects, friends, operator overloading, stream I/O, dynamic memory allocation, polymorphic functions, and basic use of standard library components. Offers development of basic graphical user interfaces. Introduces sorting, data structures, class and object reuse, and program projects. Uses programming assignment specifications, design, implementation, and testing.

MATH 1060 Trigonometry

3:3:0 Su, F, Sp •Prerequisite(s): MATH 1050 with a grade of C or better or recommended placement by the COMPASS test

Includes the unit circle and right triangle definitions of the trigonometric functions, graphing trigonometric functions, trigonometric identities, trigonometric equations, inverse trigonometric functions, the Law of Sines and the Law of Cosines, vectors, complex numbers, polar coordinates, and rotation of axes.

ECT 1210 **Analog Circuits**

•Prerequisite(s): ECT 1010

Covers designing and analyzing circuits using discrete bi-polar, FET and other devices along with operational amplifiers and other linear integrated circuits in meaningful applications. Includes lecture, demonstration, and computer simulation.

3:3:0 Su, F, Sp

3:3:0 Su, F, Sp

4:4:0 F

3:3:0 Sp

CS 2420 Introduction to Algorithms and Data Structures 3:3:0 Su, F, Sp Prerequisite(s): CNS 1410 Introduces data structures using an object-oriented programming language, and paradigms. Studies data abstraction as a design tool. Includes advanced arrays, records, dynamic data structures, searching and sorting, vectors, trees, linked lists, and graphs. Uses file I/O to store data structures. Discusses algorithm metrics. PHYS 2020 PP **College Physics II** 4:4:0 Su, F, Sp •Prerequisite(s): PHYS 2010 •Corequisite(s): PHYS 2025 A continuation of PHYS 2010. Covers electricity, magnetism, waves, sound, optics, and nuclear physics. PHYS 2025 College Physics II Lab 3.0: 3.0: 0.0 •Prerequisite(s):ECT 1210, CNS 2810

ECT 1180 Advanced Software Tools for Electronics

Course focuses on the development of electronic virtual instrumentation. Using LabVIEW students learn to use graphical programming language which uses icons instead of lines of text to create applications specific to their analytical needs. The focus is on data flow programming, where data determine execution. Application will be developed which will communicate with remote, data generating sites, via the web.

CS 2810 Computer Organization and Architecture 3:3:0 Su, F, Sp

•Prerequisite(s): CNS 1400

Uses assembly language to introduce basic concepts of computer organization. Includes number systems, CPU organization, instruction sets, programming in assembly, memory organization, debugging, program design, and documentation. Covers interrupts, vector tables, and disk I/O.

•Prerequisite(s): ECT 1010 or equivalent

Designed to accompany PHYS 2020.

Provides firsthand experience with the laws of electricity, waves, optics, nuclear physics, and data analysis.

MECH 2070 (NEW) Introduction to Mechatronics

Introduction to the design of computer controlled electromechanical systems. Electronic and mechanical design, prototyping, and construction of mechatronic systems. Uses LEGO mindstorms kits and Erector set parts to construct mechatronic robots and machines.

MECH 2250 (NEW) Technical Calculus with Analytic Geometry 4.0: 4.0 : 0.0

•Prerequisite(s):MATH 1060

Digital Design I

Covers the fundamentals of differential and integral calculus. Emphasizes mathematical techniques and technically oriented applications.

EENG 2700

•Prerequisite(s): CNS 2810 or PHYS 2220 or EENG 2270 Studies the design and application of combinational and sequential logic circuits with discrete and programmable logic devices.

Digital Design I Lab EENG 2705

Corequisite(s): EENG 2700

3:3:0 Sp

1:0:2 Su, F, Sp

3:3:0 F, Sp

1:0:3 Su, F, Sp

Designed to accompany EENG 2700. Design of digital systems with discrete and programmable logic devices. Includes the use of CAD tools for system design and verification.

MECH 2520 (NEW) Programmable Logic Controllers

•Prerequisite(s): EENG 2700

Introduction to PLC programming stressing Ladder Logic and PLC programming. Covers connection of PLCs to external components. Also introduces machine controls and sensors.

MECH 3170 (NEW) Mechatronics Foundations

•Prerequisite(s): MECH 2070, MECH 2250

Provides system level principles of design and application for mechatronics systems. Includes utilization of sensors and transducers, actuation systems, controllers, input/output systems, and communications systems.

EENG 3720 Interfacing to Microprocessors

implementations of buses, interrupts, controllers, and device drivers.

•Prerequisite(s): MATH 1210 or equivalent, EENG 2700 Develops the theory and technology necessary for the interconnection of devices and systems to microprocessors through hardware and software interface examples and student projects. Covers

3:3:0 Su, F, Sp

3.0:3.0:0.0

3.0:3.0:0.0

Appendix B

Program Schedule

Because this program requires substantive coursework throughout the program, it is doubtful that a student will carry more than 15 hours per semester most semesters; thus, a five semester program is presented. Should a student want to complete the program in four semesters it would be possible but difficult. There are two 3000 level course because the CNS course is an upper division elective in the CNS program and the MECH 3170 course is part of the upper division courses in a planned mechatronics BS program.

1st Semester

| Course Number | Title | Credit Hours |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| MATH 1050 | College Algebra | 4 |
| CS 1400 | Fundamentals of Programming | 3 |
| ENG 1010 | Introduction to Writing | 3 |
| ECT 1010 | Basic Electronics | 4 |
| | Total Semester Hours | 14 |

2nd Semester

| Course Number | Title | Credit Hours |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| CS 1410 | Object-Oriented Programming | 3 |
| PHYS 2010 | College Physics I | 4 |
| PHYS 2015 | College Physics I Lab | 1 |
| MATH 1060 | Trigonometry | 3 |
| ECT 1210 | Analog Circuits | 3 |
| PE/Health/ Safety | Choice of course | 1 |
| | Total Semester Hours | 15 |

3rd Semester

| Course Number | Title | Credit Hours |
|---------------|--|---------------------|
| CS 2810 | Computer Organization and Architecture | 3 |
| EENG 2700 | Digital Design I | 3 |
| EENG 2705 | Digital Design I Lab | 1 |
| MECH 2070 | Introduction to Mechatronics | 3 |
| PHYS 2020 | College Physics II | 4 |
| PHYS 2025 | College Physics II Lab | 1 |
| | Total Semester Hours | 15 |

4th Semester

| Course Number | Title | Credit Hours |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|
| CS 2420 | Introduction to Algorithms and Data Structures | 3 |
| ECT 1180 | Advanced Software Tools for Electronics | 3 |
| MECH 2520 | Programmable Logic Controllers | 3 |
| COMM 1020 | Public Speaking | 3 |
| MECH 2250 | Technical Calculus with Analytic Geometry | 4 |

| Total Semester Hours | 16 |
|----------------------|----|

5th Semester

| Course Number | Title | Credit Hours |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| EENG 3720 | Interfacing to Microprocessors | 3 |
| MECH 3170 | Mechatronics Foundations | 3 |
| American Institutions | Choose one of 5 to fill requirement | 3 |
| | Total Semester Hours | 9 |

Appendix C

Faculty

Principal Mechatronics Faculty

Abraham Teng PhD Mechanical Engineering Abraham graduated from Brigham Young University in 1992 and worked in industry for 10 years before joining the Computer and Networking Sciences faculty at UVSC in 2002. Abraham has industry experience in manufacturing processes and in software development to support manufacturing.

Reza Sanati PhD Computer Science Reza graduated from the University of Oklahoma in 1987 and joined the computer science faculty at Louisiana State University Shreveport. Reza proposed and obtained funding for a state-of-the-art computer-based, robotics implemented manufacturing laboratory at Louisiana State. He developed the coursework and ran the laboratory for the robotics and computer integrated manufacturing program in the computer science department at Louisiana State. He has several publications resulting from his work in developing that laboratory. Reza joined the CNS faculty at UVSC in 2001.

Afsaneh Minaie PhD Electrical Engineering Afsaneh graduated from the University of Oklahoma in 1989. Afsaneh was a professor in the Computerized Control and Robotics Department at Texas State Technical College for four years and then went on to work as a Control Engineer in industry for several years. Afsaneh joined the CNS faculty at UVSC in 2001.

Masood Amin ABD Mechanical Engineering Masood is in the final stages of completing his PHD in Mechanical Engineering at BYU. He is a Faculty member at UVSC and has been teaching in the pre-engineering program since 1997.

Supporting Faculty teaching courses in the mechatronics program

| ABD | Computer Science |
|-----|---|
| PhD | Electrical Engineering |
| PhD | Computer Science |
| ABD | Electrical and Computer Engineering |
| ABD | Computer Science |
| MS | Computer Science |
| MS | Computer Science |
| PhD | Mathematics |
| PhD | Computer Science |
| PhD | Computer Science |
| | ABD PhD ABD ABD MS MS PhD PhD PhD |

<u>May 30, 2007</u>

MEMORANDUM

- TO: State Board of Regents
- FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Salt Lake Community College – Associate of Applied Science Degree in Engineering Technology - Action Item

lssue

Officials at Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) request approval to offer an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Engineering Technology, effective Fall 2007. The proposed program was approved by the Salt Lake Community College Board of Trustees on January 17, 2007, and by the Regent's Program Review Committee on April 24, 2007.

Background

The AAS degree program in Engineering Technology is designed to address the need for skilled, entrylevel workers in professions and corporations requiring employees with backgrounds in applied science and math and with the technical expertise necessary to support product design and improvement, manufacturing, and engineering. The AAS degree program places a great emphasis on the "hands-on" aspects of Engineering Technology. The proposed program is needed due the labor market demand for technicians, and due to the interest of students in the service delivery area. Funding is in place for the program.

Policy Issues

USHE institutions have reviewed the proposal and there were no objections expressed to the approval of the proposed degree.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends that the Regents approve the Request to Offer an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Engineering Technology at Salt Lake Community College, effective Fall 2007.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/GW Attachment Academic, Applied Technology and Student Success Committee

Action Item

Request to Offer a an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Engineering Technology

Salt Lake Community College

Prepared for Richard E. Kendell By Gary Wixom Andrea Worthen

May 30, 2007

SECTION I: The Request

Salt Lake Community College requests approval to offer an Associate of Applied Science in Engineering Technology effective Fall Semester 2007. This program was approved by the Salt Lake Community College Board of Trustees on January 17, 2007.

SECTION II: Program Description

The AAS degree program in Engineering Technology is designed to address the need for skilled, entrylevel workers in professions and corporations requiring employees with backgrounds in applied science and math and with the technical expertise necessary to support product design and improvement, manufacturing, and engineering.

This program combines traditional first- and second-year engineering-related technology courses with specialized introductory courses designed specifically for the AAS degree program in Engineering Technology, such as Mathematics for Technology, Statistics and Dynamics for Technology, and Strengths for Technology. Students in the AAS degree program in Engineering Technology will have the opportunity to choose an emphasis in Civil Engineering Technology, Mechanical Engineering Technology, Computer Engineering Technology, or Electrical/Electronic Engineering Technology. Further, the AAS degree program places a great emphasis on the "hands-on" aspects of Engineering Technology. The Engineering Technology specialized courses include training in group work, communication, and applied design/build projects, making graduates ready for work.

See Appendix A for the complete Program Curriculum Outline.

Purpose of Degree

The AAS degree program in Engineering Technology is designed to address the need for skilled, entrylevel workers in professions and corporations requiring employees with backgrounds in applied science and math and with the technical expertise necessary to support product design and improvement, manufacturing, and engineering. As the need for BS and Masters Engineers has grown in Utah, so has the need for the technicians who assist the engineers. The skill sets required of supporting technicians has become more specialized and technical. The AAS program design of a common core with emphases addresses industry need for specialized technical skill in employees who have an understanding of basic science, math, and computing. The core and emphases structure of the degree will facilitate the program being responsive to changing demands of the engineering sector; as new industries emerge in Utah, additional emphases can be added to address applicable staffing needs.

The AAS degree program places a great emphasis on the "hands-on" aspects of Engineering Technology. The Engineering Technology specialized courses include extended learning modules in which students work as a member of a group on applied design/build projects. Two of the major course requirements, ENGT 1600 Introduction to Engineering Technology Design and ENGT 2600 Engineering Technology Design and Development, have curriculum that specifically addresses the integration of "soft skills" (team interaction, verbal communication, written documentation) with "hard skills" of technical proficiency. The program is constructed to produce students who will be competitive for employment upon graduation.

There are no similar two-year AAS programs in the SLCC service area.

Comparison of Engineering and Engineering Technology Degree Programs

The Associate of PreEngineering degree, in seven distinct engineering disciplines at SLCC, is a transfer degree similar to an AS but with reduced General Education. Students who complete this degree have essentially completed the first two years of a BS Engineering program and may apply for advanced placement at a four-year Engineering School. The APE degree has rigorous mathematics requirements including Calculus I, Calculus II, Calculus III, Differential Equations, and a calculus based physics series for engineers. Engineering theory is emphasized although hands-on labs are included.

The proposed AAS in Engineering Technology has non-calculus based courses, and throughout the curriculum, while essential theory is taught, hands-on project work is emphasized. The AAS degree is intended as a terminal degree preparing students for the workforce.

Advising about the differences between engineering and engineering technology programs and the spectrum of careers available to graduates will be critical for students, and must begin in high school.

Institutional Readiness

The AAS in Engineering Technology is the top priority on SLCC's program development plans per the USHE "Programs Under Development/Construction, Section 1, From: July 2006 through June 2007" matrix. The program will be housed in the Division of Engineering, Computer Science and Related Technologies in the School of Science, Math and Engineering. No new organizational structures will be needed to deliver the program.

Several courses have already been developed for the proposed program.

Faculty

Funding for a new faculty member to coordinate the program has been dedicated by the Institution; the position will be posted upon program approval by the Regents. This new faculty member will develop the Engineering Technology degree-specific courses including Statics for Technology, Dynamics and Strengths for Technology, and Energy Conversion.

The degree is an interdisciplinary program and most of the faculty members who will teach program courses are existing faculty in the Division of Engineering, Computer Science and Related Technologies. Other CTE faculty who may teach courses in the program are housed in the Division of Technical Specialties and Apprenticeship; these instructors already work collaboratively with faculty members in the Division of Engineering, Computer Science and Related Technologies on existing degree programs that cut across institutional divisions. It is anticipated that students majoring in Engineering Technology will increase the class enrollment of existing classes, more fully utilizing those classes.

There are over 15 SLCC instructors who are qualified to teach the Engineering Technology curriculum. (See Appendix C.) Currently two faculty members, Dr. G. Jimmy Chen and Gilbert Ulibarri, have received training in Project Lead The Way curriculum and pedagogy. Project Lead The Way is a national nonprofit organization that promotes best practices in teaching introductory courses in engineering and engineering technology.

In view of the number of full-time faculty who are currently qualified to teach courses in the program and given that a new full-time faculty member will be hired, the full-time to part-time faculty ratio will be comparable to other CTE programs at SLCC

Staff

Considering the program fits in the existing academic structure at SLCC, no new administrative staffing needs are anticipated in the first five years of the program. The academic advising will be handled by the advisor for the Division of Engineering Computer Science and Related Technologies. The Division office staff will provide clerical and secretarial support. As labs see increased student use, additional lab aides will be hired using existing Division hourly dollars.

Library and Information Resources

No new additions to existing information resources will be required. Existing information resources for Engineering and Related Technologies departments are sufficient for Engineering Technology. Department affiliations with the American Society of Engineering Educators and other professional organizations will provide access to online Engineering Technology journals.

Admission Requirements

There are no special admission requirements for the program.

Student Advisement

Careful student advising starting in high school will be critical for students entering the AAS program in Engineering Technology. As stated earlier, the advisor for the Division of Engineering Computer Science and Related Technologies will be the primary academic advisor for the program. However, because of the potential confusion between Engineering Technology and Engineering both in terms of degree programs and future employment options, advising materials are being developed to clearly delineate pathways. SLCC personnel currently involved with developing the program have met with partners at the Granite Technical Institute and The Jordan Applied Technology Center to discuss the program and the pathways at SLCC for their students to follow in engineering and engineering technology. The State Office of Education Specialist for Technology and Pre Engineering, Melvin Robinson, has also been consulted about the specific advising needs of high school students relative to this program. Materials describing the program will be disseminated to counselors and advisors in the Public Education System in the SLCC service area and to SLCC's four-year USHE partners.

Justification for Number of Credits

The number of credits required for the proposed program is within Regent's guidelines.

External Review and Accreditation

The AAS in Engineering Technology curriculum was designed to be compatible with ABET Technology Accreditation Commission 2006 standards for a two-year Associates Degree in Engineering Technology.

Additionally, the members of several engineering/engineering technology related Program Advisory Committees (PACs) at SLCC have been consulted in the development of the AAS degree curriculum. Consultants include; Ernie Silva from L-3 Communications, Ken Albrechtsen from Northrop Grumman, Greg Cazier from Reaveley Engineering and Associates, Amy Rawlinson from I M Flash Technologies and Joel Clarkson, an SLCC faculty member who works with Moog Aircraft. In the Industry Needs Analysis Survey (see appendix D) conducted June, 2006, specific competencies and skills that are required for engineering technicians were sought; these competencies will be taught in the common core and different emphases courses. A PAC specifically for the Engineering Technology program will be formed to give ongoing input on changing competencies and technology in this dynamic field.

As input from PACs, business and industry, and possible USHE institutional partners makes evident that ABET affiliation would strengthen the program, SLCC will devise and implement a plan to secure ABET accreditation.

Projected Enrollment

It is projected that enrollment the first year will be 15-20 FTE students, with enrollment doubling each of the first two years. A target enrollment of 100 FTE students has been set for year five. This number is consistent with similar CTE programs at SLCC and would meet current capacity.

SECTION III: Need

Program Need

The need for this program is three-fold:

- 1. There is a large labor market demand for technicians to support Utah's growing engineering sector as documented by the Department of Workforce Services.
- There are hundreds of Utah high school students currently enrolled in Project Lead The Way
 engineering/engineering technology programs who are preparing to pursue degrees in engineering or
 engineering technology. Many students who have an interest in engineering but do not have the
 aptitude or desire to study theoretical mathematics need a viable option to an APE or BS degree in
 Engineering.
- 3. Existing engineering-related technology programs have elements that should be repackaged in a new degree pathway that is more attractive to today's students and more attuned to the competencies currently required in industry. The Engineering Technology AAS degree will provide SLCC with a flexible programmatic structure to facilitate the development of future emphases responsive to evolving industry needs.

Labor Market Demand

Utah Dept of Workforce Services has identified the Engineering Technology field as one of the fastest growing industries in the state with **median annual salaries** reported **April 2007** between \$37,320 and

\$48,070. This salary range was given for employees with Associates Degrees. Quotes from the Utah Department of Workforce Services indicate the following:

- Civil Engineering Technicians have been identified as one of Utah's Five Star occupations. Actual growth in the demand for this occupation will make up the majority of the new job openings. On April 10, 2007 Department of Workforce Services stated that for civil engineering technicians the starting hourly wage is \$14.20/hr and the median wage is \$17.90/hr.
- Electrical and Electronic Engineering Technicians have been identified as one of Utah's Five Star occupations, which are occupations having the strongest employment outlook and high wages. On April 10, 2007 Department of Workforce Services stated that for electrical/electronic engineering technicians the starting hourly wage is \$15/hr and the median wage is \$23.10/hr.
- Mechanical Engineering Technicians have been identified as one of Utah's Four Star occupations, which are occupations having a good employment outlook and relatively high wages. On April 10, 2007 Department of Workforce Services stated that for mechanical engineering technicians the starting hourly wage is \$13.40/hr and the median wage is \$19.50/hr.

In June 2006, Salt Lake Community College conducted a survey of over 400 Utah companies to assess the need for engineering technologist and technicians who assist licensed engineers. (See Appendix D.) Results document a critical need for these individuals in the work place. The majority of companies responding indicate the **starting salary** for engineering technologist and technicians with an AAS degree to be \$26,000 - \$35,000. Part-time employees with the same training are paid \$12.50 - \$15.00 per hour.

Student Demand

The Wasatch Front Consortium has invested both time and money in Project Lead The Way (PLTW), the national non-profit organization established to help schools give students the knowledge they need to excel in high-tech fields. At the secondary school level, PLTW is centered on the idea of bringing engineering and engineering technology curriculum and concepts to students through practical application while their opinions about careers and interests are still forming. Currently there are at least 3 school districts (Granite, Jordan, and Davis) in the Wasatch Front area offering PLTW courses, and more than 25 high schools along the Wasatch Front are now affiliated with Project Lead The Way. The coordination of curriculum and Concurrent Enrollment agreements will enable students in PLTW programs at the high school level to continue their education in a tech-prep 2 + 2 format at SLCC.

The program is also designed to provide an option for students who begin an APE or BS Engineering degree program and find they prefer the technical aspects of engineering to the theoretical and mathematically-intensive aspects of engineering. The AAS Engineering Technology degree is designed so students can easily migrate from the APE program at SLCC. Students will be able to apply the APE prerequisite math, science and computing classes toward the AAS degree in Engineering Technology. It is anticipated the AAS program will capture \geq 10 students/year that are typically lost from the APE program because of their struggle with Calculus-level material.

Similar Programs

Weber State University

- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Computer Engineering Technology
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Construction Management Technology
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Electronics Engineering Technology

- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Manufacturing Engineering Technology
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Mechanical Engineering Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) Computer Engineering Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) Construction Management Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) Electronics Engineering Technology
- Bachelor of Science(BS) Manufacturing Engineering Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) Mechanical Engineering Technology

Utah Valley State College

- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) in Building Construction and Construction Management
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Building Inspection Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) Technology Management
- Bachelor of Applied Technology

College of Eastern Utah

- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) in Building Construction and Construction Management
- One Year Certificate of Completion in Building Construction and Construction Management

Southern Utah University

- Bachelor of Science (BS) in Construction Management
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) in Construction Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) in Engineering Technology CAD/CAM
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Design Technology
- Bachelor of Science (BS) in Electronics
- Associate of Applied Science (AAS) in Electronics Technology

Note that Engineering BS and APE degree programs have not been listed as similar programs because of the differences between Engineering and Engineering Technology explained in the Program Description.

Collaboration with and Impact on Other USHE Institutions

Given (a) the student need, (b) the Salt Lake-Tooele labor market demand for engineering technicians in civil, mechanical, electrical and computer engineering, and (c) the lack of an AAS program in Engineering Technology in the Wasatch Front-Tooele service region, it is imperative that SLCC provide a program that meets local business, industry and economic development pressures. The closest AAS programs of similar scope are currently at Weber State University and Southern Utah University. Utah Valley State also offers some similar programs. Weber State has indicated strong support for this proposal. Although this AAS program is designed to transition graduates directly into the workforce, SLCC Engineering Technology at Weber State University. This arrangement, as well as similar arrangements with other 4-year institutions, could be facilitated at least partially via the SLCC University Center.

Benefits

With the proposed AAS program in Engineering Technology, Salt Lake Community College will provide pathways to both BS Engineering degrees via its transfer APE degree and directly to the supporting technical workforce in engineering companies via its Engineering Technology AAS program. Thus the

USHE system will be addressing the entire spectrum of needs in the engineering field in the Salt Lake-Tooele region.

The core/emphases program design will allow SLCC and USHE to be quickly responsive to changing industry needs in the engineering sector.

Consistency with Institutional Mission

Salt Lake Community College is a multi-campus, comprehensive institution serving a diverse population through lifelong education. The SLCC mission focuses on student needs in an open-door setting. Based on this mission, several SLCC commitments are immediately applicable to this proposal for an AAS degree program in Engineering Technology, including: Vocational and Technical Education resulting in marketable job skills in a changing world; Adult and Continuing Education in cooperation with business and industry to enrich opportunities of citizens; General Education and pre-professional programs for transfer to other colleges and universities; Community Services Education providing services and activities that promote community involvement.

SECTION IV: Program and Student Assessment

Program Assessment and Expected Standards of Student Performance

The goals for the program including Student Learning Outcomes and appropriate assessment measures are outlined in Table 1. ASLO refers to Salt Lake Community College's Academic Student Learning Outcomes that were adopted by the College in 2005.

- ASLO 1 Acquire substantive knowledge in the discipline of their choice sufficient for further study, and/or demonstrate competencies required by employers to be hired and succeed in the workplace.
- ASLO 2 – Communicate effectively.
- ASLO 3 Develop quantitative literacies necessary for their chosen field of study.
- ASLO 4 – Think critically.
- ASLO 5 Develop the knowledge and skills to be civically engaged, and/or to work with others in a professional and constructive manner.

| ASLO | Program Objectives/Student Outcomes | | Program Assessments |
|---------|---|---|---|
| 1,2,3,4 | 1. Students will carry out a design and development project using technician appropriate research methods, documentation procedures, testing and prototype production, and written and verbal presentations to communicate results. | - | Capstone design project in ENGT 2600 and other 2000 level courses as appropriate where students will be assessed on all phases of the design/build process: lab notebook written and oral presentations functionality of design |
| 1 | Students will demonstrate sufficient mastery of technical skills in their area of emphasis. | • | written exams hands-on demonstrations feedback from employers of students and graduates |

| Table | 1 |
|-------|---|
|-------|---|

| ASLO | Program Objectives/Student Outcomes | Program Assessments | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|
| 2,5 | Students will demonstrate the ability to work as team member and communicate effectively in written and verbal form. | group work projects written and oral presentations feedback from employers of students and graduates | | |
| 1,3 | 4. Students will demonstrate in the emphasis areas the ability to engage in a hands-on manner with materials commonly found in the relevant engineering fields (ie. electronic equipment, computer equipment, manufacturing materials, surveying equipment, drafting and design equipment, or industry software) | design/build projects hands-on demonstrations feedback from employers of students and graduates | | |

To evaluate the efficacy of the program relative to the above goals, SLCC's Institutional Research Office and the Office of the Associate Vice President for Career and Technical Education will assist in gathering data for program assessment. Students graduating from the program will be tracked for quantitative data indicating employment rates and starting salary placement, and for qualitative data generated from satisfaction surveys of employers. Through the ongoing work of the program's PAC, courses will be monitored to ensure students are receiving current and appropriate technical instruction. Industry representatives will be invited to act as evaluators of student capstone project presentations.

Additionally, individual courses in the proposed Engineering Technology AAS emphases have been selected to address the ABET program criteria for an Associates degree in these areas. Associates degree programs must demonstrate that graduates are capable of:

Civil Engineering Technology

- Utilizing graphic techniques to produce engineering documents.
- Conducting standard field and laboratory testing on civil engineering materials.
- Utilizing modern surveying methods for land measurement and/or construction layout.
- Determining forces and stresses in elementary structural systems.
- Estimating material quantities for technical projects.
- Employing productivity software to solve technical problems.

Computer Engineering Technology

- The applications of electrical circuits, computer programming, associated software applications, analog and digital electronics, microcomputers, operating systems, and local are networks to the building, testing, operation, and maintenance of computer systems and associated hardware systems.
- The applications of physics or chemistry to computer systems in rigorous mathematical environment at or above the level of algebra and trigonometry.

Electrical/Electronics Engineering Technology

- The application of circuit analysis and design, computer programming, associated software, analog and digital electronics, and microcomputers to the building, testing, operation, and maintenance of electrical/electronic systems.
- The applications of physics or chemistry to electrical/electronic circuits in a rigorous mathematical environment at or above the level of algebra and trigonometry.

Mechanical Engineering Technology. Apply the following principles to the specification, installation, fabrication, test, operation, maintenance, sales, or documentation of basic mechanical systems:

- Technical expertise in a minimum of three subject areas chosen from- engineering materials, applied mechanics, applied fluid sciences, applied thermal sciences and fundamentals of electricity.
- Technical expertise in manufacturing processes, mechanical design, and computer-aided engineering graphics with added technical depth in at least one of these areas.
- Expertise in applied physics having emphasis in applied mechanics plus inorganic chemistry.

The more global ABET standards of team work, communication, understanding of ethics and social responsibilities, and critical thinking and problem solving are addressed in the program core courses common to all emphases.

SECTION V: Budget

The budget for the program is detailed in Table 2. The support requested for this program results from salary and wages for full-time and adjunct faculty associated with the introduction of new courses designed specifically for this program, and additional equipment needs. It is anticipated that the addition of adjunct faculty may be required in year two as indicated in the salary portion of Table 2.

| | | Table 2 | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Year | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 |
| Salaries | \$47,700 | \$48,654 | \$49,627 | \$50,619 | \$51,632 |
| Faculty | | | | | |
| Adjunct Faculty | \$4000 ¹ | \$8000 | \$8600 | \$9,800 | \$10,400 |
| Benefits | \$19,080 | \$19,461 | \$19,850 | \$20,247 | \$20,652 |
| Faculty | | | | | |
| Adjunct Faculty | \$400 ¹ | \$800 | \$860 | \$980 | \$1040 |
| Current Expense ² | \$2500 | \$5000 ³ | \$3000 | \$3200 | \$3500 |
| Machine Shop | \$2000 | \$2000 | \$2000 | \$2000 | \$5000 |
| Maintenance ² | | | | | |
| Department Travel | | | | | |
| In-State | | | | | |
| Out –of-State | \$500 | \$520 | \$550 | \$600 | \$600 |
| Program Equipment ⁴ | \$17,196.80 | | \$5000 | | |
| Library/Audio | | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$93,376 | \$84,435 | \$89,487 | \$87,446 | \$91,824 |

¹ Based on one faculty doing adjunct work to develop curriculum.

² Current expense and machine shop maintenance expenses are relatively low because the equipment needed to run the program is shared and maintained by existing programs.

³ \$2500 is included for faculty PLTW training at Weber State Summer '08.

⁴ PLTW kits and equipment for courses will be purchased with assistance from Carl Perkins legislative funding and via partnership with the Wasatch Front Consortium.

Funding Sources

There will be a reallocation of the current expense and hourly teaching budgets of existing SLCC departments to provide current expense and adjunct teaching dollars for Engineering Technology. Specialized program equipment will be funded by SLCC Institutional one-time funds, Carl Perkins legislative funding, and via partnership with the Wasatch Front Consortium. Through the SLCC Grass Roots Budgeting Process, Institutional funds have been allocated for the tenure-track full-time faculty member to coordinate the program.

Reallocation

In the Division of Engineering, Computer Science and Related Technologies, certain departments, through "smart" scheduling practices, have been able to reduce their need for adjunct hourly teaching dollars. The dollars necessary for adjunct teaching in the AAS Engineering Technology program will be transferred from the hourly teaching budget of the these departments. The current expense and machine shop maintenance budget dollars will be provided by base transfers from other departments in the Division including Engineering Design and Drafting Technology (EDDT) and Architectural Technology (ARCH). The transfers will have minimal impact on the ability of these related departments to operate effectively. The College is working with the Project Lead The Way organization to develop a partnership arrangement that would enable SLCC to purchase AutoCAD and other software products used in Engineering Technology, ARCH and EDDT at reduced rates. When realized, these savings will significantly reduce the financial burden of software maintenance and renewal on these departments.

Impact on Existing Budgets

There will be in impact on existing budgets.

Appendix A

Program Curriculum

New Courses to be Added in the Next Two Years

| ENGT 1900 | Statics & Dynamics for Technology | 3 |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| ENGT 2100 | Strengths for Technology | 3 |
| ENGT 2840 | Energy Conversion | 2 |
| PHYS 1200 | Applied Physics | 4 |

Courses Recently Developed for the Program

| ENGT 1100 | Principles of Engineering Technology | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|
| ENGT 1600 | Intro to Engineering Technology Design | 3 |
| ENGT 1800 | Computer Integrated Manufacturing | 3 |
| ENGT 2600 | Engineering Technology Design and Development | 3 |
| MATH 1048 | Math for Technology I | 3 |
| MATH 1058 | Math for Technology II | 3 |

All Program Courses

AAS Engineering Technology Program (Total Credit Hours 64 – 68)

| General Education | | |
|-------------------|---|-------|
| ENGL 1010 | Intro to Writing | |
| MATH 1050 or | College Algebra | |
| MATH 1048 | Math for Technology I | 3 |
| Communication | Student Choice | 3 |
| Distribution Area | Student Choice | 3 |
| Human Relations | Student Choice | 2-3 |
| | Sub-Total | 14-16 |
| Core Courses | | |
| CS 1400 | Fundamentals of Programming | 4 |
| ARCH 1310 or | Intro to AutoCAD | 3 |
| EDDT 1040 | Intro to AutoCAD | 3 |
| ENGT 1600 | Intro to Engineering Technology Design | 3 |
| ENGT 2600 | Engineering Technology Design & Development | 3 |
| MATH 1060 or | Trigonometry | 3 |
| MATH 1058 | Math for Technology II | 3 |
| PHYS 1200 | Applied Physics | 4 |
| ENGL 2100 | Technical Writing | 3 |
| | Sub-Total | 23 |
| Emphasis Options | | |
| Civil | | |

| BCCM 1030 | Construction Safety | 2 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|
| BCCM 1150 | Blueprint Reading | 3 |
| ARCH 1320 or | Basic MicroStation | 2 |
| EDDT 1420 | Basic MicroStation | 2 |
| ARCH 1120 or | Civil Drafting | 3 |
| EDDT 2190 | Civil Drafting | 3 |
| ENGT 1900 | Statics and Dynamics for Technicians | 3 |
| ENGT 2100 | Strengths for Technicians | 3 |
| ARCH 2220 | Building Structures I | 3 |
| ENGT 2810 | Construction Materials & Estimating | 2 |
| ENVT 1050 | Intro to Environmental Technology | 3 |
| SVT 1010 | Intro to Surveying | 1 |
| SVT 1030 | Surveying Field Techniques | 3 |
| | Sub-Total | 28-29 |
| Computer | | |
| CS 1100 or | Computer Operations | 2 |
| TELE 2320 | Computer Maintenance A+ | 4 |
| CS 1410 or | Object Oriented Programming | 4 |
| CS 1600 | Structured Programming C & C++ | 4 |
| CS 2130 | UNIX Internals | 3 |
| ELET 1011 | DC Electronics | 3 |
| ELET 1012 | AC Electronics | 3 |
| ELET 1130 | Digital Circuits | 4 |
| ELET 2300 | Microprocessors | 4 |
| TELE 2400 | Intro Computer Networking | 4 |
| | Sub-Total | 27-29 |
| Electrical/Electronic | | |
| ELET 1080 | Electronic Assembly Skills | 2 |
| ELET 1011 | DC Electronics | 3 |
| ELET 1012 | AC Electronics | 3 |
| ELET 1100 | Linear Circuits | 4 |
| ELET 1120 | Circuit Sim Anal & Dsgn | 2 |
| ELET 1130 | Digital Circuits | 4 |
| ELET 2300 | Microprocessors | 4 |
| ELET 2750 | Electronics Trouble Shooting | 4 |
| INST 2120 | Intro to Instrumentation | 2 |
| | Sub-Total | 28 |
| Mechanical | | |
| CHEM 1110 and | Elementary Chemistry | 4 |
| CHEM 1115 | Elementary Chemistry Lab | 1 |
| or | | |
| CHEM 1210 and | General Chemistry | 4 |
| CHEM 1215 | General Chemistry Lab | 1 |
| EDDT 2340 | Manufacturing Processes | 3 |
| EDDT 2350 | Manufacturing Processes Lab | 1 |

| MAT 1500 | Manual Machining | 3 |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-------|
| MAT 1510 | Manual Machining Lab | 1 |
| MAT 1570 | CAD/CAM | 2 |
| EDDT 2540 or | Geometric Dimensioning & Tolerance | 2 |
| EDDT 2600 | 3D CAD Modeling | 3 |
| ENGT 1900 | Statics & Dynamics for Technicians | 3 |
| ENGT 2100 | Strengths for Technicians | 3 |
| ENGT 2840 | Energy Conversion | 2 |
| | Sub-Total | 27-28 |
| Electives | (Not required for degree) | |
| ENGT 1100 | Principles of Engineering Technology | 2 |
| ENGT 1800 | Computer Integrated Manufacturing | 3 |
| | | |
| | Total Number of Credits | 64-68 |

Course Descriptions of Courses in the Engineering Technology AAS degree

ENGT 1900 Statics and Dynamics for Technology

Prerequisites: PHYS 1200 and MATH 1058 or MATH 1060.

This course consists of the study of forces and their effects on motionless and moving objects. Applications to trusses, beams, frames, and other topics are presented. Energy, impulse and momentum are included. Basic theory for structural design in mechanical and civil programs is studied.

ENGT 2100 Strengths for Technology

Prerequisite: ENGT 1900.

The reaction of materials to tension, compression, torsion and flexure are introduced and applied to the design of beams, columns, fasteners, etc. Students will perform materials tests in a laboratory setting.

ENGT 2840 Energy Conversion

Prerequisites: PHYS 1200, CHEM 1110, and Math 1058.

This course is a fundamental study of the conversion of energy into work and heat. The principles of thermodynamics used in the analysis of engines, air conditioning systems, turbines, pumps and fans are reinforced through laboratory experiments.

ENGT 1100 Principles of Engineering Technology

Prerequisite: CIS 1020 or competency.

This course provides an overview of Engineering Technology. Students develop problem solving skills by tackling real-world problems and address the emerging consequences of technological change through theory and practical hands-on experience.

ENGT 1600 Intro to Eng Tech Design

Prerequisite: ENGT 1100.

This course emphasizes the development of design. Students use computer software to produce, analyze and evaluate models, study the design concepts of form and function, and translate conceptual design into reproducible products.

2

3

3

2

3

ENGT 1800 Introduction to Computer Integrated Manufacturing 3

This course is an introduction to Computer Integrated Manufacturing. Topics of study include computer modeling, CNC machining, robotics, and computer integrated manufacturing systems. Students will be involved in extensive hands-on projects.

ENGT 2600Engineering Technology Design and Development3

Prerequisite: ENGT 1600.

This course provides students with a hands-on opportunity to take a design project from concept development, through research, solution, process documentation, prototype development and testing, and final presentation.

Appendix B Program Schedule

(See advisor for suggested schedules for the specific emphases.)

| SAMPLE SCHEDULE 2007-2008 | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| FALL SEMESTER | | SPRING SEMESTER | |
| ENGL 1010 | 3 | HR | 2-3 |
| MATH 1048 | 3 | MATH 1058 | 3 |
| or MATH 1050 4 | | or MATH 1060 3 | |
| COMM 1010 | 3 | ENGT 1600 | 3 |
| CS 1400 | 4 | Engineering Technology Empl | nases 7 |
| EDDT 1040 | 3 | | |
| TOTAL 16 -17 | | TOTAL | 15 -16 |
| | | | |
| 2ND FALL SEMESTER 2ND SPRING SEMESTER | | | |
| PHYS 1200 | 4 | Distribution Area | 2-3 |
| ENGL 2100 | 3 | ENGT 2600 | 3 |
| Engineering Technology Emphases10-13 | | Engineering Technology Emphases11-12 | |
| TOTAL 17 | ~ 20 | TOTAL | 16 ~ 18 |
| minimum 64 ~ 68 hours required | | | |

Appendix C

Faculty

Names and credentials of Faculty who may be included in the Engineering Tech program

| Name | Department | Rank | Credential |
|-------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Chad Fail | Building Construction/ Construction Management | Instructor | 1998 AAS Salt Lake Community College 2000 AAS Salt Lake Community College 2002 BS Utah Valley State College |
| Curtis Barnett | Building Construction/ Construction Management | Instructor | 2001 AAS Salt Lake Community College 2003 LICENSE State of Utah Dept. of Commerce |
| Dan Hutchings | Telecommunications | Instructor | 2004 BS University of Utah |
| Sharon DeReamer | Computer Science | Assistant Professor | 1978 BS University of Wisconsin 1992 MS University of Texas |
| Dick Darnell | Telecommunications | Assistant Professor | 1990 AA University of State of New York |
| Doug Richards | Mathematics | Assistant Professor | 1974 BS Brigham Young University 1980 MA Brigham Young University |
| Gilbert Ulibarri | Electronics Technology | Associate Professor | 1986 AAS Utah Technical College (SLCC) 1992 AS Salt Lake Community College 1992 BS Weber State University 2000 MS Utah State University |
| Jane Hook | Engineering Design/ Drafting Technology | Professor | 1978 AAS Utah Technical College 1993 BS Utah State University 2000 MS Utah State University |
| G. Jimmy Chen | Computer Science | Associate Professor | 1982 BS National Central University 1988 MS University of Utah 1991 PhD University of Utah |
| Joel Clarkson | Engineering Design/ Drafting Technology | Instructor | 1997 AS Salt Lake Community College 1999 BS Weber State University |
| Kevin King | Architectural Technology | Associate Professor | 1989 B-Arch Cal Poly San Luis Obispo |
| Lee Brinton | Engineering/Electrical | Associate Professor | 1983 BS University of Utah 1984 MS University of Utah |
| Ross McNamara | Electrical & Instrumentation Technology | Associate Professor | 1992 BS University of State of New York 1997 AS ITT Technical Institute |
| Joe Gallegos | Mathematics | Assistant Professor | 1986 BS University of Utah 1992 MS University of Utah |
| Vinayak Kamdar | Engineering/Metallurgical | Instructor | 1960 BS Oregon State University, 1961 MS Virginia Polytechnic 1974 MBA West Virginia University |
| Walter Cunningham | Engineering Design/Drafting Technology: Surveying | Instructor | 1988 BS Brigham Young University |
| Yuri Starik | Electrical and Instrumentation Technology | Professor | 1984 PhD Kharkovsky Polytechnical Institute |

Appendix C



Miller Campus, 9750 S 300 W, Sandy, UT 84070

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY - POSSIBLE NEW PROGRAM Survey Results

1. Do you feel there is presently a shortage of trained individuals to assist engineers in Utah? Comments: There is a shortage of engineers (software)

| Not Sure | 1 |
|----------|----|
| Yes | 46 |
| No | 5 |

- 2. What engineering-related functions do not require an engineering degree? **Comments**:
 - Everything if done under the direct supervision of a licensed engineer. Preparation of spreadsheets and computer models, determination of grades.
 - For civil engineering, the CAD Technician, designer functions do not require a BS. We prefer to hire AS degree or tech school graduates
 - . Under direct supervision, perform minor technical and clerical tasks in support of professional staff, drafting or field work, under specific directions
 - Any electrical design under the supervision of a professional engineer. Lighting design, power & lighting, circuiting, one line design, fire alarm design, tele/data design, grounding, etc.
 - Essentially, the big problem in the USA is that the engineer can design it but very few are skilled to build it.
 - Concentrate on **power** engineering, electronic
 - CAD drafting, they can do engineering work as long as it is reviewed and supervised by a licensed engineer
 - Plotting survey points, layout & basic design of property parcels, roads, parking lots, subdivisions. Basic water/waste water/ run-off control design, extensive drafting.
 - Software engineering none; you either know how to program or you don't; there is nothing in the process to separate out and have someone less qualified do.
 - Basic utility system layouts under the direction of a PE; Field work (testing, inspection, survey help); Grading plans & roadway plans (basics) under supervision of a PE.
 - Assemble project specifications
 - AutoCad / Graphics
 - Basic member sizing .
 - CAD/CAM Operator
 - Checking shop design
 - Computer hardware
 - Coordination
 - Data entry / evaluation
 - Drafting
 - . Drawings
 - Engineer
 - Equipment selection/sizing
 - Estimating
 - Field construction quality control
 - Field measuring / observation
 - GIS technician

- . Graphics
- Hydraulic calculations
- HVAC
- . Inspections (construction)
- Junior project manager
- Laboratory Testing
- . Land surveying
- Lavout
- Lighting design software
- . Marketing engineering
- products
- Minor calculations
- Modeling 3D
- Plan checking
- Preliminary design work
- . Project
- engineer/management
- PR

- Process documentation

- •
- Software maintenance
- .

- .
- Subsurface exploration
- Survey technicians
- Take-offs .
- Testing technicians
- Vendor layout for material options
- Water quality sampling

- Prototype building
- Quantities
- Rebar detailing
- Research
- Specialized drafting
- Specification writing
- Stream gauging
- Structural member selections

- 3. Would functions of an engineering technician be limited by licensing requirements? (one checked both yes and no)
 - Design checking & final review for stamping
 - Call DOPL
 - Yes, but not if a licensed person signs approvals

| Blank | 1 |
|-------|----|
| Yes | 27 |
| No | 24 |

- 4. Do you have individuals assisting with engineering functions without the designated title, education or licensure of an engineer?
 - But they work directly under a licensed professional engineer
 - Only one in 200 employees

| Blank | _1 |
|-------|----|
| Yes | 44 |
| No | _7 |

- 5. If yes to Question #4, what position titles do they hold?
 - We utilize engineering interns and very experienced designers.
 - Assemblers
 - Assistant
 - CAD Designer / Drafting / Detailer / Technician
 - Coder
 - Construction Inspector
 - Designer
 - Drafter / Draftsman
 - EIT Engineer Intern

- Electrical Designer
- Engineer in Training w/
- Bachelor Degree
- Engineer Intern in School
- Engineering Aid T-3
- Engineering Aid T-4
- Engineering Assistant
- Engineering Technician I, II
- Facility Manager
- Interns
- Intern Engineer
- Graphics

- Lab Technician
- Land Use Technician
- Lead Designer
- Machinist
- Project Engineer / Manager
- Senior Technician
- Technical Advisor
- Technician (Engineering, Field, Laboratory)
- Water Supervisor
- 6. If yes to Question #4, what types of daily job functions do they perform? Comments:
 - Under direct supervision, perform minor, technical and clerical tasks in support of professional staff, drafting or field work, under specific directions
 - Prepare initial draft specifications which are then checked and corrected by a professional engineer
 - Construct quality control testing & observation
 - Assist licensed engineers in field
 - Perform engineering duties for engineer to check
 - Occasionally, they help detail a building and check shop drawings
 - All facets of design under the supervision of a professional engineer, i.e., lighting, power, tele/data, etc.
 - Drafting on the computer with Solid Works and Auto CAD, prototyping and designing machines, debugging machines, precision assembly of machines, machining
 - Replicate what the engineers create
 - Design lighting, outlets, fire alarms, etc.
 - CAD, prepare figures and draft text for reports, collect field data, traffic counts, traffic analysis, etc.

- Quantity take-offs, solicit subcontractors and vendor, routine paperwork, cost control calculation
- CAD drawings, preliminary designs under direction of licensed engineers
- Civil inspections for public roads, servers, etc.
- Daily operations, support, data collection, maintenance functions on a precious metals extraction pilot plant.
- Design electrical systems for industrial facilities. Lighting, MCCS including VFDs, grounding, sizing of conductors & protective devices, etc.
- General project leader functions; Ace functions required to complete a project up to signing the construction drawings; Attend coordination meetings, site inspections, prepare record drawings, etc.
- Take designs by engineers and translate them into workable plans; work with plans for other firms to draw out our required info.
- 3D models
- AS build documents

- Base map set-up
- CAD drafting
- CAD engineer
- Calculations (minor)
- Civil site plan checks
- Compiling design packages
- Construction observation, inspection, testing
- Cost estimates
- . Creating engineering design documents
- Data reduction
- Designing (limited, preliminary, detailed)
- Detention/retention checks Drafting (of systems)
- Drawings
- Drawing review
- Engineering quality control
- Equipment selections / layout
- Field Investigations
- Field testing
- Implementing changes to existing documents

- Inspections
- Laboratory testing
- Lavout of systems
- Marketing
- Plan review
- Preliminary designs & plans
- Preliminary engineering
- Prepare spreadsheets
- Prepare computer models/input
- Project set-up
- Red lining
- Research
- Reports, letters
- Same as Question #2
- Scheduling & PM
- Specification (writing)
- Storm water calculations
- Troubleshooting internal process control
- 7. If yes to Question #4, what hiring salary range would you anticipate for a full-time employee? (some checked multiple ranges) 6 \$20,000 - \$25,000 19 \$26,000 - \$30,000 17 \$31,000 - \$35,000 7 Other \$35,000 - \$60,000 9 Blank
- If yes to Question #4, what hourly hiring salary range would you anticipate for a part-time (30 hours or less) employee? 8. (some checked multiple ranges) 2 Other \$18.00 - \$25.00 9 Blank

20 \$12.51 - \$15.00 17 \$15.01 - \$17.50 8 \$10.00 - \$12.50

- 9. If yes to Question #4, what benefits would be available for a full-time employee?
- Blank 3

- Health & Wellness Allowance 1
- 34 401K Bonuses
- 2 Life Insurance 38 Paid Holidays
- 1 14 Employee Assistance
- 35 Paid Personal Days Off
- 2 Flex Spending

- 1 Pension Profit Sharing
- 7 37 Health/Dental Insurance
- 10. Additional comments you would like to share regarding this industry?
 - Mid-level, trained electrical designers have been in short supply for over 10 years
 - I'm glad you are looking into this. Such expertise is desperately needed.
 - There are no real limits in this area on work, but different companies may limit work because of engineering stamp requirement.
 - We need drafters!
 - There is definitely a shortage of engineering technicians in the civil/structural field right now. This program is long overdue!
 - Our business is consulting for architects and mechanical contractors. Currently, an Engineering Tech degree means only that the person is competent and hardworking.
 - All engineering work and final work product must be performed by or performed under the direct supervision of a licensed professional engineer.
 - Stantec Consulting: We are a civil engineering firm, 100+ employees in SLC, always looking for technical staff. .
 - Plumbing systems layout and sizing a big plus.
 - An engineering assistant would never get paid well in structural engineering.
 - Please do this. It would greatly help the industry; however, make it specialized and not a jack of all trades.
 - I recommend the laws be changed to allow apprenticeships.
 - Construction engineering technology a possible career path.

- 2 Retirement

term

- 1 Telecommuting
- 2 Disability Insurance Short/Long-

- The problem we have is finding skilled/hands-on technicians and engineers. There are plenty of analyst types of engineers, bur very few that can design a mechanical, automated machine that works and is cost-effective. And very few technicians that are skilled to machine and assemble such machines. One solution: Follow the old (not current) pattern that Germany uses, which is to put the kids who would eventually choose technical (not engineering) degrees into vocational training in high schools. Then have these same kids work in industry to parallel their training. What happens now is that these kids get tired of liberal education, etc. by age 19 or 20, they drop out of college, have no marketable skills, and there is a lack of qualified technicians.
- Engineering is too complicated for a two-year program. If Associate degree is then applied to a Bachelor degree to become an engineer, then I would support. Otherwise, not. Road to licensure/Bachelor degree needs coordination with the correct programs.
- Most engineers are older people who have many years of experience, but no P.E.
- Basic engineering classes, i.e., statics and a design overview, these are the things the engineering does and is concerned with would be useful.
- SL County: In the old days, 15 20 years ago, we did have a need for technicians, drafters, designers. With AutoCAD, design and drafting, we no longer have a need for that type of position. The engineer currently completes both tasks in their design effort. SL County uses technicians in three areas: hydrographers for stream gauging and hydrologic data collection, construction inspection (construction technology), and hydrographers for water quality sampling.
- All applicants to drafting design & engineering positions must have extensive experience operating auto desk products.
- There is a large need for this type of training but math and physics are critical.
- Otto Bock Healthcare: It would be excellent for students to have some training in typical industry operating procedures...ECO's, ECR's, ISO standards and Quality Assurance Systems, etc. Degree should absolutely require practical internship experience. I would say a minimum of 6 months @ 2 hrs/week approx. 500 hrs. Degree should require technical writing, strong Word, Excel, Power Point skills. Degree should also require technical modeling and drawing. We have a definite deficit in the SLC region of skilled modelers and drafters, particularly with advanced programs like ProE.
- PSE: Somewhat specialized, but we would like to see people well-trained in the basics more computer skills. The ability of new drafters to produce a complete drawing does not exist. They are computer jockets who can run the CAD but have no idea on how to layout a drawing.
- Geotechnical Design: We are short of good people getting worse because there are fewer being trained, yet the demand is rising.

Total Surveys Sent: 416 Total Surveys Returned: 52

May 3, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Consent Calendar: Academic, Career and Technical Education, and Student</u> <u>Success Programs Committee</u>

The following requests have been submitted for consideration by the Regents on the Consent Calendar of the Programs Committee:

A. University of Utah

Discontinue the Communication Skills Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Degrees

<u>**Request</u>**: The Department of Communication at the University of Utah would like to officially discontinue the Communication Skills B.A. and B.S. degree and remove its listing from General Catalog information.</u>

<u>Need</u>: The Department of Communication has awarded only eight Communication Skills degrees since 2000, and has awarded none in the last two years. There are neither any current nor any prospective students for the program.

<u>Institutional Impact</u>: There will be no institutional impact. Students will still have the same opportunity for receiving this training through an established course sequence the Communications Department's existing Speech Communication major.

Financial Impact: None.

B. Weber State University

Community Involvement Center

<u>**Request</u>**: Weber State University requests approval for the establishment of the Community Involvement Center dedicated to engaging students in service experiences in the community.</u>

The Community Involvement Center represents an intentional and strategic partnership between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to facilitate a civically engaged learning experience for Weber State University students. The mission of the center is to engage students and faculty members in a process which combines community service and academic learning in order to promote civic participation, build community capacity, and enhance the educational process. The Community Involvement Center is consistent with the mission of Weber State University and will play a key role in helping WSU achieve its goal of providing students with engaged learning opportunities.

Weber State University has formally supported students' involvement in extra curricular service activities for more than 20 years through the Community Service office situated in Student Affairs. However, in July of 2006, a new office – Community-based and Experiential Learning situated in Academic Affairs – was established to formally support the rapidly growing needs of faculty and students engaging in service-learning, (service directly connected to curricular objectives). The Community Involvement Center being requested in this proposal would bring these two offices together in one physical space, under one center name, with a broader mission that is inclusive of both extra curricular service opportunities and academic service-learning experiences.

The Center will provide significant academic and practical contributions to the university and community. Some of the significant academic contributions are evident in the strong foundation upon which the center will be built:

- Service-learning and community-based research integrating service into the intellectual and academic life of the university and enhancing the university's connection with the community.
- Resources and training opportunities for faculty interested in community-based learning teaching techniques.
- Volunteerism and involvement of students across the campus in public service activities through the Volunteer Involvement Program which includes 14 student run volunteer programs.
- A growing AmeriCorps Education Awards Program, a national service program that provides college students with education awards in exchange for service.
- Grants to faculty, staff, and students proposing service projects in the community.

In addition to continuing the many efforts of engagement already existing on campus, the center would also develop and coordinate a service scholar program, provide matchmaking forums between campus and community partners, develop an annual forum for faculty, students, and staff to share their experiences in service, and expand the current collection of resource materials.

Some of the key practical contributions of the center include:

- Act as a clearinghouse of resources and referrals on community agencies, service opportunities, service-learning, community-based research, and the AmeriCorps Education Award program.
- Build and maintain a center website.
- Provide a virtual community calendar for our community partners to post events.
- Act as a key campus liaison to the Utah Campus Compact.
<u>Need</u>: Several existing challenges would be addressed by bringing the efforts of these two offices together in the Community Involvement Center. First, the center will enable WSU to make cleaner and stronger partnerships with community organizations seeking service from students. The current offices partner with many of the same community organizations. Building and maintaining these relationships has been challenging because the community partners are having difficulty understanding the relationship between the two existing offices. The center would make this structure transparent to the community and provide them with one point of contact. Similarly, a single center would better meet the needs of the faculty and students on our campus. They too would have one point of contact that would allow them to move fluidly from volunteerism to service-learning and vice-versa.

Secondly, the Community Involvement Center will streamline the dispersion of existing resources pertinent to both offices. These resources include: 1) the AmeriCorps Education Award program, which awards education vouchers to each student who fulfills their contract; 2) grants from the Alan E. and Jeanne N. Hall Endowment for Community Outreach that supports service projects lead by faculty, staff, or students; and 3) the John A. Lindquist Award that recognizes a faculty or staff member who mentors students through service.

Although many institutions of higher education in the state of Utah are beginning to support both volunteer and academic service-learning activities on their campuses, we have modeled the Community Involvement Center after two successful centers in the state, the Lowell Bennion Center at the University of Utah and the Thayne Center for Serving and Learning at Salt Lake Community College. Weber State's Community Involvement Center would be similar to these centers in its mission but unique in its intentional partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. This intentional partnership will build on the strengths of Weber State's culture and surrounding community.

Institutional Impact: It is anticipated that the Community Involvement Center will create very minimal impact on the current institutional structure. The center is an opportunity for less duplication and more synergy between the community service and community-based learning offices on campus.

<u>Finances</u>: The financial support that is currently in place to support the two existing offices will be used to support the center and its programs. This includes \$136,700 in institutional support supplemented with several private donations, including, \$1 million Alan E. and Jeanne N. Hall Endowment for Community Outreach, and \$100,000 endowment for the John A. Lindquist award. Total operating budget available for the center is \$186,850.

The Community Involvement Center plans an active community fund-raising program under the direction of the university development office. The center will also pursue relevant foundation grants with the assistance of the Office of Sponsored Projects.

C. SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY

Center for Applied Research and Advanced Technologies

<u>Request</u>: The College of Computing, Integrated Engineering, and Technology (CCIET) requests authorization to establish the Center for Applied Research and Advanced Technologies (CARAT). This Center will serve as a resource center for Southern Utah's small and medium computing, engineering, and manufacturing businesses, using the expertise of its faculty and students to assist them in developing and implementing innovative technologies. Collaboration with industry partners will not only assist in the economic development of the region, but will also provide a venue for faculty and students to engage in real life applied research. The Center will be available to provide specialized educational services for industry, as requested by our constituent clientele. The Center will focus on the areas of Computer Modeling, Computer Science, Computational Mathematics, Engineering, Engineering Technology, and Information Systems. The Center is needed to serve as an interface between the College of CIET and the participating industrial partners. The Center for Applied Research and Advanced Technologies was approved by the SUU Board of Trustees on March 22, 2007.

<u>Need</u>: There is a need for a central and identifiable unit that can be a conduit to make the industries of the area aware of the capabilities of the programs in the College of CIET and to provide a contact point for interested potential partners. In particular, the Center will address:

Small Business Needs:

- Develop and implement technological innovations
- Resolve technological problems quickly
- Keep employees current in modern technologies, equipment and software
- Consolidate resources with other businesses having similar problems
- Ascertain that funds are spent on the project's specific problem, not on related theoretical problems
- Protect intellectual property while solving problems

Southern Utah University Needs:

- Develop state of the art "real world oriented" technical training methodologies
- Attract students to computer science, engineering, and engineering technology programs
- Provide faculty with the opportunity to be involved in applied and interdisciplinary research
- Develop interdisciplinary courses and programs in Computing, Engineering, and Technology
- Place students with internships and secure for them gainful employments after graduation

Regional Need:

- Foster economic development in Southern Utah
- Assist in attracting new manufacturing firms and their production facilities to Southern Utah

Institutional Impact: The CARAT will be administered by the Dean's office in the College of Computing, Integrated Engineering and Technology. A faculty member from the college will serve as the Director of the Center with compensation of two class releases a semester. He/she will be overseen by the dean and the Center's Advisory Committee, composed of academic and industrial representatives. It is anticipated that the Center will initially need approximately 300 square feet of space for administrative and staff functions as it absorbs current projects, begins operation and develops a clientele. This space will come from existing space in the IET and ELC buildings. The Center will provide senior projects for students in the participating departments, thus fulfilling an academic need. Any currently available space will need some modifications to house the Center. This space will have to be increased to meet the needs of the Center as it grows. The Center will enhance the educational opportunities for students and faculty and will help increase the enrollments in the college. The Center will be the engineering, computational and applied technology unit in Southwestern Utah that will meet the demand of the growing industry in the region. It will become an asset to the community, as well as SUU and the state of Utah. This Center will be a defining element in identifying and illuminating the value of SUU to our constituent community.

Finances: For the first year the College of Computing, Integrated Engineering and Technology anticipates committing \$15,000 from state appropriated funds (Engineering and Computer Science Initiative) to increase the number of students and faculty participating in interdisciplinary applied research projects. Through redistributing faculty responsibilities the College will find inside resources to give teaching load releases for the faculty members who will start supervising students in interdisciplinary applied projects. With this startup funding the Center should become self supporting as it moves into full-scale operation.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends the Regents approve the institutional requests on the Consent Calendar as described above.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/LS/JMC

May 3, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Information Calendar: Academic, Career and Technical Education, and Student Success <u>Programs Committee</u>

The following requests have been submitted for consideration by the Regents on the Information Calendar of the Programs Committee.

A. Utah State University

i. Proposal to Offer a New Specialization in Speech-Language Pathology Within the PhD Program in Disability Disciplines

<u>Request</u>: Utah State University requests approval to offer a new specialization in Speech-Language Pathology within the existing Disability Disciplines PhD Program. The Disability Disciplines Doctoral Program is an interdepartmental program administered by the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation and coordinated by an interdepartmental committee chaired by Dr. Timothy Slocum. Participating departments and centers include the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, the Center for Persons with Disabilities, and the Department of Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education. The program currently has four specializations: (a) Special Education, (b) Applied Behavior Analysis with Individuals with Disabilities, (c) Rehabilitation Counseling, and (d) Disabilities Studies. The specializations within the Disability Disciplines program share a common core of courses, seminars, and internships and a common professional interest in disciplines that serve individuals with disabilities.

This proposal seeks authorization to add a new specialization in Speech-Language Pathology. Students selecting this specialization, in addition to completing the common core courses, shared with other specializations within the degree, will receive specialized training and conduct research related to children and adults who present communication disorders. The complete program requires a minimum of 64 credits beyond the Masters Degree in Communicative Disorders.

<u>Need</u>: The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association has documented a shortage in doctoral level Speech-Language Pathologists. In a report entitled, "Crisis for the discipline," the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on the Shortage of PhD Students and Faculty in Communication Sciences and Disorders concluded that, "over the next 15 years the shortage of PhD faculty is likely to become so severe as to require massive

restructuring of the field, with many program closures and reductions in the proportion of faculty holding the PhD." Data from the Joint Ad Hoc Committee's survey indicate that the number of students enrolling in doctoral programs in Speech-Language Pathology falls far short of the number of faculty who are or will be retiring. Although there are more than 300 academic speech-language programs in the nation, only 62 of them prepare PhDs and fewer than 20 of those programs prepare the vast majority of future faculty members in the discipline. There is a strong need for more doctoral programs in Speech-Language Pathology.

The current structure of the PhD program in Disabilities Disciplines promotes the study of issues of disabilities from multiple perspectives across specific categories of disabilities. It explicitly recognizes the disciplines of special education, behavior analysis, rehabilitation counseling, and disabilities studies. The addition of speech-language pathology will set the stage for further growth because it will broaden the scope of the program to include an important disability-related discipline that does not fit within the current specializations. Speech-Language Pathology is a well-established discipline nationally.

There are numerous advantages to this additional specialization. First, it will allow USU to provide leadership training in five professional disciplines that are in need of leadership personnel. Second, it will increase the capacity for research, training, service, and grant development in a critical area of the College of Education and Human Services. Third, the addition of the doctoral specialty area will have substantial benefit for recruiting new faculty. Fourth, it will increase the efficiency of staffing current doctoral courses in special education which currently often operate somewhat under capacity. Fifth and finally, increasing doctoral training enhances the national reputation of Utah State University.

Institutional Impact: The proposed addition of a Speech-Language Pathology specialization in Disability Disciplines will create minimal new demands on institutional resources. The new specialization is an addition to existing activities. The administrative infrastructure of the Disabilities Disciplines doctoral program is already in place in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation. Many of the core courses and seminars are already being offered in the existing Disabilities Disciplines doctoral program and in the College of Education and Human Services Interdepartmental Doctoral Program. Many special education doctoral classes are currently under enrolled and have unused capacity which can beneficially be filled by students in the new Speech-Language Pathology specialization. A number of the proposed Speech-Language Pathology specialization courses are already taught regularly and could accommodate additional students. Some seminars may need to be expanded in scope so that they will be sufficiently broad to serve students in the new specialization.

This addition will not require additional faculty. Members of the graduate faculty in Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education already participate in the Disability Disciplines program. These faculty members include Dr. Kim Corbin-Lewis, Dr. Beth Foley, Dr. Sonia Manual-Dupont, and Dr. Julie Wolter. In addition, the department added two new full-time PhD faculty lines this fall. Dr. Ron Gillam is the Raymond L. and Eloise H. Lillywhite Professor of Communicative Disorders. Dr. Sandra Gillam is a tenured associate professor. Dr. Ron Gillam was the director of graduate studies in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders at the University of Texas at Austin. He has served as the chair or co-chair of 7 doctoral committees and has participated on 16 other doctoral committees. No additional faculty lines are needed for this new specialization.

The addition of this program will set the stage for possible expansion of enrollment. Thus, an important positive impact of the proposed specialization is the potential expansion of doctoral studies at USU.

However, growth in this new program will be controlled to assure that it does not outstrip capacity in the new specialization and in the program as a whole.

<u>Finances</u>: This Speech-Language Pathology specialization program will not require new finances. Two new faculty members who specialize in language disorders in children have joined the COMD faculty this year. Much of the core coursework already exists and is being offered regularly under the current organization of the Disability Disciplines program. In addition, many of the specialization courses are currently offered in the Department of Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education. The two new faculty positions in COMD enable the department to expand their doctoral level course offerings.

ii. Consolidation of Existing Bachelor of Science Degrees

<u>Request</u>: Utah State University requests approval to consolidate all BS degrees offered by the Department of Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences into a single degree with the name: Bachelors of Science in Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences, with emphases in (1) Animal & Dairy Science; (2) Bioveterinary Science; (3) Biotechnology, and (4) Equine Science and Management. effective Fall 2007.

<u>Need</u>: As part of its periodic internal review of undergraduate programs, the ADVS Department Curriculum Committee identified potential efficiencies by consolidation of the three existing BS degrees. These efficiencies include flexibility for students, particularly those who choose to make changes in their program preference within the department. A similar conclusion was reached by the Cooperative States Research, Education and Extension Services (CSREES) Review Team that conducted a Comprehensive Review of the ADVS Department in November 2004.

Institutional Impact: There is no significant institutional impact expected as a result of the proposed consolidation of existing BS degree programs in the ADVS Department contained in this submission, on instructional programs, in affiliated departments, or existing administrative structures. Resource requirements related to faculty, physical facilities or equipment will remain unchanged. Students in the current programs of student will be allowed to complete their degrees whereas courses have not been altered or eliminated, merely sequenced differently.

<u>Finances</u>: There is no significant impact envisioned as a result of the proposed consolidation of existing BS degree programs in the ADVS Department contained in this submission on budgets, other programs or units within Utah State University.

1) Emphasis in Animal and Dairy Science

<u>Request</u>: Utah State University requests approval to create an emphasis in Animal and Dairy Science within the requested combined Bachelor of Science degree, effective Fall 2007. The emphasis in Animal and Dairy Science has the same core and depth as the currently offered Bachelors Degree in Animal Science (science option) and the Bachelors Degree in Dairy Science (science option).

Students enrolled in the Animal and Dairy Science emphasis will complete 14 credits common to all four of the emphases recommended in this proposal. These common 14 credits included foundation coursework in animal anatomy, physiology, health, feeding systems, and the professional orientation and research

seminars. With a common set of courses for all four emphases, students will be better able to transfer between emphasis areas without falling behind or out of course sequence.

The balance of course work for the Animal and Dairy Science emphasis will include biology, chemistry, math, statistics, and animal breeding, reproductive physiology. An internship or Undergraduate Research/Creative Opportunity (URCO) is also required. With these changes students will also be better prepared for graduate studies if they elect to pursue an MS or PhD.

<u>Need</u>: The emphasis is designed to meet the needs of those students with a primary focus on production agriculture for food producing species including beef, dairy, sheep and swine. The faculty believe that the successful animal producer in the future will need a solid science foundation as well as practical livestock skill to be successful. The curriculum for the animal and dairy science emphasis reflects a strong science base.

Institutional Impact: No new courses will be created as a result of this emphasis and no new faculty, facilities or equipment will be required. The proposal will have no significant institutional impact upon Utah State University or other undergraduate programs within the Utah System of Higher Education.

Finances: There is no anticipated budget impact of these proposed changes.

2) Emphasis in Bioveterinary Science

<u>Request</u>: Utah State University requests approval to create an emphasis in Bioveterinary Science within the combined Bachelor of Science degree in Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences, effective Fall 2007. The emphasis in Bioveterinary Science has the same core and depth as the current Bachelor of Science Degree in Bioveterinary Science.

<u>Need</u>: The Bioveterinary Science emphasis is for those students whose primary goal is to become veterinarians. Students take those classes required for admission into professional Schools of Veterinary Medicine. The emphasis includes the same 14 common credits and an internship or URCO as described under the Animal and Dairy Science emphasis. Since competition for admission is so keen, these students often concurrently apply for admission into various life science graduate education programs. For the Bioveterinary Science emphasis, students complete courses in chemistry (organic, inorganic, and biochemistry), biology (genetics and microbiology), math, statistics, and physics. The Utah State University program has been highly successful in advancing students to veterinary schools in the past and we have confidence that it will continue.

Institutional Impact: No new courses will be created as a result of this emphasis and no new faculty, facilities or equipment will be required. The proposal should have no significant institutional impact upon Utah State University or other undergraduate programs within the Utah System of Higher Education.

Finances: There is no anticipated budget impact of these proposed changes.

3) Emphasis in Biotechnology

<u>**Request</u>**: Utah State University requests approval to create an emphasis in Biotechnology within the requested combined Bachelor of Science degree in Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences, effective Fall</u>

2007. The emphasis in Biotechnology has the same core and depth as the currently offered Bachelor of Science Degree in Animal Science (biotechnology option), Bachelors of Science degree in Dairy Science (biotechnology option), and Bachelors of Science Degree in Bioveterinary Science (biotechnology option).

<u>Need</u>: The emphasis will prepare students for employment in the rapidly advancing and expanding field of animal biotechnology. We envision students completing this emphasis will go on for advance graduate degrees and become researchers in the field. Others will find employment in the animal health industry with their BS degree. The emphasis includes the same 14 common credits and an internship or URCO as described under the Animal and Dairy Science emphasis. The emphasis requires math, statistics, genetics, chemistry (organic, inorganic and biochemistry) plus specialization in biotechnology methodologies, applications, and ethics. Directed electives give the students options to strengthen their advance biological science knowledge.

Institutional Impact: No new courses will be created as a result of this emphasis and no new faculty, facilities or equipment will be required. The proposal will have no significant institutional impact upon Utah State University or other undergraduate programs within the Utah System of Higher Education.

Finances: There is no anticipated budget impact of these proposed changes.

4) Emphasis in Equine Science and Management

<u>**Request</u>**: Utah State University requests approval to create an emphasis in Equine Science and Management within the requested combined Bachelor of Science degree in Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences, effective Fall 2007.</u>

<u>Need</u>: The American Horse Council reported that the impact of the equine industry in the United States is rapidly increasing. There were an estimated 6.9 million horses in the US in 1996. By 2005 that number had increased to 9.2 million head. In 2005, approximately 4.6 million Americans were involved in the industry and 2 million owned horses. Using the Utah 4-H Horse Program as an indicator of equine interest in Utah's youth and future, 2,937 youth involved in horse projects 2000 while this number jumped to 3,880 by 2004.

Current students in the Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences Department express an overwhelming interest in the equine program. These students are currently served in the Animal Science BS degree program (animal industries emphasis). The Equine Science and Management emphasis includes the same 14 common credits and an internship or URCO as the previous three emphases (Animal and Dairy Science, Bioveterinary Science, and Biotechnology). The Equine Science and Management emphasis requires math, statistics, biology and chemistry (general and inorganic). Specialization is achieved in the Equine Science and Management emphasis as students complete equine courses focusing on nutrition, reproductive physiology, breeding practices, training, riding techniques, and stable management.

Institutional Impact: The Equine Science and Management emphasis will require ten new courses, basic and advanced, in such areas as evaluation, riding fundamentals, behavior and training, stable management, and the internships. The courses have been approved and are scheduled to be taught by existing faculty and staff.

The Department of Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Sciences has designated equine studies as a priority in their undergraduate program. Plans for a new facility are nearing completion. The facility will permit

breeding instruction to be offered that will allow students to gain very useful skills in modern equine breeding techniques. A large indoor arena will allow more than one riding class or labs to be taught simultaneously. The facility and program will give students experience and understanding of the day-to-day operations of a facility. There are no similar or equivalent programs currently approved and functioning in the USHE.

Finances: With planning for the construction of a new equine facility well underway, the teaching program will have additional expense. The program is designed so that most of the additional labor required to maintain the facility and program will come from students. As part of two courses, students will work at the horse facility during their sophomore and senior years. Additionally, the facility may need to provide a handful of paid student positions to overseeing the students and the daily operation of the facility in conjunction with the manager. The focus on student involvement allows students to develop and apply skills learned through courses in equine science, management, and handling. Such a focus will yield students who are confident and capable of securing and maintaining a rewarding career in the equine industry.

Additional student labor will cost approximately \$32K a year. As the horses used by this program will be maintained in stalls with limited turnout in pastures, there will be additional bedding costs (approximately \$7K/year) associated with this management system. This expense will be revisited as the development of pastures and the rotation of horses between stalls and turnout is developed at the new facility.

Critical faculty have been hired in support of the Equine Science and Management emphasis. The College of Agriculture has internally reallocated funds to support this emphasis. Additional operating funds for student labor and supplies will required further internal reallocation from the within the department and the college.

iii. Western Region SARE Program to be changed to the Western Region SARE Center

<u>Request</u>: Utah State University operates the USDA-CSREES SARE (Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education) competitive grants program for the eleven contiguous Western states, Alaska, Hawaii and four island protectorates that have land-grant status (Guam, Micronesia, Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa). In January 1994, Utah State University and Professor V. Philip Rasmussen competitively won the program, which has since brought more than \$40 million to Utah State University. It currently brings in approximately \$3.7 million a year. SARE is a line item in the USDA-CSREES budget, *not* an earmark, and has been institutionalized in the USDA budget. Hence, it has attained ongoing status within USDA programs.

During its 12 years at USU, SARE has undergone USDA and CSREES audits, receiving numerous accolades for fair and equitable administration. The administrative funds to operate the program come from the annual SARE appropriations, so there is no ongoing budgetary burden on the Plants, Soils, and Climate Department, where it resides within the College of Agriculture.

Regional SARE programs are governed by congressionally mandated Administrative Councils (boards of directors), which include deans, agricultural experiment station directors, and extension directors as well as farmers and ranchers from across the West. A recent administrative review by the Western SARE

Administrative Council proposed that the SARE office at Utah State University change its name from a program to an official center. To retain this ongoing program at Utah State University, we need to comply with this request.

Need: When the Western SARE Administrative offices were awarded to Utah State University, Dr. Rasmussen was designated as its regional coordinator. Dr. Robert Gilliland (then Extension Director) and Dr. Paul Rasmussen (Utah Agricultural Experiment Station Director) designated Dr. Rasmussen as an Assistant Director in both organizations. This was required by USDA-CSREES so that Dr. Rasmussen could operate on a par with deans and directors across the region as he negotiated millions of dollars in contracts and grants. The recent administrative audit by SARE's Administrative Council requires that the program receive center status at Utah State University in order for Utah State University to continue to serve as host institution.

For this reason, it is imperative that the name be changed from the Western Region SARE Program to the Western Region SARE Center. It is also necessary that Dr. Rasmussen receive Center Director status within the Administrative structure at Utah State University, which will allow for a smoother flow of a multimillion dollar operation. It will also give the program the status needed to continue operating efficiently with the other land-grant programs in the western region and islands of the Pacific.

Institutional Impact: We believe the name change simply reflects the current status of this multi-million dollar program. This change simply codifies that center status. The administration in the Plants, Soils, and Climate Department, as well as College of Agriculture and research, extension, and academic administrators at Utah State University have expressed support for this name change.

The change should have minimal institutional impact within the College of Agriculture, the Department of Plants, Soils, and Climate, Utah State University or any other program in the Utah higher education system. No additional faculty, facilities or equipment will be required.

Finances: There is no anticipated budget impact from this proposed name change. All administrative fees for the program are paid by USDA-CSREES. The administrative budget is approximately \$400,000 a year, which reflects the travel required across the expansive western region. There would be no budget impact on College of Agriculture, the Utah Cooperative Extension Service or the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station.

B. Southern Utah University

i. Name Changes for Two Departments Within the Beverly Taylor Sorenson College of Education and Human Development.

<u>Request</u>: In accordance with USHE R401, Approval of New Programs, Program Changes, and Discontinued Programs, Southern Utah University requests The current Department of Secondary Education will be renamed the Department of Graduate Studies in Education and the existing Department of Elementary Education and Family Development will be renamed the Department of Trustees on March 23, 2007.

Need: The name changes better reflect the structure of the College which has evolved due to growth of the Master's of Education program. This Department of Graduate Studies in Education will oversee and facilitate the Master's of Education Program, The Educational Leadership - Utah Administrative/Supervisory Program, The Graduate Educator Licensure Program (G.E.L.P.), all graduate endorsement programs (Reading, Elementary Mathematics, ESL, etc.), the Clark County School District/Clark County Education Association Center for Teaching Excellence, and co-facilitate all 5000 level coursework with the School of Continuing and Professional Studies. It will also facilitate all other graduate education courses.

This Department of Teacher Education and Family Development will oversee and facilitate the Elementary Education Program, the Secondary Education Program, the Special Education Program, The Family Life and Human Development Program, Distance and Licensure Programs to Dixie State College, the Community College of Southern Nevada, and future distance programs in collaboration with the School of Continuing and Professional Studies, and all other undergraduate education courses.

Institutional Impact: The results of the change will help facilitate the operation of the Master's of Education program and other programs offered within the Beverly Taylor Sorenson College of Education and Human Development

Finances: The proposed name changes will have no budgetary impact.

ii. Name Change for One of the Five Emphases Currently Offered Under the Communication Major

<u>**Request</u>**: The department requests the "interpersonal communication" emphasis be renamed to "communication studies."</u>

<u>Need</u>: The new name, "communication studies" better reflects the national trends for such programs and aligns better with the current course offerings that include broader courses beyond human communication such as conflict management, human resource development, health communication, family communication and political communication.

Institutional Impact: The change will help in advising communication students and clarify emphases options. There should be no negative affects or broader institutional impacts.

Finances: No budgetary impact

Commissioner's Recommendation

<u>The Commissioner recommends the Regents approve the institutional requests on the Information</u> <u>Calendar of the Career and Technical Education, and Student Success Programs Committee as described</u> <u>above. No action required.</u>

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/LS/JMC

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Chief Academic Officers (CAO) Report

Background

The Council of Chief Academic Officers has written a series of research papers regarding recurring and important issues influencing higher education today. Many of the topics are timeless and will have relevance for years to come. Although the initial papers were authored by CAOs, in the future they will include the work of the Chief Students Services Officers and their staffs as well and reflect many functions of higher education and campus programs. Ultimately, these papers are written to address our customers: the students. The papers have the potential to assist in the development of campus and system-wide initiatives. Beginning with the April 2007 Board of Regents planning meeting, one paper will be presented during each meeting. They will be heard first in the Strategic Planning and Communications committee before they are presented to the Board.

Issue

Utah's Concurrent Enrollment Program is designed to provide high school students the opportunity to earn college credit while in high school. The program is an ideal way for high school students to experience the challenge of college curriculum while still in high school.

Research indicates that students who participate in concurrent enrollment not only transition to postsecondary education at a higher rate than other students, but also those students who have completed concurrent enrollment courses graduate on time at a higher rate than students who have not taken concurrent enrollment courses.

During 2006-07, the Utah System of Higher Education and the Utah State Office of Education agreed on an approach to managing Concurrent Enrollment that has moved the program forward in both quantity and quality. Over 27,000 students were enrolled in at least one concurrent enrollment course during 2005-06. In addition to providing educational opportunities to the students who participate, the program saves parents and the state of Utah a substantial amount of money. The CAOs are concerned about and committed to ensuring that the concurrent enrollment program is of the highest quality and adheres to state and national standards in providing students a focused and rigorous experience. During 2006-07, the CAOs agreed upon outcomes and performance standards for the concurrent enrollment program. This paper calls for a continuation of these efforts as the program continues to server Utah students.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This is not an action item. The Commissioner recommends the Board discuss the proposed initiatives in this and future papers and use them as needed to help define and implement the strategic direction.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/GW



Concurrent Enrollment Challenges and Opportunities: Quality is the Key

Dr. Gary S. Wixom Dr. Mike King for the Council of Chief Academic Officers Utah System of Higher Education June 2007

The Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) is committed to delivering a quality experience for high school students participating in the concurrent enrollment program. A quality concurrent enrollment program ensures that course work is academically rigorous and congruous with classes taught at USHE institutions and simultaneously satisfies public education requirements.

A quality concurrent enrollment program is dependent on an appropriate and rigorous curriculum, faculty that meets appropriate and rigorous standards, and students who have appropriate and rigorous preparation. A strong partnership between public and higher education will help ensure these elements of a quality program.

Over the past several years, officials at USHE institutions have worked together and individually to put policies and procedures in place that insure quality outcomes and performance. The responsibility for the quality rests with the faculty, department, and institution delivering the program.

Utah's Rich History

Concurrent enrollment (dual enrollment) has a rich history in Utah. Articulation between high school and college courses has been in place in many regions of Utah since the 1970s. Formal articulation, which includes granting both high school and college credit for students' work, developed fully in the early 1980s. The number of students enrolled across the state grew to several thousand by the mid-1980s. The costs to deliver and support the program came from fees charged to students and school districts. The success of the program caught the interest of legislators and in 1988, the Utah State Legislature implemented the current format for concurrent enrollment programs, providing state funding for the program and making concurrent enrollment offerings available to all high school junior and seniors that meet the minimum requirements without substantial cost.

The Impact of Concurrent Enrollment

Nationally, 70 percent of students complete high school;¹ of those, only 53 percent enter college directly from high school and only 35 percent earn a degree.² In Utah, 88 percent of 18- to 24-year-olds have a high school credential; however, only 34 percent of those 18- to 24-year-olds are enrolled in college.³

Concurrent enrollment courses have a direct positive impact on students. It is reported nationally that high school students who take college-level courses graduate from high school and succeed in college at higher rates than classmates who do not take such courses.⁴

A study conducted by Clark (2001) ⁵ indicates that four-year college students who participated in a high school concurrent enrollment program have higher postsecondary aspirations, higher college GPAs, and a higher four-year graduation rate than students who did not participate.

During 2005-2006, there were 27,396 students enrolled in Concurrent Enrollment courses across Utah. These students generated 189,838 semester hours split between career and technical education (CTE) courses and general studies. A recent study conducted at the Commissioner's Office examined the students enrolled in concurrent enrollment during a five-year period from 2000 to 2005.⁶

| Academic Entry Year | Number of Students | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--|
| 1999 | 19,605 | |
| 2000 | 20,221 | |
| 2001 | 19,423 | |
| 2002 | 20,891 | |
| 2003 | 22,258 | |
| 2004 | 23,625 | |
| 2005 | 26,997 | |

Table 1: System-wide Student Count of Concurrent Enrollment Students

While the majority of high school students are male, the majority of concurrent enrollment students are female.

| Year | Male | Female | Non-specified |
|----------|------|--------|---------------|
| 1999 | 46% | 54% | 0% |
| 2000 | 46% | 54% | 0% |
| 2001 | 47% | 53% | 0% |
| 2002 | 45% | 54% | 1% |
| 2003 | 45% | 54% | 1% |
| 2004 | 44% | 54% | 2% |
| 2005 | 43% | 51% | 6% |
| HS: 2005 | 60% | 40% | n/a |

Table 2: Gender Percentages of Concurrent Enrollment Students

Utah students have the opportunity to choose from over 600 courses. Each of these courses fits somewhere in the requirements for a certificate or degree. However, the majority of the students takes only two to four courses. During 2005, 91 percent of the students were enrolled in four or fewer courses.

Of the students in 1999 that took concurrent enrollment courses, 58 percent of the students eventually enrolled at a postsecondary institution. Of the students that entered in 2000, 46 percent graduated on-time

(On-time graduation is defined as six years for a bachelor's degree and three years for an associate's degree or two-year certificate.) Only 21 percent of non-concurrent enrollment students graduated on time.⁷

| Table 3: On-time Graduation Rates of Full-time and Part-time |
|--|
| Students who were First-Year Students in 2000 |
| |

| | Concurrent Enrollment | Non-Concurrent Enrollment |
|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| | Students | Students |
| Full-time | 52% | 31% |
| Part-time | 25% | 7% |
| Average | 46% | 21% |

The more concurrent enrollment courses students take, the higher the rate of graduation.

| Concurrent Enrollment Courses Completed | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| Number of Courses | On-time Graduation Rate | |
| One | 42% | |
| Two to Four | 46% | |
| Five to Seven | 57% | |
| Eight to Eleven | 61% | |
| Twelve or more | 67%* | |
| Average | 46% | |

Table 4: On-time Graduation Rate based on Number of Concurrent Enrollment Courses Completed

Although in general college participation rates and on-time graduation rates seem favorable for concurrent enrollment, more research is needed to determine the success of the program.⁸

Ensuring Quality

In an effort to enhance and ensure quality in the concurrent enrollment program, the Chief Academic Officers from USHE institutions, and staff from the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education and the Utah State Office of Education have agreed to adopt performance and outcome standards for the concurrent enrollment program. These standards give direction to four essential aspects of the program: the curriculum, the faculty, the students, and the evaluation process.

The standards for concurrent enrollment curriculum are:

- The content of USHE courses is to be the same regardless of the site where they are delivered. Concurrent enrollment courses must use an approved syllabus, have the same course content, use the approved text material, and use assessment instruments as specified by the sponsoring USHE department. Student grading standards will be defined by the sponsoring USHE department. In order for USHE courses to be approved for high school credit, course content must also be in harmony with standards set for the high school core.
- 2. To help ensure quality, the commonality of instruction, and the success of participants, at least 50 percent of students in academic courses must be officially enrolled as concurrent enrollment students as specified by the sponsoring institution (some institutions may require a higher percentage.) Career and technical education (CTE) courses are an exception.

- 3. Concurrent enrollment courses should be delivered by the local institution in the service delivery area. Courses delivered through technology intended for state-wide enrollment may come from any USHE institution and will be coordinated through the Utah Electronic College. Courses delivered by institutions other than the institution in the local service area are governed by the first right of refusal as specified in Regents policy R-165.
- 4. Students may register only for courses that are approved in the students SEOP and that follow the student's approved career pathway. All concurrent enrollment courses must lead to a certificate or degree program. Proper advisement at both the high school and college/university is essential to help ensure that students are reaching their goals.
- 5. College courses that are delivered through the concurrent enrollment program and used by high school students for high school graduation requirements must meet the Utah State Core Standards.
- 6. Requests for concurrent enrollment courses should generally come from public education based on local student needs. Courses must be approved by the offering institution and USOE prior to being included on the concurrent enrollment master list. Courses not on the master list will not receive concurrent enrollment funding.

The following standards have been established for faculty teaching concurrent enrollment courses:

- All concurrent enrollment faculty must meet the established criteria for adjunct status of the sponsoring department. A minimum of a master's degree in the subject or related area generally will be required. Institutional decisions will be made in harmony with institutional policy. Requirements for CTE faculty will be consistent with requirements established by the sponsoring institution.
- 2. Concurrent enrollment faculty are required to attend New Adjunct Faculty Orientation as specified by the sponsoring institution. In addition, faculty must attend in-service training during the year as specified by the institution. This training will include curriculum design, assessment criteria, course philosophy, and administrative requirements for concurrent faculty.
- 3. Concurrent enrollment faculty are expected to adhere to all guidelines established by the department of the sponsoring institution.

The following standards have been set for students participating in concurrent enrollment courses:

- Students enrolled in concurrent enrollment classes must demonstrate their preparedness for a course by meeting the standards established by sponsoring departments. These requirements may include qualifying ACT or assessment test scores. Some courses may require the successful completion of pre-requisites in addition to an overall GPA. The requirements will match those of on-campus college students. Students not meeting these standards will not be allowed to register.
- 2. Students may be required to pay a one-time application fee as set by the sponsoring institution.
- 3. All concurrent enrollment grades are posted to an official USHE transcript, which becomes part of a student's permanent record. The grade given at the high school must be the same as the grade given

at the USHE institution. Student grades assigned on the high school transcript will remain the responsibility of the high school and school district.

4. Prior to registration, students must meet with a high school counselor to plan a program which will best facilitate their long-term educational goals. Concurrent enrollment courses should be identified during the Student Educational Occupational Plan (SEOP) process. USHE academic advisors will also be available to help students formulate career choices. Students are discouraged from taking a random list of classes just to amass college credits.

The following evaluation process has been established for the concurrent enrollment program:

- Site visits by departmental representatives and concurrent enrollment personnel are important to the on-going, program assessment. Close attention to departmental guidelines, learning objectives outlined in the syllabus, course content, and program evaluation will help assure a quality program. Departmental representatives should visit each adjunct faculty member at least once a year to coordinate the instructional activities. Concurrent enrollment staff will coordinate visits and are available throughout the year to address specific needs of the high school students, faculty, and administrators.
- 2. All courses and instructors will be evaluated according to the institutions student's evaluation process. These evaluations are to be shared with the appropriate concurrent enrollment personnel; the department chair/dean; and, in the case of high school adjuncts with the high school principal. Adjunct faculty not meeting acceptable departmental standards will be withdrawn from the program according to the sponsoring institutional policies.
- 3. Each year concurrent enrollment staff will conduct student-participant surveys of graduating seniors. The survey data, excluding confidential personnel matters, will be shared with the Concurrent Enrollment Task Force.
- 4. Every five years, concurrent enrollment staff will conduct a study of the impact and effectiveness of the concurrent enrollment program. The evaluation should include college faculty, participating high school instructors, principals and guidance counselors. The study data, excluding confidential personnel matters, will be shared with the Concurrent Enrollment Task Force
- 5. Every five years, concurrent enrollment staff will conduct a follow-up study of concurrent enrollment participants who are currently enrolled or have been enrolled in a college or university in order to track their performance. This study may be coordinated with system-wide studies conducted by the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education. The study findings, excluding confidential personnel matters, will be shared with the Concurrent Enrollment Task Force.
- 6. Concurrent enrollment staff will also conduct other research activities as deemed necessary to learn the effectiveness of the program and provide feedback to each institution involved. The study findings, excluding confidential personnel matters, will be shared with the Concurrent Enrollment Task Force.
- 7. A process will be established by the Concurrent Enrollment Task Force to monitor both the higher and public education institutions to determine whether the services as outlined are being delivered.

Technology-Delivered Courses

Delivering concurrent enrollment courses through technology is an excellent option since the instruction is generally delivered by college faculty and instruction can reach students in remote areas of the state. Courses delivered through technology should be closely supervised and evaluated by the sponsoring instructional department.

Summary

The concurrent enrollment program will continue to grow in Utah. The program is a bridge between public and higher education for many students and has the potential to influence the lives of many more students. The success of the program will require a continued partnership between public education and higher education.

Initiatives

The Chief Academic Officers recommend the following initiatives:

- 1. Communication needs to be enhanced between concurrent enrollment partners by streamlining the course review and approval process, enhancing supervision activities, and improving the data collection and reporting process.
- 2. The process for ensuring rigor and focus in all concurrent enrollment courses should be further defined.
- 3. Additional research needs to be conducted on the success factors for students participating in concurrent enrollment and the impact of concurrent enrollment on various populations including disadvantaged and minority students.
- 4. The current Website, hosted at the USOE, should be expanded and enhanced to provide additional information for students, parents, and concurrent enrollment managers.
- 5. The evaluation processes for the concurrent enrollment program needs to be enhanced, in order to provide stakeholders pertinent information for future decisions concerning the program.

¹ Barton, P. (2005). *One-Third of a nation: Rising dropout rates and declining opportunities*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

² Adelman, C. (March 17, 2006). *The Toolbox Revisited, Paths to degree completion from high school through college.* Presentation at the American Youth Policy Forum, Washington, D.C.. Retrieved May 1,2006, from http://www.aypf.org/forumbriefs/2006/Resources/031706Adelman.ppt.

³ *Measuring Up 2006, The National Report Card on Higher Education*, The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Utah, pp 5-7.

⁴ New Report Features Dual-Enrollment Programs That Help High-Schoolers Excel. (October 30, 2006). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

⁵ Clark, R.W. (2001). *Dual credit: A Report of programs and policies that offer high school students college credits*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trust.

⁶ Colbert, J. (November 2006). Concurrent Enrollment in Utah: Descriptive Student and Course Information, Utah System of Higher Education.

⁷ Colbert, J. (November 2006). Concurrent Enrollment in Utah: System-wide on-time Graduation Rates, Utah System of Higher Education. pg 3.

⁸ Ibid, pg. 4.

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Proposed Presidential Salaries for 2007-2008</u>

It has been the practice of the Board of Regents to approve salary increases for presidents and the commissioner at the May/June Board meeting. Often these increases reflect the standard percentage increase funded by the Legislature for faculty and staff. On other occasions, the Board has found it prudent to make special adjustments to presidential salaries in order to continue to have competitive salary levels. For presidents recently appointed, salaries were established at the time of appointment at what was perceived to be market level at that time.

The Board of Regents utilizes several criteria when setting salary levels for institutional Presidents and the Commissioner. It should be noted that no President requested a salary increase and several have resisted salary increases in past years. The proposed salaries, in part, are influenced by the following policy issues:

- 1. Salaries should reflect the size, scope of programs, and administrative complexity of the institution. Preferably, presidential salaries of the ten institutions should be arrayed in rank order to clearly reflect these characteristics.
- In order for USHE to recruit and retain qualified Presidents, USHE salaries should be competitive compared to presidential salaries for peer institutions. In cases where USHE salaries are far from peer averages, achieving market levels may need to be a multi-year process.
- 3. Salaried should also reflect the length of service of the President and the extent to which the President is meeting institutional and Regents expectations.
- 4. Attention should be given to the fact that salaries of new presidents have been set closer to market value at the time of appointment. This has created some internal inequities which should be addressed.

Regent Jerry Atkin, Chair of the Compensation Committee, has participated in discussion of these proposed salaries. A list of proposed presidential salaries for FY08 will be hand-carried to the June 8 meeting. These proposed salaries reflect presidential salaries at peer institutions as well as individual job performance by each president.

Commissioner's Recommendation

<u>The Commissioner recommends that the Board of Regents review information presented on</u> <u>presidential salaries and approve a 2007-2008 salary for each president and the commissioner.</u>

> Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>University of Utah – Campus Master Planning Process</u>

Regent policy R710 requires approval of campus master plans every two years, a process traditionally done during Regent visits to campus.

The University of Utah has initiated a comprehensive planning effort, in response to strategic business, educational and service initiatives, to develop a new Campus Master Plan. This effort will be driven by President Michael K. Young's vision referred to in his inaugural address, as he spoke of "engagement, preparation, and partnership."

The Campus Master Plan will guide efficient development in a way that gives physical form to the university's mission, vision, and academic programs. It will provide an analysis of site locations for research and teaching facilities, broader campus land use, landscape, formal and informal open space, as well as pedestrian and vehicular circulation. The analysis will also assess TRAX and public transportation, parking, predominant building use, utility infrastructure, land ownership, campus edges and community interaction, design features, and opportunities.

The Campus Master Plan will be organized into five (5) phases:

| Phase I – Project Start up | January – February |
|--|----------------------|
| Phase II – Discovery a. Develop Campus Concepts (Part 1) New Building Sites b. Visioning and Analysis | February - April |
| Phase III – Develop Campus Concepts (Part 2) Plan Alternatives | April - May |
| Phase IV – Refine Strategy | May - August |
| Phase V – Campus Master Plan Documentation | September - December |

The University has hired Skidmore Owings and Merrill, San Francisco, to assist in the development of the Campus Master Plan. The Campus Master Plan, administered by the Office of Facilities Planning, will provide a clear vision to guide physical development of the campus over the next twenty years. This Campus Master Plan will supersede the 1997 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP); the 1998 East Campus Plan (ECP); and the 2003 LRDP Supplement. There will be a number of opportunities for campus and community involvement, and input, during this anticipated one-year process.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends that the Regents endorse the master planning process currently underway at the University of Utah, anticipating conclusion on or about January 2008.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS Attachments

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: University of Utah – Approving Resolution, Research Facilities System Revenue Bonds, Series 2007A (383 Colorow Way Building Acquisition Project)

Utah Code (11-17-17) permits the Board of Regents, on behalf of the University of Utah, to issue up to \$10,000,000 of bonded debt in any fiscal year. The University of Utah requests that the Board issue \$10 million this year as part of a \$20 million non-state funded project to purchase a building located at 383 Colorow Way in Research Park.

Funding for debt service on the \$10 million bond comes from research revenue. No state tax funds or student fees are used for this purpose. This purchase was approved by the Executive Committee of the University's Board of Trustees on May 24, 2007.

The bond resolution draft and a financing summary are included with this memo. University officials and bond counsel will deliver official documents at the June 8 meeting and will be prepared to answer questions from the Board of Regents.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends that the Regents review and approve the attached bond authorization.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS Attachments

\$10,000,000

STATE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE STATE OF UTAH

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH Research Facilities System Revenue Bonds (383 Colorow Way Building Acquisition Project) Series 2007A

FINANCING SUMMARY

The University is seeking Regent approval to purchase, renovate and equip a building located at 383 Colorow Way in Research Park (the "Building") and to issue Research Facilities System Revenue Bonds in the aggregate amount of \$10 million including the amounts necessary for debt service reserves and capitalized interest, if any, and to pay costs of issuance.

> The proposed acquisition would bring under University ownership the facility in Research Park located at 383 Colorow Way, whose current owners have expressed an interest in selling it to the University. The Building is currently configured as prime research space and should require little additional renovation to make it immediately useful to the University. It is anticipated that this facility may act initially as "bridge" space for the USTAR initiatives, until that facility can be built. But even after the USTAR building is completed, this proposed acquisition will provide much needed expansion space for the University's ongoing research needs, especially in the health sciences arena.

> The University anticipates the purchase price of the Building at an amount not-to-exceed \$18.5 million. Initial renovation and equipping of the Building have been estimated at approximately \$1.5 million, for a total price of \$20.0 million. Given the timing and urgency of this transaction, the University must act expeditiously to secure ownership of the Building, pending an independent appraisal.

> After consultation with the University's Bond Counsel and Financial Advisor, the University feels it is in its best interest to issue \$10 million of such bonds during fiscal year 2007 (the "Series 2007A Bonds" or the "Bonds") with the remaining \$8.5 to \$10 million in July or August of 2007 (the new fiscal

Purpose:

| | year) to complete the borrowing package for the Building (the "Series 2007B Bonds"). |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | The University's Research Facilities System bonding system is very robust and strong in terms of credit quality. The underlying bond ratings for the system are currently "Aa3/AA-" from Moody's Investors Service and Standard and Poor's, respectively. |
| Par Amount: | Not-to-exceed \$10,000,000 |
| Security: | The Series 2007A Bonds (the "Bonds") will be payable from indirect cost recovery revenues (the "Revenues") collected by the University. For Fiscal Year June, 30, 2006, total pledged Revenues were approximately \$62 million. Based upon maximum annual debt service on the University's outstanding Research Facilities Revenue Bonds of \$4,731,000, there is a very healthy coverage factor of approximately 12.85X. |
| Ratings/Insurance: | Neither bond ratings nor bond insurance will be sought for the Bonds. |
| Method of Sale: | Private Placement through Competitive Bid |
| Closing Date: | June 28, 2007. |
| Interest Payment Dates: | April 1 & October 1, beginning October 1, 2007. |
| Interest Basis: | 30/360 |
| Principal Payment Dates: | April 1, beginning April 1, 2008. |
| Maturity: | Not to exceed 16 years from date of issuance |
| Redemption: | Callable at par at any time (The successful purchaser of the Bonds will be aware that the University may consider (without any obligation to do so) refinancing the Bonds as part of the expected issuance of the Series 2007B Bonds). |
| University of Utah Contact: | Arnold B. Combe (581-6404) |
| Financial Advisor: | Kelly Murdock, Wells Fargo Public Finance (246-1732) |
| Trustee, Paying Agent/Reg.: | Wells Fargo Bank, National Association |
| Bond Counsel: | Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP |

APPROVING RESOLUTION UNIVERSITY OF UTAH RESEARCH FACILITIES REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2007A

Salt Lake City, Utah

June 8, 2007

The State Board of Regents of the State of Utah met in regular session (including by electronic means) at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah on June 8, 2007, commencing at __:00 a.m. The following members were present:

| Jed H. Pitcher | Chair |
|---------------------|------------|
| Bonnie Jean Beesley | Vice Chair |
| Jerry C. Atkin | Member |
| Daryl C. Barrett | Member |
| Janet A. Cannon* | Member |
| Rosanita Cespedes | Member |
| Katharine B. Garff | Member |
| David J. Grant | Member |
| Ali Hasnain | Member |
| Greg W. Haws* | Member |
| Meghan Holbrook | Member |
| James S. Jardine | Member |
| Michael R. Jensen | Member |
| David J. Jordan | Member |
| Nolan E. Karras | Member |
| Josh M. Reid | Member |
| Sara V. Sinclair | Member |
| Marlon O. Snow | Member |
| | |

Absent:

Also Present:

Richard E. Kendell Joyce Cottrell, CPS Commissioner of Higher Education Secretary

^{*}

Non-voting member from State Board of Education

After the meeting had been duly convened and called to order by the Chair, the roll had been called with the above result and after other matters not pertinent to this Resolution had been discussed, the Chair announced that one of the purposes of the meeting was the consideration of various matters with respect to the issuance and sale of the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah University of Utah Research Facilities Revenue Bonds, Series 2007A.

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

AYE:

NAY:

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION OF THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE STATE OF UTAH AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF ITS UNIVERSITY OF UTAH RESEARCH FACILITIES REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2007A IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000,000; AUTHORIZING THE PUBLICATION OF A NOTICE OF BONDS TO BE ISSUED; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL INDENTURE OF TRUST, A BOND PURCHASE AGREEMENT AND OTHER DOCUMENTS REQUIRED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF ALL OTHER ACTIONS NECESSARY TO THE CONSUMMATION OF THE TRANSACTIONS CONTEMPLATED BY THIS RESOLUTION; AND RELATED MATTERS.

WHEREAS, the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah (the "Board") is established and exists under and pursuant to Section 53B-1-103, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Title 53B, Chapter 1, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, the Board is authorized to act as the governing authority of University of Utah (the "University") for the purpose of exercising the powers contained in Title 11, Chapter 17, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Act, the Board is empowered to issue up to \$10,000,000 of bonds in any one fiscal year to finance the acquisition, construction, improvement, equipping and furnishing of buildings and projects on behalf of the University; and

WHEREAS, the Board has not issued any bonds on behalf of the University pursuant to the Act during the current fiscal year (commenced July 1, 2006); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents on behalf of the University has previously issued its Research Facilities Revenue and Refunding Bonds, Series 2000A (Huntsman Cancer Institute Building Project), its Research Facilities Revenue Bonds, Series 2004A (Medical Research Facility Renovation Project), its Research Facilities Revenue Bonds, Series 2005A (Moran Eye Center Project) and its Research Facilities Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2005B (collectively, the "Outstanding Parity Bonds") pursuant to a General Indenture dated as of July 1, 2000 by and between the Board acting for and on behalf of the University and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., as trustee (the "Trustee") as heretofore amended and supplemented (the "General Indenture"); and

WHEREAS, the General Indenture permits the issuance of additional bonds under the General Indenture on a parity with the Outstanding Parity Bonds; and WHEREAS, the Board desires to authorize and approve the issuance and sale of the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah, University of Utah Research Facilities Revenue Bonds, Series 2007A (the "Series 2007A Bonds") in an aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$10,000,000 pursuant to the General Indenture and a Fifth Supplemental Indenture of Trust (the "Fifth Supplemental Indenture" and collectively with the General Indenture, the "Indenture") in order to (i) finance a portion of the costs of acquiring, improving, equipping and furnishing a building for research purposes for the University (the "Series 2007A Project") and (ii) fund reserves and pay costs of issuance related thereto; and

WHEREAS, the Series 2007A Bonds shall be payable solely from the University's reimbursed overhead revenues with respect to the University's research and development activities as more fully described in the Indenture (collectively, the "Revenues") and other moneys pledged therefor in the Indenture, and shall not constitute nor give rise to a general obligation or liability of the Board, the University or the State of Utah or constitute a charge against their general credit; and

WHEREAS, there has been presented to the Board at this meeting a form of a Bond Purchase Agreement (the "Bond Purchase Agreement") among the Board, the University and ______ as purchaser for the Series 2007A Bonds (the "Purchaser"), and a form of the Fifth Supplemental Indenture; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to grant to the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee of the Board the authority to approve the final interest rates, principal amounts, terms, maturities, redemption provisions, and purchase price at which the Series 2007A Bonds shall be sold and any changes with respect thereto from those terms which were before the Board at the time of adoption of this Resolution; provided such terms do not exceed the parameters set forth in this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE STATE OF UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:

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

Section 2. All action heretofore taken (not inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution) by the Board and the University and the officers of the Board or the University directed toward the issuance of the Series 2007A Bonds and acquisition and improvement of the Series 2007A Project are hereby ratified, approved and confirmed.

Section 3. The Fifth Supplemental Indenture in substantially the form presented to this meeting is in all respects authorized, approved and confirmed. The Chair, Vice Chair and/or Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee and Secretary of the Board and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Fifth Supplemental Indenture in substantially the same form and with substantially the same

content as the form of such document presented to this meeting for and on behalf of the Board and the University with such alterations, changes or additions as may be authorized by Section 7 hereof.

Section 4. For the purpose of (i) financing a portion of the costs of the Series 2007A Project and (ii) funding reserves and paying costs of issuance of the Series 2007A Bonds in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$10,000,000. The Series 2007A Bonds shall mature on such date or dates and bear interest at the rates, as shall be approved by the Chair or Vice Chair of the Board or the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee, all within the parameters set forth on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The issuance of the Series 2007A Bonds shall be subject to the final advice of Bond Counsel and to the approval of the office of the Attorney General of the State of Utah.

Section 5. The form, terms and provisions of the Series 2007A Bonds and the provisions for the signatures, authentication, payment, registration, transfer, exchange, interest rates, redemption and number shall be as set forth in the Indenture. The Chair, Vice Chair and/or Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee and the Secretary of the Board and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University are hereby authorized to execute and seal by manual or facsimile signature the Series 2007A Bonds and to deliver the Series 2007A Bonds to the Trustee for authentication. All terms and provisions of the Indenture and the Series 2007A Bonds are hereby incorporated in this Resolution. The appropriate officials of the Board and the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver to the Trustee the written order of the Board for authentication and delivery of the Series 2007A Bonds in accordance with the provisions of the Indenture.

Section 6. The Series 2007A Bonds shall be sold to the Purchaser with a Purchaser's discount of not to exceed 2.0% of the face amount of the Series 2007A Bonds (plus out of pocket expenses). The Bond Purchase Agreement in substantially the form presented to this meeting is hereby authorized, approved and confirmed. The Chair or Vice Chair of the Board or the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University are hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Bond Purchase Agreement in substantially the same form and with substantially the same content as the form of the Bond Purchase Agreement presented at this meeting for and on behalf of the Board with final terms as may be established for the Series 2007A Bonds within the parameters set forth herein and with such alterations, changes or additions as may be necessary or as may be authorized by Section 7 hereof. The Chair or Vice-Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University are hereby authorized to specify and agree as to the final principal amounts, terms, discounts, maturities, interest rates, redemption provisions and purchase price with respect to the Series 2007A Bonds for and on behalf of the Board and the University and any changes thereto from those terms which were before the Board at the time of adoption of this Resolution, provided such terms are within the parameters set by this Resolution, with such approval to be conclusively established by the execution of the Bond Purchase Agreement and the Indenture.

Section 7. The appropriate officials of the Board and the University, including without limitation the Chair or Vice Chair of the Board and/or the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University are authorized to make any alterations, changes or additions to the Fifth Supplemental Indenture, the Series 2007A Bonds, the Bond Purchase Agreement or any other document herein authorized and approved which may be necessary to correct errors or omissions therein, to complete the same, to remove ambiguities therefrom, to conform the same to other provisions of said instruments, to the provisions of this Resolution or any resolution adopted by the Board or the provisions of the laws of the State of Utah or the United States.

Section 8. The appropriate officials of the Board and the University, including without limitation the Chair, Vice Chair, the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee, Commissioner of Higher Education and Secretary of the Board and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University, are hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver for and on behalf of the Board and the University any or all additional certificates, documents and other papers (including any reserve instrument guaranty agreements not in conflict with the Indenture) and to perform all other acts they may deem necessary or appropriate in order to implement and carry out the matters authorized in this Resolution and the documents authorized and approved herein.

Section 9. The appropriate officers of the Board and the University, including without limitation the Chair, Vice Chair, the Chair of the Finance, Facilities and Accountability Committee, Commissioner of Higher Education and Secretary of the Board and the President and Vice President for Administrative Services of the University are hereby authorized to take all action necessary or reasonably required by the Indenture or the Bond Purchase Agreement to carry out, give effect to and consummate the transactions as contemplated thereby and are authorized to take all action necessary in conformity with the Act.

Section 10. Upon their issuance, the Series 2007A Bonds will constitute special limited obligations of the Board payable solely from and to the extent of the sources set forth in the Indenture. No provision of this Resolution, the Series 2007A Bonds, the Bond Purchase Agreement, the Indenture or any other instrument, shall be construed as creating a general obligation of the Board or the University, or of creating a general obligation of the State of Utah or any political subdivision thereof, nor as incurring or creating a charge upon the general credit of the Board, the University, the State of Utah or any political subdivision thereof.

Section 11. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, the Board shall cause the following "Notice of Bonds to be Issued" to be published one (1) time in <u>The Salt</u> <u>Lake Tribune</u>, a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the principal administrative office of the University is located and shall cause a copy of this Resolution

and the Indenture to be kept on file in the Board's office in Salt Lake City, Utah, for public examination during the regular business hours of the Board until at least thirty (30) days from and after the date of publication thereof. The "Notice of Bonds to be Issued" shall be in substantially the following form:

NOTICE OF BONDS TO BE ISSUED

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to the provisions of the Utah Industrial Facilities and Development Act, Title 11, Chapter 17, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, that on June 8, 2007, the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah (the "Board") adopted a resolution (the "Resolution") in which it authorized the issuance of the Board's Research Facilities Revenue Bonds, Series 2007A (the "Series 2007A Bonds") in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the purpose of financing a portion of the costs of acquiring, improving, equipping and furnishing a building for research purposes (the "Project") for the University of Utah (the "University"). The Project shall be used by the University.

The Series 2007A Bonds are to be issued and sold by the Board pursuant to the Resolution, including as part of said Resolution a form of a General Indenture of Trust as previously amended and supplemented and a Fifth Supplemental Indenture of Trust (collectively, the "Indenture").

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

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that a period of thirty (30) days from and after the date of the publication of this notice is provided by law during which any person in interest shall have the right to contest the legality of the Resolution, the Indenture (only as it relates to the Series 2007A Bonds), or the Series 2007A Bonds, or any provision made for the security and payment of the Series 2007A Bonds, and that after such time, no one shall have any cause of action to contest the regularity, formality or legality thereof for any cause whatsoever.

DATED this 8th day of June, 2007.

/s/ Joyce Cottrell

Secretary

Section 12. After any of the Series 2007A Bonds are delivered by the Trustee to or for the account of the Purchaser and upon receipt of payment therefor, this Resolution shall be and remain irrepealable until the principal of, premium, if any, and interest on the Series 2007A Bonds are deemed to have been fully discharged in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Indenture.

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

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

Section 15. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE STATE OF UTAH THIS 8TH DAY OF JUNE, 2007.

STATE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE STATE OF UTAH

(SEAL)

Chair

ATTEST:

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

(SEAL)

Chair

ATTEST:

Secretary

STATE OF UTAH)

:ss.

COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

I, Joyce Cottrell, do hereby certify that I am the duly qualified and acting Secretary of the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah.

I further certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of an excerpt of the minutes of a meeting of said Board held on June 8, 2007 and of a resolution adopted at said meeting, as said minutes and resolution are officially of record in my possession.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and impressed hereon the official seal of said Board this 8th day of June, 2007.

Secretary

(SEAL)

:ss.

)

COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

I, Joyce Cottrell, the undersigned, the duly qualified and acting Secretary of the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah, do hereby certify, according to the records of said State Board of Regents in my official possession, and upon my own knowledge and belief, that:

in accordance with the requirements of Section 52-4-202, Utah (a) Code Annotated 1953, as amended I gave public notice of the agenda, date, time and place of the June 8, 2007 public meeting held by the Members of the State Board of Regents by causing a Notice of Public Meeting to be posted at the principal office of the State Board of Regents at 60 South 400 West, in Salt Lake City, Utah, on , at least 24 hours prior to the convening of such meeting, in the form attached hereto as Schedule 1; said Notice of Public Meeting having continuously remained so posted and available for public inspection during the regular office hours of the State Board of Regents until the convening of the meeting; and causing a copy of said Notice of Public Meeting in the form attached hereto as Schedule 1 to be provided on , at least 24 hours prior to the convening of such meeting, to the Deseret Morning News and The Salt Lake Tribune, newspapers of general circulation within the geographic jurisdiction of the State Board of Regents, and to each local media correspondent, newspaper, radio station or television station which has requested notification of meetings of the State Board of Regents; and

(b) that in accordance with the requirements of Section 52-4-202, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, public notice of the 2007 Annual Meeting Schedule of the State Board of Regents was given specifying the date, time and place of the regular meetings of the State Board of Regents scheduled to be held during the year, by causing a Notice of Annual Meeting Schedule for the State Board of Regents (in the form attached as <u>Schedule 2</u>) to be posted on ______ at the principal office of the State Board of Regents in Salt Lake City, Utah and causing a copy of such Notice of Annual Meeting Schedule to be provided on ______ to a newspaper of general circulation within the geographic jurisdiction of Salt Lake City, Utah.

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and impressed hereon the official seal of the State Board of Regents of the State of Utah, this 8th day of June, 2007.

Secretary

(SEAL)

SCHEDULE 1

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

(See Transcript Document No. __)

SCHEDULE 2

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

(See Transcript Document No. __)

SCHEDULE 3

ELECTRONIC MEETING POLICY

EXHIBIT A

PARAMETERS OF THE SERIES 2007A BONDS

| Principal amount not to exceed | \$10,000,000 |
|--|-----------------|
| Interest rates not to exceed | 6.5% |
| Discount from par not to exceed | 2% |
| Final Maturity not to exceed | April 1, 2023 |
| Optional Call at not more than 101% of par on or prior to: | October 1, 2008 |

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: University of Utah – Board of Trustees Statement of Responsibilities and Code of Conduct, Trustee Disclosure Statement, and Conflict of Interest Policy

On April 20, 2007, the Board of Regents approved a system-wide "Statement Regarding Ethical Duties and an Acknowledgment and Disclosure Form" to be reviewed and signed by presidents, the commissioner, trustees, and regents. At that time, the Regents left open the possibility that individual institutions could develop an institutionally-specific statement and form.

The University of Utah requests approval of a statement and form to be used by the University president and Board of Trustees. Commissioner's staff and Attorney General staff have reviewed the University's "Board of Trustees Statement of Responsibilities and Code of Conduct," "Trustee Disclosure Statement," and Conflict of Interest Policy" and have determined that they are consistent with the Regents' documents.

Commissioner's Recommendation

<u>The Commissioner recommends approval of the University of Utah's "Statement of</u> <u>Responsibilities and Code of Conduct," "Trustee Disclosure Statement," and "Conflict of Interest</u> <u>Policy" for use by the University's president and trustees.</u>

> Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH BOARD OF TRUSTEES CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

1. <u>Introduction</u>

University trustees commonly have a range of professional and personal associations with and interests in other entities. To assure the University's many constituents of the integrity of its endeavors, trustees should avoid situations in which such associations or interests could compromise or reasonably appear to compromise important academic values or the University's business decisions. Accordingly, it is the policy of the Board of Trustees that trustees shall act in a manner consistent with their responsibilities to the University and avoid circumstances in which their financial or other ties to outside entities could present an actual, potential or apparent conflict of interest or impair the University's reputation.

No policy statement can address specifically every conceivable situation that might entail a conflict of interest. As a general principle, trustees should avoid any actions or situations that might result in or create the appearance of using their association with the University for private gain, according unwarranted preferential treatment to any outside individual or organization, losing independence or impartiality, or adversely affecting the University's reputation or public confidence in its integrity.

2. <u>State Law</u>

Trustees are public officers under the Utah Public Officers and Employees Ethics Act, U.C.A 67-16-1 *et seq* and may be subject to various other state laws in certain circumstances. In addition, the Board of Trustees has determined that it is in the best interests of the University and the public to set forth in greater detail the policies below regarding conflicts of interest. To the extent these policies conflict with state law, state law shall govern.

3. <u>Presumed Financial Conflicts of Interest</u>

For purposes of this policy, a conflict of interest is presumed to arise when the University has or is considering a transaction or other business relationship with a trustee or a trustee's family member (defined to include a spouse, child or household member) or with an outside entity in which the trustee or family member has a material financial interest. A financial interest is presumed to be material if it entails:

- Any ownership or investment interest (including stock, options, a partnership interest or any other ownership or investment interest) valued at more than \$10,000 except equity in a publicly traded company amounting to less than a 5 percent ownership interest in the company;
- Receipt of non-dividend compensation (including salary, consulting fees, royalty payments or other remuneration) of more than \$10,000 in any 12-month period in the past three years, or the expectation of such compensation in the future;

- Real property, personal property, intellectual property or any other interest valued at \$10,000 or more;
- A position of real or apparent authority in an outside entity, such as director, officer, trustee, or partner.

A trustee is not deemed to have a material financial interest in a publicly traded entity by reason of an investment in that entity by another publicly traded entity, such as through a mutual fund, of which the trustee does not control investment decisions.

A conflict of interest may also arise when a trustee or family member has or is considering an investment in an entity, such as a fund or partnership, that is not publicly traded and in which the University has or is considering an investment. Because such parallel investments may create at least an appearance that the trustee is benefiting from the University's participation in the entity, trustees should promptly disclose to the Board any material financial interest in any such entity in which the trustee otherwise knows the University has or is considering an investment.

4. <u>Disclosure of Financial Interests</u>

A trustee who has a known material financial interest in a pending or proposed transaction or business arrangement involving the University shall promptly disclose to the Board the existence of the interest and other material information that the trustee may have regarding the transaction or arrangement. In addition, each trustee shall annually sign and submit to the secretary of the University a statement disclosing all material financial interests, known to the trustee, of the trustee or a family member, in any outside entity with which the trustee knows the University has or is considering a transaction or other business relationship, or affirming that the trustee knows of no such interests.

The University is a large, complex and diverse institution which has financial relationships and dealings with countless individuals, businesses and other entities. In the ordinary course of fulfilling their responsibilities, trustees will not be aware of all the transactions and business dealings of the University. Consequently, this conflict of interest policy applies only to transactions and business dealings of which the trustee is actually aware.

5. <u>Determination Whether Financial Conflict of Interest Exists</u>

The secretary shall review annual disclosure statements to determine whether a material financial interest has been disclosed. When a material financial interest has been disclosed, either in the annual disclosure statement or otherwise, the secretary shall promptly submit to the chair of the Board's Audit Committee or, if the interests involve the chair of the Audit Committee, another member of the Audit Committee, such disclosure forms together with any additional information about the current or proposed transaction or business relationship that may give rise to a conflict of interest that the secretary in consultation with the Audit Committee believes may be informative.

Unless the trustee elects recusal, the Audit Committee shall review the matter and preliminarily determine whether there is a conflict of interest. If the interests being reviewed

involve a member of the Audit Committee, the member shall not participate in or be present during the committee's consideration of the matter except as requested by the Committee to answer questions or provide information. The Audit Committee may review such information as it deems pertinent, including posing questions to the interested trustee involved. If the Audit Committee preliminarily determines that there is a conflict of interest, it shall so advise the interested trustee, who shall have an opportunity to address the matter with the Audit Committee. If the Audit Committee or the trustee involved believes that to do so is indicated, the matter may be referred to the Board.

If a conflict of interest determination is referred to the Board, either following review by the Audit Committee or if disclosure is made in the first instance to the Board (for example, where a trustee becomes aware of a possible conflict of interest during or just before a meeting of the Board), unless the trustee elects recusal, the Board shall decide whether a conflict of interest exists. The Board may question the interested trustee, and the trustee shall have an opportunity to address to the Board whether there is a conflict. The interested trustee shall leave the Board meeting while the disinterested members of the Board determine, by majority vote, whether the financial interest gives rise to a conflict of interest. If it is determined that no conflict of interest exists, the interested trustee may rejoin the meeting and participate fully in the discussion of and vote on the proposed transaction or arrangement.

6. <u>Consideration of Matters Involving Financial Conflict of Interest</u>

If the Board determines that a trustee has a financial conflict of interest in a matter before the Board, the Board may permit the interested trustee to make a presentation regarding the matter, but the interested trustee shall be required to leave the meeting prior to the discussion of, and the vote on, the proposed transaction or arrangement. The interested trustee shall not vote on the matter before the Board. The Board shall approve the transaction or arrangement only upon a finding, by a majority vote of the disinterested trustees, that the transaction or arrangement is in the University's best interest, is for the University's benefit, and is fair and reasonable to the University. The Board may engage such consultants as it deems necessary or useful to assist its determination of these issues.

7. <u>Disclosure of Non-Financial Interests</u>

A trustee who is an officer, director or fiduciary of another organization shall disclose said relationship prior to voting whenever the University Board of Trustees is considering a proposed action where said other organization would have a material interest in the outcome of the proposed action.

8. <u>Consideration of Matters Involving Non-Financial Conflict of Interest</u>

A trustee who has a known conflict of interest that is non-financial in nature and who discloses the same to the Board may nonetheless discuss and vote on the contemplated action of the Board.

9. <u>Record of Proceedings</u>

Whenever the Board holds a meeting at which a trustee's financial interest in a matter is disclosed, a determination regarding the existence of a conflict of interest is made, or a transaction or arrangement with respect to which a trustee has a conflict of interest is considered, the Board's consideration of these issues shall be considered pursuant to the provisions of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act and shall be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.

10. <u>Gifts</u>

Trustees shall not encourage or accept gifts, favors or gratuities, for themselves or family members, from any individual or entity that to the trustee's knowledge has, or seeks to have, a business relationship with the University. This does not include meals and activities which are part of official meetings or activities.

11. <u>Appropriation of University Opportunities</u>

If a trustee becomes aware of a business, investment or other potentially valuable opportunity that rightfully belongs to the University, and not to the trustee individually or another entity with which the trustee is affiliated, the trustee shall bring the opportunity to the attention of the Board.

12. <u>Confidentiality</u>

Trustees may not use confidential information acquired as a result of service to the University for any purpose unrelated to University business, or provide such information to any third party, without the consent of the Board. Wrongful use of University information includes, but is not limited to, use or disclosure of information to engage, invest or otherwise participate in any business, project, venture or transaction other than through the University.

13. Actions Not Void or Voidable

No transaction or action undertaken by the University shall be void or voidable, or may be challenged as such by an outside party, by reason of having been undertaken in violation of this policy or the principles set forth herein.

Trustee Disclosure Statement

Please report below any actual, apparent or potential conflict of interest you or a family member (defined to include a spouse, child or household member) may have, including, but not limited to, any known material financial interest in any entity that you know to have a current or proposed transaction or business arrangement with University. A financial interest is presumed to be material if it entails:

- Any ownership or investment interest (including stock, options, a partnership interest or any other ownership or investment interest) valued at more than \$10,000 except equity in a publicly traded company amounting to less than a 5 percent ownership interest in the company;
- Receipt of non-dividend compensation (including salary, consulting fees, royalty payments or other remuneration) of more than \$10,000 in any 12-month period in the past three years, or the expectation of such compensation in the future;
- Real property, personal property, intellectual property or any other interest valued at \$10,000 or more;
- A position of authority in an outside entity, such as director, officer, trustee, or partner.

A trustee is not deemed to have a material financial interest in a publicly traded entity by reason of an investment in that entity by another publicly traded entity, such as through a mutual fund, of which the trustee does not control investment decisions.

Each trustee has an ongoing obligation to notify the Board promptly of any actual, apparent or potential conflict of interest as it arises. (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

I have received and read a copy of the University Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Policy. I affirm that, other than the interests reported above, I am aware of no actual, apparent or potential conflict of interest (including known interests of family members), including no known material financial interest within the meaning of the conflict of interest policy in any entity that I know to have a current or proposed transaction or business arrangement with University.

Trustee (print name)

Date:

Signature

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH BOARD OF TRUSTEES STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND CODE OF CONDUCT

Trustee Responsibilities

The duties and responsibilities of trustees are set forth in (a) relevant sections of the Utah Code, including but not limited to U.C.A. 53B-2-101, *et seq.*(b) the bylaws, rules and policies and procedures of the State Board of Regents, including but not limited to Regent Rule R220 and (c) the University's policy and procedure manual, including but not limited to PPM 1-5.1. Trustees are expected to adhere to the aforementioned provisions, copies of which are attached and incorporated herein by this reference. In addition to the aforementioned, the Board has also recognized and assumed the following specific responsibilities:

1. to advance and support the mission of the University;

2. to preserve institutional independence to the fullest extent permitted by law;

3. to foster the fundamental values of the University, such as academic freedom, due process, shared governance, educational quality, fiscal integrity, non-discrimination and diversity;

4. to consider the legitimate and relevant interests of various constituencies, including faculty, staff, students, alumni, donors, parents, neighbors, government and the people of the State of Utah; and

5. to act in the best interests of the University as a whole and to the people of the State of Utah.

General Standards of Conduct

1. A Trustee shall at all times discharge his or her duties as a Trustee in good faith, with the care an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would exercise under similar circumstances, and in a manner the Trustee reasonably believes to be in the best interests of the University. As public officials, trustees are subject to various state laws and policies adopted by the Utah State Board of Regents. These laws and policies shall govern in the event of any conflict with this Code of Conduct.

2. A Trustee shall diligently prepare for, and regularly attend, all scheduled Board meetings and the meetings of Committees to which he or she is assigned.

3. A Trustee should allocate the necessary commitment of time to be effective in meetings and, where appropriate, participate actively in the group discussion.

4. A Trustee is expected to become knowledgeable in all material aspects of the University including its governance, mission, strategic plans, and programs. In addition, in order to increase understanding of the University, its culture and community, a Trustee is encouraged to participate in the life of the University through attendance at its functions and social events.

5. A Trustee must be committed to the principles of equal opportunity and nondiscrimination to all students, faculty and staff as well as to the University policy statement on diversity.

Loyalty

1. A Trustee may challenge the judgment of others when he or she deems it necessary to do so, and shall vote his or her individual convictions after listening to others. A Trustee must, however, be willing to work with fellow Board members in the best interests of the University and should support Board decisions publicly, once made.

2. A Trustee shall maintain the confidential nature of Executive Sessions, and except as otherwise required by law or authorized by the Board, a Trustee shall not disclose to any unauthorized persons information or communication subject to confidentiality by action of the Board or other applicable law or policies, including privileged attorney/client communications.

3. A Trustee shall support the President's role as chief executive, to whom the State Board of Regents and Trustees have delegated responsibility for personnel, management and administrative matters.

4. A Trustee shall recognize that the President is the spokesperson for the University and the Chair is the spokesperson for the Board unless otherwise designated.

5. A Trustee should support the University's fundraising activities through participation in fund drives according to their personal circumstances and/or related activities.

Conflicts Avoidance

1. The constituency of each Trustee is the University, regardless of the source of appointment. A Trustee shall act independently for the benefit of the University of Utah as a whole and not for the benefit of a particular program or interest.

2. A Trustee shall comply with the letter and spirit of the University Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Policy and the Utah Public Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act.

Prohibited Activities

1. Except for those decisions that are subject to the direct authority of the Board, no Trustee shall use the position, title, influence or prestige of Trustee to attempt to influence the hiring of University employees, decisions concerning the admissions to the University or its graduate schools or the awarding of consulting or other contracts. Notwithstanding the above, a Trustee may write a letter of recommendation for an individual seeking employment at or admission to the University, provided the trustee has direct and personal knowledge of the applicant.

2. Except as otherwise provided by law or policy of the Board, a Trustee shall not use the position, title, influence or prestige of Trustee to secure special privileges or exemptions for the benefit of the Trustee, Trustee's family members or others. This prohibition does not

extend to the receipt of parking privileges, event tickets or other similar benefits which have or may be provided to trustees in connection with their service as trustees.

Actions Not Void or Voidable

No transaction or action undertaken by the Board of Trustees shall be voidable, or may be challenged as such by an outside party, by reason of having been undertaken in violation of this statement of Responsibilities and Code of Conduct.

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Dixie State College – Building and Property Purchase

Dixie State College is requesting authorization to purchase a residential living facility adjacent to the college campus. The Chancellor Manor includes six 3-bedroom units and a manager's apartment. The property is located on the north side of the campus.

The purchase price is \$1,000,000. A \$300,000 down payment will be taken from auxiliary account reserves. The remaining amount will be financed with a local financial institution. The revenue source for the financing will be rental income from those units, with a secondary revenue source as rental income from Abby Apartments, which is uncommitted.

The value of this transaction is the strategic location of the property adjacent to the DSC campus. The rental value is break-even only under optimum conditions, i.e. 100% occupancy, 10-year note at 6%. The plan is essentially a land bank approach with an interim financing arrangement.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner Recommends approval of the Dixie State College proposal to purchase the Chancellor Manor building and property.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS Attachments

Chancellor Manor

11 South 800 E.

St. George, Utah

10-12 years old, remodeled 2006 (ceramic tile and carpet), 6 Apartments, laundry in apartments, 36 beds

| | | | 5 YR Loan | | 10 YR Loan | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|
| Sales Price | Down | Balance | 6% | 7% | 6% | 7% | |
| \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 300,000 | \$ 700,000 | \$ 162,396 | \$ 166,330 | \$ 93,257 | 7 \$ 97,531 | |
| | \$ 400,000 | \$ 600,000 | \$ 139,196 | \$ 142,569 | \$ 79,932 | 2 \$ 83 <i>,</i> 598 | |
| | \$ 500,000 | \$ 500,000 | \$ 115,997 | \$ 118,807 | \$ 66,612 | 2\$ 69,665 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Potential Ren | t - singles | | | | | | |
| Annual Contr | act: | \$ 1,990 | | | | | |
| | Beds | 36 | - | | | | |
| | | \$ 71,640 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Summer Cont | ract: | \$ 600 | | | | | |
| | Beds | 36 | - | | | | |
| | | \$ 21,600 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 100% | 90% | 80% | 70% | 60% |
| | Totals/Occu | pancy % | Ş 93,240 | Ş 83,916 | Ş 74,592 | 2 \$ 65,268 | Ş 55,944 |
| | | 1 | | | | | |
| Potential Rent | - marrieds | ć 7.000 | | | | | |
| Annual Contr | act: | \$ 7,200 | | | | | |
| | Apts | b | - | | | | |
| | | \$ 43,200 | 1000/ | 000/ | 0.00/ | 700/ | C00/ |
| | Tatala (Osau | | 100% | 90% | 80% | 70% | 60% |
| | lotals/Occu | pancy % | \$ 43,200 | \$ 38,880 | \$ 34,560 | J Ş 30,240 | \$ 25,920 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Owner - devel | oper, operat | or, manager | | | | | |
| avnancasi tha | | | | | | | |
| expenses: the | 6200 ma w | ator | | | | | |
| | 5200 mo. co.bl | | | | | | |
| | 550 mo cabi | e | | | | | |
| | renants pay | electric | | | | | |
| Socondary Po | | | 1 | | | | |
| Abby Apartma | nter uniner | mborod roug | nuo stroom | | | | |
| | 00 month = 1 | | 100% | 0.0% | 000/ | 700/ | 60% |
| 20 units @ \$6 | | Ş12,000 | 100% | 90% | | /U% | ¢ 9C 400 |
| | Annual Incol | me = | \$144,000 | \$ 129,600 | \$ 115,200 | J \$ 100,800 | \$ 86,400 |

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Action: Consent Calendar, Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

The Commissioner recommends that the Regents approve the following items on the Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee Consent Calendar:

- A) USHE 2006-2007 Final Work Program Revisions (Attachment 1). Utah statute requires that the Utah State Board of Regents approve all work program revisions. Regents are asked to review and finalize the Work Programs for each USHE institution for FY 2006-07. The term "Work Program" relates to the revenue and expenditure allotment schedules submitted to the State Division of Finance. Work Programs serve as a basis for disbursement of state appropriated funds to the institutions. The revisions for FY 2006-07 consist of supplemental tax fund appropriations and tuition revenues adjustments to more accurately reflect collections for the year.
- B) USHE 2007-2008 Work Program Revisions (Attachment 2). Regents are asked to review and finalize the initial Work Programs for FY 2007-08. The initial revisions for FY 2007-08 consist of tuition revenue estimates related to second tier tuition and unallocated first tier tuition increases not appropriated by the State Legislature during the 2007 General Session.
- C) USHE 2007-2008 Budget Implementation Reports (Attachment 3). Annually USHE institutions submit reports demonstrating how new funds will be administered across campuses. The 2007-08 reports provide a summary on average salary increases received by employee classification, second-tier tuition uses, anticipated usages for institutional priority and partnership funding, and the sources of matching funds for the engineering and computer science initiative.
- D) USHE Money Management Reports (Attachment 4). Board Policy R541 (Management and Reporting of Institutional Investments) and the State Money Management Act direct that a comparative annual summary of investments be submitted by the institutions. Complete institutional reports are on file in the Commissioner's office. The graphs included in the analysis demonstrate the relative size of institutional investments and the asset allocations in place at each school.

E) UofU and USU – Capital Facilities Delegation Reports (Attachment 5). In accordance with the capital facilities delegation policy adopted by the Regents and by the State Building Board, the attached reports are submitted to the Board for review. Officials from the institutions will be available to answer any questions that the Regents may have.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS/BRF/MV Attachments

Utah System of Higher Education 2006-07 Work Programs

June 2006

Initial Schedule (Ties to 2006 General Session Appropriations)

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------|----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Expondituros | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experioritores | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| University of Utah | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$317.446.600 | \$16,178,100 | \$184.131.300 | \$0 | \$108.350.600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,786,600 |
| School of Medicine | 32,490,400 | 1,006,400 | 20,705,700 | 0 | 10,778,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regional Dental Education Prog. | 725,800 | 563,200 | 6,500 | 0 | 156,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tele Health Network | 500,000 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poison Control | 1,462,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,462,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Seismograph Stations | 424,300 | 410,900 | 13,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Museum Nat. History | 943,800 | 836,800 | 107,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc State Arboretum | 119,300 | 115,100 | 4,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| KUED | 2,550,400 | 2,468,700 | 81,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University Hospital | 4,689,600 | 4,521,400 | 168,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455.000 |
| Miller's Hospital | 510,500 | 35,700 | 17,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455,800 |
| | 362 625 000 | 27 355 000 | 205 254 800 | 0 | 120 747 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 276 000 |
| | 302,033,000 | 21,300,900 | 203,234,000 | 0 | 120,747,400 | 0 | 0 | 9,270,900 |
| Utah State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 159,631,000 | 98,947,300 | 8,523,100 | 0 | 51,510,000 | 0 | 0 | 650,600 |
| Uintah Basin Continuing Ed. Ctr. | 5,785,700 | 2,953,200 | 103,400 | 0 | 2,729,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeastern Utah Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 1,241,900 | 652,500 | 19,100 | 0 | 570,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigham City Continuing Ed Ctr. | 4,444,100 | 1,552,600 | 244,900 | 0 | 2,646,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Looele/Wasatch Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 5,449,800 | 1,316,800 | 941,800 | 0 | 3,191,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 15,118,900 | 1,041,800 | 11,633,300 | 0 | 630,000 | U 1 745 000 | 1,813,800 | 0 |
| Cooperative Extension | 3,403,300 | 1,574,800 | 82,700 | 0 | 150,000 | 1,745,800 | 2 099 500 | 0 |
| Educationally, Disadvantaged | 242 500 | 236 500 | 6 000 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 0 |
| Total USU | 209,778,700 | 108,993,300 | 33,059,500 | 0 | 61,427,200 | 1,745,800 | 3,902,300 | 650,600 |
| Weber Chebe University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and Conorol | 102 007 000 | 2 070 100 | E0 470 000 | 0 | 40 457 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Education and General Educationally, Disadvantaged | 353 600 | 2,970,100 | 13 300 | 0 | 40,437,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total WSU | 103,261,500 | 3,310,400 | 59,493,200 | 0 | 40,457,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southorn Utab University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and Conoral | 11 810 100 | 2 300 600 | 27 400 800 | 0 | 15 120 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Litah Shakesnearean Festival | 25 000 | 2,307,000 | 12 500 | 0 | 13,137,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rural Development | 101 700 | 98 100 | 3 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 98,200 | 95,400 | 2.800 | 0 | ů 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SUU | 45,074,300 | 2,515,600 | 27,419,700 | 0 | 15,139,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Snow College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and Conoral | 22 440 700 | 1 5 25 000 | 15 954 000 | 0 | F 047 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Applied Technology Education | 22,440,700 | 1,000,900 | 10,600,900 | 0 | 0,047,900 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 32 000 | 32 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Snow College | 23,738,400 | 2,833,600 | 15,856,900 | 0 | 5,047,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Divis State Callege | | | | | | | | |
| Dixie State College | 2/ 4/1 /00 | 2 / 17 000 | 14 010 200 | 0 | 0.025.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zion Dark Amphitheotro | 20,401,000 | 3,017,800 | 14,818,300 | 0 | 8,025,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally, Disadvantaged | 30,600 | 30,400 | 000 | 0 | 33,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Dixie College | 26 583 700 | 3 705 800 | 14 818 900 | 0 | 8 059 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 20,000,100 | 0,100,000 | 11,010,700 | 0 | 0,007,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| College of Eastern Utah | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 13,852,500 | 808,600 | 10,721,700 | 0 | 2,322,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Juan Center | 2,952,500 | 2,021,200 | 155,500 | 0 | /75,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prenistoric Museum | 274,800 | 190,700 | 83,100 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEU Star Schools - Pfice | 0 | 0 | 0 | U | 0 | U | 0 | 0 |
| GLU Stal Schools - Sall Juali Educationally, Disadvantagod | U 110 200 | U 117 QOO | U 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total CFU | 17,198 100 | 3,138,300 | 10,960 800 | 0 | 3,099,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 17,170,100 | 0,100,000 | 10,700,000 | 0 | 0,077,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Valley State College | 100 000 000 | 10.0/7.000 | 0/ 00/ FCC | 0 | F0 407 000 | <u>,</u> | • | - |
| Education and General | 102,292,200 | 12,967,900 | 36,836,500 | 0 | 52,487,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Euucationaliy Disadvantaged | 144,700 | 139,100 | 5,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2006-07 Work Programs

June 2006

Initial Schedule (Ties to 2006 General Session Appropriations)

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| | Europelituroo | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experialities | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | Тах | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| Total UVSC | 102,436,900 | 13,107,000 | 36,842,100 | 0 | 52,487,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Salt Lake Community College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$92,529,400 | \$5,020,500 | \$51,269,100 | \$0 | \$36,239,800 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Skills Center | 5,848,400 | 4,091,800 | 146,600 | 0 | 1,610,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 178,400 | 178,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SLCC | 98,556,200 | 9,290,700 | 51,415,700 | 0 | 37,849,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR and Statewide Programs | | | | | | | | |
| Administration - SBR | 3,067,100 | 2,967,000 | 9,700 | 0 | 90,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration - Prison Recidivism | 1,385,700 | 385,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 |
| Engineering Initiative | 1,200,000 | 0 | 1,200,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WICHE Student Financial Aid | 1,021,900 | 1,021,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid | 3,527,100 | 3,310,800 | 210,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - New Century | 4,233,600 | 1,963,600 | 2,250,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin Aid - Minority Scholarshins | 47 100 | 47 100 | 017,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Tuition Assistance | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Engineering Loan Repaym | 50,000 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans | 799,100 | 623,300 | 0 | 0 | 175,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campus Compact | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Coursework/UEC | 734,500 | 535,700 | 0 | 0 | 198,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Higher Education Technology Initiative | 3,845,600 | 2,445,600 | 1,400,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Programs | 303,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 303,100 | 0 |
| Jobs Now Initiative | 1,500,000 | 0 | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Academic Library Council | 2,883,500 | 2,883,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SBR | 25,638,500 | 16,480,700 | 7,389,700 | 0 | 465,000 | 0 | 303,100 | 1,000,000 |
| 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL | \$1,014,901,300 | \$190,731,300 | \$462,511,300 | \$0 | \$344,780,000 | \$1,745,800 | \$4,205,400 | \$10,927,500 |
| Utah College of Applied Technology | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgerland | \$9,914,600 | \$7,772,900 | \$921,900 | \$0 | \$1,219,800 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Davis | 10,837,200 | 7,817,000 | 1,135,000 | 0 | 1,885,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie | 1,667,400 | 879,200 | 687,700 | 0 | 100,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountainland | 4.536.500 | 2,935,000 | 1.382.600 | 0 | 218,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oaden Weber | 11.597.100 | 8.655.500 | 1.093.200 | 0 | 1.848.400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt Lake/Topele | 3 071 500 | 2 065 800 | 628 100 | 0 | 377 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southoast | 1 263 700 | 911 500 | 162 200 | 0 | 190,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southwost | 1,203,700 | 1 446 500 | 282,200 | 0 | 130,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Juntah Basin | 1,000,500 | 1,440,500 | 202,900 | 0 | 130,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4,640,500 | 4,096,200 | 345,000 | 0 | 403,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 3,108,100 | 3,108,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAI Equipment | 837,400 | 837,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Administration | 1,030,800 | 383,700 | 647,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCATIOTAL | \$54,571,100 | \$40,910,800 | \$7,285,700 | \$0 | \$6,374,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Utah Education Network | | | | | | | | |
| UEN Satellite | \$1,463,900 | \$1,463,900 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UEN Administration | 28,043,100 | 14,100,900 | 4,429,100 | 0 | 79,000 | 0 | 9,311,300 | 122,800 |
| UEN IUIAL | \$29,507,000 | \$15,564,800 | \$4,429,100 | \$0 | \$79,000 | \$0 | \$9,311,300 | \$122,800 |
| GRAND TOTAL - LISHE (W/ LICAT) & LIEN | \$1 008 070 /00 | \$247 206 000 | \$474 226 100 | <u>0</u> ¢ | \$251 222 600 | \$1 7/15 800 | \$13 516 700 | \$11.050.300 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2006-07 Work Programs June 2007 Revisions

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experiationes | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| University of Utah | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$5,742,900 | \$0 | \$229,200 | \$0 | \$5,513,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| School of Medicine | 121,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regional Dental Education Prog. | 12,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tele Health Network | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poison Control | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Seismograph Stations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Museum Nat. History | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University Hospital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miners Hospital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total U of U | 5,877,500 | 0 | 229,200 | 0 | 5,648,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Litah Stata University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 007 700 | 0 | Λ | Ω | 007 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lintah Basin Continuing Ed. Ctr | 907,200 193 ∩∩∩ | 0 | 0 70 800 | 0 | 707,200 122,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeastern Utah Cont. Fd. Ctr. | 28.400 | 0 | 0,000 | 0 | 28.400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigham City Continuing Ed Ctr. | 78,000 | 0 | 0 | Ũ | 78,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tooele/Wasatch Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 133,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water Research Laboratory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cooperative Extension | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total USU | 1,420,000 | 0 | 70,800 | 0 | 1,349,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Weber State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 825,700 | 0 | 111,500 | 0 | 714,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total WSU | 825,700 | 0 | 111,500 | 0 | 714,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Utah University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 5.722.200 | 0 | 135.300 | 0 | 5.586.900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Shakespearean Festival | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rural Development | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SUU | 5,722,200 | 0 | 135,300 | 0 | 5,586,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Snow College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 789.000 | 0 | 568,700 | 0 | 220.300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Applied Technology Education | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | Ũ | 220,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Snow College | 789,000 | 0 | 568,700 | 0 | 220,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Divie State College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 1 501 000 | 0 | ٥ | ٥ | 1 501 000 | 0 | ٥ | 0 |
| Zion Park Amphitheatre | 000,170,1 ۵ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 000, 170, 1 ۱ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Dixie College | 1,591,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,591,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| College of Fostern Lit-1 | | | | | | | | |
| College of Eastern Utah | 011 /00 | ^ | 0/ 202 | • | 105 000 | ~ | ^ | <u>^</u> |
| Education and General | 211,600 | 0 | 86,300 | U | 125,300 | 0 | 0 | U |
| San Juan Genter Prehistoric Museum | 34,700 A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,700 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEU Star Schools - Price | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEU Star Schools - San Juan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total CEU | 246,300 | 0 | 86,300 | 0 | 160,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| utan Valley State College | (1 1 / 1 000) | 0 | 244 000 | 0 | (1 200 700) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally, Disadvantaged | (1,141,800) | 0 | 246,900 | U | (1,388,700) | U | 0 | U |
| Euucationaliy Disauvantayeu | 0 | 0 | 0 | U | 0 | U | 0 | U |

Utah System of Higher Education 2006-07 Work Programs June 2007 Revisions

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experiatores | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | (1.1.11.000) | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| Total UVSC | (1,141,800) | 0 | 246,900 | 0 | (1,388,700) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Salt Lake Community College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | (\$38,100) | \$0 | \$479,900 | \$0 | (\$518,000) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Skills Center | (471,300) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (471,300) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | (509.400) | 0 | 470.000 | 0 | (080 300) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (307,400) | 0 | 477,700 | 0 | (707,500) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR and Statewide Programs | (22,122) | | | | (00, (00) | | | |
| Administration - SBR | (90,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (90,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration - Prison Recidivism | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - LICOPE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - New Century | 130,100 | 0 | 130,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Tuition Assistance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Engineering Loan Repayn | r 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campus Compact | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Coursework/UEC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Higher Education Technology Initiative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jobs Now Initiative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SBP | 39 700 | 0 | 130 100 | 0 | 0 (00 / 00) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 37,700 | 0 | 130,100 | 0 | (70,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL | \$14,860,200 | \$0 | \$2,058,700 | \$0 | \$12,801,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Utah College of Applied Technology | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgerland | \$150.000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$150.000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Davis | (285,700) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (285,700) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie | 19 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountainland | 19,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Orden Weber | (475,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (475,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (075,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (075,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sall Lake/Toolele | (45.000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (45.000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast | (45,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (45,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southwest | 19,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uintah Basin | 300,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Custom Fit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Equipment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT TOTAL | (\$497,300) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$497,300) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Utah Education Network | | | | | | | | |
| UEN Satellite | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UEN Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UEN TOTAL | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| GRAND TOTAL - USHE (w/ UCAT) & UEN | \$14,362,900 | \$0 | \$2,058,700 | \$0 | \$12,304,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2006-07 Work Programs

Revised Schedule -- June 2007

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experiations | General Fund | Income Tax | School Fund | Dedicated Credits | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ Other Funds |
| | | T UIU | Tdx | Tunu | Credits | Lease | T unus | Other Fullus |
| University of Utah | ¢222.400 F00 | ¢1/ 170 100 | ¢104.2/0 F00 | ¢0 | ¢112.0/4.200 | ¢0 | ¢0 | ¢0.707.700 |
| Education and General | \$323,189,500 | \$16,178,100 | \$184,360,500 | \$0 | \$113,864,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,786,600 |
| School of Medicine | 32,012,100 | 1,006,400 | 20,705,700 | 0 | 10,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regional Dental Education Prog. | /38,/00 | 563,200 | 6,500 | 0 | 169,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deicon Control | 1 462 400 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 1 462 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pulson Control Dub Suc Spicmograph Stations | 1,402,400 | 410.000 | 12 400 | 0 | 1,402,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Seismograph Stations | 424,300 | 410,900 | 107,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Museum Nal. Fisiony Pub. Svc State Arborotum | 943,000 | 030,000 115 100 | 107,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| KIIED | 2 550 400 | 2 468 700 | 4,200 81 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University Hospital | 2,550,400 | 4 521 400 | 168 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minors Hospital | 4,007,000 510 500 | 4,321,400 | 100,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455 800 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 771 000 | 710 600 | 17,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 500 |
| Total U of U | 368,512,500 | 27,355,900 | 205,484,000 | 0 | 126,395,700 | 0 | 0 | 9,276,900 |
| Utah State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 160,618,200 | 98,947,300 | 8,523,100 | 0 | 52,497,200 | 0 | 0 | 650,600 |
| Uintah Basin Continuing Ed. Ctr. | 5,978,700 | 2,953,200 | 174,200 | 0 | 2,851,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeastern Utah Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 1,270,300 | 652,500 | 19,100 | 0 | 598,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigham City Continuing Ed Ctr. | 4,522,100 | 1,552,600 | 244,900 | 0 | 2,724,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tooele/Wasatch Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 5,583,200 | 1,316,800 | 941,800 | 0 | 3,324,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 15,118,900 | 1,041,800 | 11,633,300 | 0 | 630,000 | 0 | 1,813,800 | 0 |
| Water Research Laboratory | 3,403,300 | 1,574,800 | 82,700 | 0 | 0 | 1,745,800 | 0 | 0 |
| Cooperative Extension | 14,461,500 | 717,800 | 11,505,200 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 2,088,500 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 242,500 | 236,500 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total USU | 211,198,700 | 108,993,300 | 33,130,300 | 0 | 62,776,400 | 1,745,800 | 3,902,300 | 650,600 |
| Weber State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 103,733,600 | 2,970,100 | 59,591,400 | 0 | 41,172,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 353,600 | 340,300 | 13,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total WSU | 104,087,200 | 3,310,400 | 59,604,700 | 0 | 41,172,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Utah University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 50,571,600 | 2,309,600 | 27,536,100 | 0 | 20,725,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Shakespearean Festival | 25,000 | 12,500 | 12,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rural Development | 101,700 | 98,100 | 3,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 98,200 | 95,400 | 2,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SUU | 50,796,500 | 2,515,600 | 27,555,000 | 0 | 20,725,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Snow College | | | | | | _ | _ | _ |
| Education and General | 23,229,700 | 1,535,900 | 16,425,600 | 0 | 5,268,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Applied Technology Education | 1,265,700 | 1,265,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 32,000 | 32,000 | 16 425 600 | 0 | <u> </u> | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 24,327,400 | 2,033,000 | 10,425,000 | 0 | 3,200,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie State College | 00.050.400 | 0 (47 000 | 14.010.000 | | 0 (4 (500 | | 0 | 0 |
| Education and General | 28,052,600 | 3,617,800 | 14,818,300 | 0 | 9,616,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zion Park Amphitheatre | 91,500 | 57,400 | 600 | 0 | 33,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 30,600 | 2 705 900 | 14 919 000 | 0 | 0.450.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 20,174,700 | 3,703,600 | 14,010,900 | 0 | 9,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| College of Eastern Utah | 14.0/4.100 | 000 (00 | 10 000 000 | 0 | 2 447 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Education and General | 14,064,100 | 808,600 | 10,808,000 | 0 | 2,447,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Juan Center | 2,987,200 | 2,021,200 | 155,500 | 0 | 810,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prenistoric Museum | 274,800 | 190,700 | 83,100 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEU Star Schools - Price | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEU Star Schools - San Juan | 110.000 | 117.000 | 0 | U | 0 | U | 0 | 0 |
| Loucationally Disadvantaged | 118,300 | 3 128 200 | 11 0/7 100 | 0 | 3 250 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 17,777,700 | 5,130,300 | 11,047,100 | U | 0,207,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utan valley State College | 101 150 400 | 12 047 000 | 37 083 100 | ٥ | 51 000 100 | 0 | ٥ | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 101,150,400 | 12,707,700 | 37,003,400 E 400 | 0 | 01,099,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Euroanonany Disauvaniayeu | 144,700 | 137,100 | 0,000 | U | U | U | U | 0 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2006-07 Work Programs Revised Schedule -- June 2007

| Expenditures Expenditures Fond Income Fund Uniform Studie Pedral Cradits Fedral Funds Fedral Truest (nuds') 0ther Funds' Other Funds' Other Funds' Other Funds' Other Funds' Other Funds' Other Funds' Total LV/SC 101 395, 100 13,107,000 37,089,000 0 51,099,100 | | | | | | Revenue | S | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Legendation General Fund Income Tax School Desicated Desicated Mineral Mineral Lesse Federal Fund Trust Funds/ Other Funds Total UNSC 101 295,100 13,107,000 37,089,000 0 51,099,100 0 0 Stal Lake Community College Education and General \$92,491,300 \$5,020,500 \$51,749,000 \$0 | | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| Total UVSC Total VSC Total VSC <thtotal th="" vsc<=""> <thtotal th="" vsc<=""> <th< td=""><td></td><td>Lypenultures</td><td>General</td><td>Income</td><td>School</td><td>Dedicated</td><td>Mineral</td><td>Federal</td><td>Trust Funds/</td></th<></thtotal></thtotal> | | Lypenultures | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| Titel UNSC 101,295,100 13,107,000 37,089,000 0 51,099,100 0 0 0 (continued) Stat Lake Community College 52,721,800 S5,721,800 S0 < | | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| Canadianand Bar Lake Community College Sp2 (491 300 Sp (200 500 Sp1 74 000 Sp (201 500 Sp (201 500 <thsp (201="" 500<="" th=""> Sp (201 500</thsp> | Total UVSC | 101,295,100 | 13,107,000 | 37,089,000 | 0 | 51,099,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt Lake Community College Extraction and General \$92,491,300 \$55,020,500 \$51,749,000 \$0 \$138,700 \$0 0 <th< td=""><td>(continued)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<> | (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General \$92,491,300 \$5,729,800 \$35,721,800 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Educationally Disadvantaged 178,400 178,400 | Salt Lake Community College | | | | | | | | |
| Skills Center 5.377,100 4,091,800 11,38,700 0 0 0 0 Total SLCC 98,046,800 9,290,700 51,895,600 0 36,860,500 0 <td>Education and General</td> <td>\$92,491,300</td> <td>\$5,020,500</td> <td>\$51,749,000</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>35,721,800</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$0</td> | Education and General | \$92,491,300 | \$5,020,500 | \$51,749,000 | \$0 | 35,721,800 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged 178,400 0 0 0 0 0 0 SRR and Statewide Programs Administration - SRR 2.976,700 2.967,000 9,700 | Skills Center | 5,377,100 | 4,091,800 | 146,600 | 0 | 1,138,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SLCC 98,046.800 9.290,700 51,895,600 0 36,860,500 0 0 0 SDR and Statewide Programs Administration - SRR 2.976,700 2.967,000 9,700 | Educationally Disadvantaged | 178,400 | 178,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR and Statewide Programs Administration - SRR 2.976,700 2.967,000 9,700 0 0 0 0 0 Administration - SRR 2.2967,000 0.200,000 | Total SLCC | 98,046,800 | 9,290,700 | 51,895,600 | 0 | 36,860,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration - SBR 2976 700 2.967 000 9,700 | SBR and Statewide Programs | | | | | | | | |
| Administration Prison Reciditism 1,385,700 385,700 | Administration - SBR | 2,976,700 | 2.967.000 | 9,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Engineering initiative 1,200,000 0 1,200,000 | Administration - Prison Recidivism | 1.385.700 | 385,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.000.000 |
| WCR_E 1021900 1,021900 | Engineering Initiative | 1,200,000 | 0 | 1.200.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid 3,527,100 3,316,800 210,300 0 <td>WICHE</td> <td>1.021.900</td> <td>1.021.900</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | WICHE | 1.021.900 | 1.021.900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - UCOPE 4 233,800 1,983,800 2,250,000 | Student Financial Aid | 3,527,100 | 3,316,800 | 210,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - New Century 1,023,000 73,200 949,800 | Student Financial Aid - UCOPE | 4,233,800 | 1,983,800 | 2,250,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships 47,100 47,100 0 <t< td=""><td>Student Financial Aid - New Century</td><td>1,023,000</td><td>73,200</td><td>949,800</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></t<> | Student Financial Aid - New Century | 1,023,000 | 73,200 | 949,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid: - Tulition Assistance 47,100 47,100 0 <th< td=""><td>Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships</td><td>47,100</td><td>47,100</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th<> | Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Atd Engineering Loan Repaym 50,000 50,000 | Student Fin. Aid - Tuition Assistance | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans 799,100 623,300 0 0 175,800 0 0 0 Campus Compact 100,000 100,000 | Student Fin. Aid - Engineering Loan Repaym | 50,000 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campus Compact 100,000 100,000 0 </td <td>T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans</td> <td>799,100</td> <td>623,300</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>175,800</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans | 799,100 | 623,300 | 0 | 0 | 175,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Coursework/UEC 734,500 535,700 0 0 198,800 0 0 0 Higher Education Technology Initiative 3,845,600 2,445,600 1,400,000 | Campus Compact | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Higher Education Technology Initiative 3,845,600 2,445,600 1,400,000 0 <td>Electronic Coursework/UEC</td> <td>734,500</td> <td>535,700</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>198,800</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Electronic Coursework/UEC | 734,500 | 535,700 | 0 | 0 | 198,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Programs 303,100 0 0 0 0 0 0 303,100 0 Jobs Now Initiative 1,500,000 2,883,500 2,883,500 < | Higher Education Technology Initiative | 3,845,600 | 2,445,600 | 1,400,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jobs Now Initiative 1,500,000 0 1,500,000 | Federal Programs | 303,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 303,100 | 0 |
| Academic Library Council 2,883,500 2,883,500 0 0 0 0 0 0 Total SBR 25,678,200 16,480,700 7,519,800 0 374,600 0 303,100 1,000,000 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL \$1,029,761,500 \$190,731,300 \$464,570,000 \$0 \$357,581,500 \$1,745,800 \$4,205,400 \$10,927,500 Utah College of Applied Technology Bridgerland \$10,064,600 \$7,772,900 \$921,900 \$0 1,369,800 \$0 | Jobs Now Initiative | 1,500,000 | 0 | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SBR 25,678,200 16,480,700 7,519,800 0 374,600 0 303,100 1,000,000 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL \$1,029,761,500 \$190,731,300 \$464,570,000 \$0 \$357,581,500 \$1,745,800 \$4,205,400 \$10,927,500 Utah College of Applied Technology Bridgerland \$10,064,600 \$7,772,900 \$921,900 \$0 1,369,800 \$0 <th< td=""><td>Academic Library Council</td><td>2,883,500</td><td>2,883,500</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th<> | Academic Library Council | 2,883,500 | 2,883,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL \$1,029,761,500 \$190,731,300 \$464,570,000 \$0 \$357,581,500 \$1,745,800 \$4,205,400 \$10,927,500 Bridgerland \$10,064,600 \$7,772,900 \$921,900 \$0 1,369,800 \$0 \$0 \$0 Davis 10,551,500 7,817,000 1,135,000 0 1,599,500 0 0 0 Mountainland 4,555,600 2,935,000 1,382,600 0 238,000 | Total SBR | 25,678,200 | 16,480,700 | 7,519,800 | 0 | 374,600 | 0 | 303,100 | 1,000,000 |
| Utah College of Applied Technology Bridgerland \$10,064,600 \$7,772,900 \$921,900 \$0 1,369,800 \$0 \$0 \$0 Davis 10,551,500 7,817,000 1,135,000 0 1599,500 0 0 0 0 Mountainland 4,555,600 2,935,000 1,382,600 0 238,000 0 </td <td>9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL</td> <td>\$1,029,761,500</td> <td>\$190,731,300</td> <td>\$464,570,000</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>\$357,581,500</td> <td>\$1,745,800</td> <td>\$4,205,400</td> <td>\$10,927,500</td> | 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL | \$1,029,761,500 | \$190,731,300 | \$464,570,000 | \$0 | \$357,581,500 | \$1,745,800 | \$4,205,400 | \$10,927,500 |
| Bridgerland \$10,064,600 \$7,772,900 \$921,900 \$0 1,369,800 \$0 \$0 \$0 Davis 10,551,500 7,817,000 1,135,000 0 120,000 0 0 0 Dixie 1,686,900 879,200 687,700 0 120,000 0 0 0 Mountainland 4,555,600 2,935,000 1,382,600 0 238,000 | Utah College of Applied Technology | | | | | | | | |
| Davis 10,551,500 7,817,000 17,27,00 17,27,00 17,07,000 17,07,000 | Bridgerland | \$10,064,600 | \$7 772 900 | \$921 900 | \$0 | 1 369 800 | \$0 | 08 | \$0 |
| Davis 10,331,300 7,817,000 1,133,000 0 1,397,300 | Davis | 10 551 500 | 7 017 000 | 1 1 25 000 | ψ0 0 | 1,507,000 | 0 0 | \$0 0 | \$ 0 |
| Dixle 1,686,900 87,920 687,700 0 120,000 0 0 0 Mountainland 4,555,600 2,935,000 1,382,600 0 238,000 | Davis | 10,331,300 | 7,017,000 | 1,133,000 | 0 | 1,399,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountainland 4,555,600 2,935,000 1,382,600 0 238,000 0 0 0 0 Ogden Weber 10,922,100 8,655,500 1,093,200 0 1,173,400 0 0 0 0 0 Salt Lake/Tooele 3,071,500 2,065,800 628,100 0 377,600 | Dixie | 1,686,900 | 879,200 | 687,700 | 0 | 120,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ogden Weber 10,922,100 8,655,500 1,093,200 0 1,173,400 0 0 0 Salt Lake/Tooele 3,071,500 2,065,800 628,100 0 377,600 0 0 0 0 0 0 Southeast 1,218,700 911,500 162,200 0 145,000 0 </td <td>Mountainland</td> <td>4,555,600</td> <td>2,935,000</td> <td>1,382,600</td> <td>0</td> <td>238,000</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Mountainland | 4,555,600 | 2,935,000 | 1,382,600 | 0 | 238,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt Lake/Tooele 3,071,500 2,065,800 628,100 0 377,600 0 0 0 Southeast 1,218,700 911,500 162,200 0 145,000 0 0 0 Southeast 1,879,400 1,446,500 282,900 0 150,000 0 0 0 Uintah Basin 5,147,200 4,098,200 345,000 0 704,000 0 0 0 UCAT Custom Fit 3,108,100 3,108,100 | Ogden Weber | 10,922,100 | 8,655,500 | 1,093,200 | 0 | 1,173,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast 1,218,700 911,500 162,200 0 145,000 0 0 0 0 Southwest 1,879,400 1,446,500 282,900 0 150,000 | Salt Lake/Tooele | 3,071,500 | 2,065,800 | 628,100 | 0 | 377,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southwest 1,879,400 1,446,500 282,900 0 150,000 0 0 0 Uintah Basin 5,147,200 4,098,200 345,000 0 704,000 1 | Southeast | 1,218,700 | 911,500 | 162,200 | 0 | 145,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uintah Basin 5,147,200 4,098,200 345,000 0 704,000 0 0 0 UCAT Custom Fit 3,108,100 3,108,100 1 0 | Southwest | 1 879 400 | 1 446 500 | 282 900 | 0 | 150 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Custom Fit 3,108,100 3,108,100 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 | Llintah Basin | 5 1/17 200 | 1 008 200 | 345,000 | 0 | 704.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Equipment 3,106,100 3,106,100 0 <th< td=""><td></td><td>2 100 100</td><td>2 100 100</td><td>043,000</td><td>0</td><td>704,000</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th<> | | 2 100 100 | 2 100 100 | 043,000 | 0 | 704,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Equipment 837,400 837,400 0 </td <td></td> <td>3,106,100</td> <td>3,108,100</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | | 3,106,100 | 3,108,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Administration 1,030,800 383,700 647,100 122,800 122 | UCAT Equipment | 837,400 | 837,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT TOTAL \$54,073,800 \$40,910,800 \$7,285,700 \$0 \$5,877,300 \$12,800 \$12,800 | UCAT Administration | 1,030,800 | 383,700 | 647,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Education Network UEN Satellite \$1,463,900 \$1,463,900 \$0 \$0 0 \$10 | | \$54,073,800 | \$40,910,800 | \$7,285,700 | \$0 | \$5,877,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UEN Satellite \$1,463,900 \$1,463,900 \$0 \$0 0 \$110.50 | Utah Education Network | | | | | | | | |
| UEN Administration 28,043,100 14,100,900 4,429,100 0 79,000 0 9,311,300 122,800 UEN TOTAL \$29,507,000 \$15,564,800 \$4,429,100 \$0 \$79,000 \$0 \$9,311,300 \$122,800 GRAND TOTAL LISHE (w/ LICAT) & LIEN \$1 113 342 300 \$247 206 900 \$476 284 800 \$0 \$363 537 800 \$1 3516 700 \$11 050 300 | UEN Satellite | \$1,463,900 | \$1,463,900 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| UEN TOTAL \$29,507,000 \$15,564,800 \$4,429,100 \$0 \$79,000 \$0 \$9,311,300 \$122,800 GRAND TOTAL - LISHE (w/ LICAT) & LIEN \$1 113 342 300 \$247 206 900 \$476 284 800 \$0 \$363 537 800 \$1 745 800 \$13 516 700 \$11 050 300 | UEN Administration | 28,043,100 | 14,100,900 | 4,429,100 | 0 | 79,000 | 0 | 9,311,300 | 122,800 |
| GRAND TOTAL - LISHE (w/ LICAT) & LIEN \$1 113 342 300 \$247 206 900 \$476 284 800 \$0 \$363 537 800 \$1 745 800 \$13 516 700 \$11 050 300 | UEN TOTAL | \$29,507,000 | \$15,564,800 | \$4,429,100 | \$0 | \$79,000 | \$0 | \$9,311,300 | \$122,800 |
| | GRAND TOTAL - USHE (W/ LICAT) & LIEN | \$1 113 342 300 | \$247 206 900 | \$476 284 800 | 02 | \$363 537 800 | \$1 745 800 | \$13 516 700 | \$11.050.300 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2007-08 Work Programs

Initial Schedule (Ties to 2007 General Session Appropriations)

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|---------------|---------|---------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experimitates | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| University of Utah | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$344,982,500 | \$98,500 | \$218,515,700 | \$0 | \$117,581,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,786,600 |
| School of Medicine | 34,235,900 | 1,091,000 | 21,860,100 | 0 | 11,284,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regional Dental Education Prog. | 764,200 | 563,900 | 25,600 | 0 | 174,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lele Health Network | 514,600 | 514,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poison Control | 1,534,400 | U 410.000 | 1 070 / 00 | 0 | 1,534,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Seismoyraph Stations | 1,490,500 | 410,900 | 1,079,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Museum Ndi. History Pub. Svc State Arboretum | 950,700 125,800 | 030,000 | 119,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| KLIED | 4 166 000 | 2 468 700 | 1 697 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University Hospital | 4,941,500 | 4.521.400 | 420,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miners Hospital | 537,300 | 35,700 | 45,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455,800 |
| Center on Aging | 180,400 | 180,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 798,000 | 719,600 | 43,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,500 |
| Total U of U | 395,227,800 | 11,556,600 | 243,818,700 | 0 | 130,575,600 | 0 | 0 | 9,276,900 |
| Utah State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 173,572,200 | 56,600 | 118,398,700 | 0 | 54,466,300 | 0 | 0 | 650,600 |
| Uintah Basin Continuing Ed. Ctr. | 7,266,000 | 2,953,200 | 1,391,800 | 0 | 2,921,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeastern Utah Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 1,321,600 | 652,500 | 57,500 | 0 | 611,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigham City Continuing Ed Ctr. | 5,624,100 | 1,552,600 | 1,293,800 | 0 | 2,777,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tooele/Wasatch Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 5,817,600 | 1,316,800 | 1,117,500 | 0 | 3,383,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 15,616,400 | 884,800 | 12,287,800 | 0 | 630,000 | 1 745 000 | 1,813,800 | 0 |
| Cooperative Extension | 3,049,700 | 1,574,800 | 204,400 | 0 | 150,000 | 1,745,800 | 2 000 500 | 64,700 |
| Educationally, Disadvantaged | 15,344,400 | 874,800 | 12,231,100 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 2,088,500 | 0 |
| Total USU | 228 463 200 | 10 102 600 | 147 057 300 | 0 | 64 939 900 | 1 745 800 | 3 902 300 | 715.300 |
| Weber State University | | | | - | | .,, | -11 | |
| Education and General | 110 /10 100 | 70 700 | 67 034 200 | 0 | 12 111 200 | ٥ | ٥ | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 373 300 | 340 300 | 33 000 | 0 | 42,414,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total WSU | 110,792,400 | 411,000 | 67,967,200 | 0 | 42,414,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Utah University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 50.124.900 | 310.500 | 32,413,300 | 0 | 17.401.100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Shakespearean Festival | 75,000 | 12,500 | 62,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rural Development | 107,200 | 98,100 | 9,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 101,100 | 95,400 | 5,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SUU | 50,408,200 | 516,500 | 32,490,600 | 0 | 17,401,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Snow College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 25,812,300 | 36,900 | 20,261,800 | 0 | 5,513,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Applied Technology Education | 1,265,700 | 1,265,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 32,000 | 32,000 | 20.261.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 27,110,000 | 1,334,000 | 20,201,000 | 0 | 3,313,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie State College | 21 415 700 | 110 100 | 01 0/0 100 | 0 | 0 007 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Education and General | 31,415,700 | 119,100 | 21,369,100 | 0 | 9,927,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zion Park Amphilneatre | 93,500 | 57,400 30,600 | 2,600 | 0 | 33,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Dixie College | 31,539,800 | 207,100 | 21,371,700 | 0 | 9,961,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| College of Fastern Litab | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 16 258 700 | 200 200 | 12 896 000 | ٥ | 2 553 500 | 0 | n | 0 |
| San Juan Center | 3 219 900 | 2.021.200 | 383 200 | 0 | 815 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prehistoric Museum | 287.600 | 190.700 | 95.900 | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Applied Technology Education | 1,609,700 | 491,400 | 928,300 | 0 | 190,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 119,200 | 117,800 | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total CEU | 21,495,100 | 3,630,300 | 14,304,800 | 0 | 3,560,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Valley State College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 114,247,800 | 968,100 | 61,997,200 | 0 | 51,282,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 152,500 | 139,100 | 13,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2007-08 Work Programs

June 2007

Initial Schedule (Ties to 2007 General Session Appropriations)

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | Expondituros | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experioritores | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| Total UVSC | 114,400,300 | 1,107,200 | 62,010,600 | 0 | 51,282,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Salt Lake Community College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$99,447,800 | \$21,700 | \$63,349,100 | \$0 | \$36,077,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Skills Center | 5,751,400 | 4,091,800 | 420,900 | 0 | 1,238,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 178,400 | 178,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SLCC | 105,377,600 | 4,291,900 | 63,770,000 | 0 | 37,315,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR and Statewide Programs | | | | | | | | |
| Administration - SBR | 3,566,000 | 2,967,200 | 598,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration - Prison Recidivism | 1,385,700 | 385,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 |
| Engineering Initiative | 5,000,000 | 0 | 5,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WICHE | 1,021,900 | 1,021,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid | 3,737,400 | 3,316,800 | 420,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - UCOPE | 5,983,800 | 1,983,800 | 4,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - New Century | 1,330,400 | 73,200 | 1,257,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Tuition Assistance | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Engineering Loan Repaym | 50,000 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans | 1,999,100 | 623,300 | 1,200,000 | 0 | 175,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campus Compact | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Coursework/UEC | 746,500 | 535,700 | 12,000 | 0 | 198,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Higher Education Technology Initiative | 7,709,700 | 2,445,600 | 5,264,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Programs | 303,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 303,100 | 0 |
| Hearing Impaired | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Scholar Initiative | 500,000 | 0 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jobs Now Initiative | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Academic Library Council | 3,183,500 | 2,883,500 | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 38,711,300 | 16,480,900 | 20,552,700 | 0 | 374,600 | 0 | 303,100 | 1,000,000 |
| 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL | \$1,123,525,700 | \$49,638,700 | \$693,605,400 | \$0 | \$363,338,200 | \$1,745,800 | \$4,205,400 | \$10,992,200 |
| Utah College of Applied Technology | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgerland | \$10,870,400 | \$271,000 | \$6,702,300 | \$2,677,000 | \$1,220,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Davis | 11.365.200 | 478,000 | 6.329.800 | 2.957.500 | 1,599,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie | 1 903 400 | 0 | 764 500 | 1,038,400 | 100 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountainland | 5 023 000 | 200 | 1 058 000 | 3 745 000 | 218 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 12.07/ 100 | 200 | 7,050,000 | 3,743,900 | 210,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 12,976,100 | 446,200 | 7,605,000 | 3,075,800 | 1,849,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt Lake/Tooele | 3,420,500 | 1,607,600 | 937,500 | 551,400 | 324,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southwest | 2,372,400 | 442,500 | 582,100 | 1,197,800 | 150,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uintah Basin | 5,604,500 | 1,851,500 | 723,200 | 2,325,800 | 704,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Custom Fit | 3,608,100 | 3,108,100 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Equipment | 2,262,400 | 801.900 | 1.460.500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1 773 400 | 233 700 | 1 110 700 | 420.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT TOTAL | \$61,179,400 | \$9,240,700 | \$27,782,600 | \$17,989,600 | \$6,166,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | ÷.,= 10,7.00 | ÷=:,:02,000 | | | ÷ | ÷ | ÷0 |
| Utah Education Network | 405 ct 1 05 - | 40/11/1- | AF 010 (07 | 64F 4 + 1 0 5 - | 6470.00- | ± - | #40.400.00 ⁻ | A405 00- |
| UEN | \$35,114,800 | \$261,100 | \$5,919,600 | \$15,146,000 | \$170,900 | \$0 | \$13,492,000 | \$125,200 |
| UEN IUTAL | \$35,114,800 | \$261,100 | \$5,919,600 | \$15,146,000 | \$170,900 | \$0 | \$13,492,000 | \$125,200 |
| GRAND TOTAL - USHE (w/ UCAT) & UEN | \$1,219,819,900 | \$59,140,500 | \$727,307,600 | \$33,135,600 | \$369,675,600 | \$1,745,800 | \$17,697,400 | \$11,117,400 |

Ĩ

Utah System of Higher Education 2007-08 Work Programs June 2007 Revisions

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|--------------|---------|--------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|----------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experiators | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| University of Utah | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$4,818,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,818,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| School of Medicine | 181,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regional Dental Education Prog. | 5,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tele Health Network | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poison Control | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Seismograph Stations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc Museum Nat. History | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pub. Svc State Arboretum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| KUED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| University Hospital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miners Hospital | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Center on Aging | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total U of U | 5,005,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,005,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | (1,322,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (822,400) | 0 | 0 | (500,000) |
| Uintah Basin Continuing Ed. Ctr. | (717,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (717,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeastern Utah Cont. Ed. Ctr. | (99,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (99,400) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigham City Continuing Ed Ctr. | 3,359,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,359,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tooele/Wasatch Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 1,730,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,730,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water Research Laboratory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cooperative Extension | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total USU | 2,950,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,450,300 | 0 | 0 | (500,000) |
| Weber State University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total WSU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Utah University | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 1,759,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,759,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Utah Shakespearean Festival | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rural Development | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SUU | 1,759,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,759,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Snow College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | ٥ | Ο | ٥ | 0 | ٥ | ٥ | ٥ | ٥ |
| Applied Technology Education | 0 | 0 | 0 | n | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Snow College | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Divie State College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and Conoral | (150 000) | 0 | ^ | 0 | (150 000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zion Park Amphitheatro | (150,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (100,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Dixie College | (150,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (150,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (······) | | | | , <i>,</i> | | | |
| Education and Concret | (LLE 100) | 0 | ^ | 0 | (64E 100) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Euucation and General Son Juan Contor | (000,100) | U | 0 | U | (005,100) | U | 0 | 0 |
| San Judii Geniei Drobistoria Musoum | (274,800) | U | 0 | U | (274,800) Ω | U | 0 | 0 |
| Applied Technology Education | (E3 000) | U | 0 | 0 | (E3 000) | U | 0 | 0 |
| Applieu recimology Education | (53,000) | U | 0 | U | (03,000) | U | 0 | 0 |
| | 002 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | U (000 000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | (332,300) | U | 0 | U | (772,700) | U | U | U |
| Utah Valley State College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | 2,656,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,656,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Utah System of Higher Education 2007-08 Work Programs June 2007 Revisions

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------------|---------|-----------|----------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experiatores | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | lax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| Total UVSC | 2,656,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,656,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Salt Lake Community College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$2,002,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,002,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Skills Center | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 2 002 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 002 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SECC | 2,002,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,002,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR and Statewide Programs | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Administration - SBR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration - Prison Recidivism | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Einancial Aid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - LICOPE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - New Century | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Tuition Assistance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Engineering Loan Repaym | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campus Compact | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Coursework/UEC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Higher Education Technology Initiative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hearing Impaired | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Scholar Initiative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JODS NOW IMITATIVE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SBR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL | \$13 231 000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$13 731 000 | 0\$ | 0 | (\$500.000) |
| | ¢10,201,000 | 40 | ψŪ | ψū | \$10,701,000 | ψŬ | ψŬ | (\$000,000) |
| Utah College of Applied Technology | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgerland | \$224,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$224,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Davis | 50,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie | 49,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountainland | 42,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ogden Weber | (300,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (300,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt Lake/Tooele | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southwest | 10.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Llintah Basin | 369 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LICAT Custom Fit | 007,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 007,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | \$450,900 | 0* | 0 | 0 \$0 | \$450,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ψ100,700 | 40 | 40 | ψŪ | ¥ 100,700 | ψŪ | 40 | ψ0 |
| Utah Education Network | ** | *^ | 60 | *0 | * ^ | ** | #^ | ** |
| | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$U ¢0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | \$0 | \$U | \$0 | φU | \$U | φU | \$U | \$U |
| GRAND TOTAL - USHE (w/ UCAT) & UEN | \$13,681,900 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,181,900 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$500,000) |

Utah System of Higher Education 2007-08 Work Programs Revised Schedule -- June 2007

| | Revenues | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|---------|------------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ | |
| | Experiatores | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ | |
| | | Fund | Tax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds | |
| University of Utah | | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$349,800,800 | \$98,500 | \$218,515,700 | \$0 | \$122,400,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,786,600 | |
| School of Medicine | 34,417,400 | 1,091,000 | 21,860,100 | 0 | 11,466,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Regional Dental Education Prog. | 770,100 | 563,900 | 25,600 | 0 | 180,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Tele Health Network | 514,600 | 514,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Poison Control | 1,534,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,534,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Pub. Svc Seismograph Stations | 1,490,500 | 410,900 | 1,079,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Pub. Svc Museum Nat. History | 956,700 | 836,800 | 119,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Pub. Svc State Arboretum | 125,800 | 115,100 | 10,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| KUED | 4,166,000 | 2,468,700 | 1,697,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| University Hospital | 4,941,500 | 4,521,400 | 420,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Miners Hospital | 537,300 | 35,700 | 45,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455,800 | |
| Center on Aging | 180,400 | 180,400 | 12 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 500 | |
| | 400 233 500 | 11 556 600 | 243,900 | 0 | 135 581 300 | 0 | 0 | 9 276 900 | |
| | 400,233,300 | 11,550,000 | 243,010,700 | 0 | 133,301,300 | 0 | 0 | 7,270,700 | |
| Utan State University | 170 040 000 | F/ /00 | 110 200 700 | • | F2 (42 000 | 0 | ~ | 150 / 00 | |
| Education and General | 1/2,249,800 | 56,600 | 1 18,398,700 | 0 | 53,643,900 | U | 0 | 150,600 | |
| Uintan Basin Continuing Ed. Ctr. | 6,548,600 | 2,953,200 | 1,391,800 | 0 | 2,203,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Southeastern Utan Cont. Ed. Ctr. | 1,222,200 | 652,500 | 57,500 | 0 | 512,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Brignam City Continuing Ed Ctr. | 8,983,100 | 1,552,600 | 1,293,800 | 0 | 6,136,700 E 112,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 7,548,100 | 1,310,800 | 1,117,500 | 0 | 5,113,800 | 0 | 1 012 000 | 0 | |
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 10,010,400 | 004,000 | 12,207,000 | 0 | 030,000 | 1 745 900 | 1,013,000 | 64 700 | |
| | 3,049,700 | 074,000 | 204,400 | 0 | 150.000 | 1,745,600 | 2 000 500 | 04,700 | |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 10,344,400 | 074,000 | 12,231,100 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 2,066,300 | 0 | |
| Total USU | 231 413 500 | 10 102 600 | 147.057.300 | 0 | 68 390 200 | 1,745,800 | 3,902,300 | 215 300 | |
| | 2017110/000 | 10,102,000 | 111,001,000 | Ū | 0010701200 | 1,7 10,000 | 077027000 | 210,000 | |
| Education and Conoral | 110 /10 100 | 70 700 | 67 024 200 | 0 | 12 111 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 272 200 | 240,200 | 22 000 | 0 | 42,414,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total WSU | 110.792.400 | 411.000 | 67.967.200 | 0 | 42.414.200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | | ,, | | | | |
| Southern Utan University | E1 004 200 | 210 E00 | 22 412 200 | 0 | 10 140 E00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Euucation and General | 01,004,000 75,000 | 310,500 | 32,413,300 | 0 | 19,100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Duan Shakespearean Festival | 107,000 | 12,500 | 02,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 107,200 | 96,100 | 9,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total SUU | 52 167 600 | 516 500 | 32 490 600 | 0 | 19 160 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 02,107,000 | 010,000 | 02,170,000 | Ŭ | 17,100,000 | 0 | Ŭ | 0 | |
| Snow College | 25 012 200 | 24 000 | 20 241 000 | 0 | E E12 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Education and General | 25,812,300 | 36,900 | 20,261,800 | 0 | 5,513,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Applied Technology Education | 1,265,700 | 1,265,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Snow College | 27 110 000 | 1 334 600 | 20 261 800 | 0 | 5 513 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 27,110,000 | 1,004,000 | 20,201,000 | 0 | 5,515,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dixie State College | 04 0/5 75- | 4 - 0 | 04 0 / 0 4 0 - | - | 0 777 505 | - | ~ | - | |
| Education and General | 31,265,700 | 119,100 | 21,369,100 | 0 | 9,777,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Zion Park Amphitheatre | 93,500 | 57,400 | 2,600 | 0 | 33,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 30,600 | 30,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 011 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Dixie College | 31,389,800 | 207,100 | 21,371,700 | 0 | 9,811,000 | 0 | 0 | U | |
| College of Eastern Utah | 45 500 (65 | 000.07- | 40.00/ 00- | - | 4 000 10- | - | - | - | |
| Education and General | 15,593,600 | 809,200 | 12,896,000 | 0 | 1,888,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| San Juan Center | 2,945,100 | 2,021,200 | 383,200 | 0 | 540,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Prenistoric Museum | 287,600 | 190,700 | 95,900 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Applied Technology Education | 1,556,700 | 491,400 | 928,300 | 0 | 137,000 | U | 0 | 0 | |
| | 20 502 200 | 3 630 300 | 1,400 | 0 | 2 567 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 20,002,200 | 0,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 2,007,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Utan Valley State College | 116 004 200 | 040 100 | 61 007 200 | 0 | 23 030 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 110,904,300 | 700,100 | 01,777,200 12,400 | 0 | 00,757,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Luucanonany Disauvanidyeu | 152,500 | 124,100 | 13,400 | U | U | U | U | 0 | |

June 2007

Utah System of Higher Education 2007-08 Work Programs Revised Schedule -- June 2007

| | | | | | Revenues | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| | Expenditures | | | Uniform | | | | Cigarette Tax/ |
| | Experialates | General | Income | School | Dedicated | Mineral | Federal | Trust Funds/ |
| | | Fund | lax | Fund | Credits | Lease | Funds | Other Funds |
| Total UVSC | 117,056,800 | 1,107,200 | 62,010,600 | 0 | 53,939,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Salt Lake Community College | | | | | | | | |
| Education and General | \$101,449,800 | \$21,700 | \$63,349,100 | \$0 | 38,079,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Skills Center | 5,751,400 | 4,091,800 | 420,900 | 0 | 1,238,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Educationally Disadvantaged | 178,400 | 178,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SLCC | 107,379,600 | 4,291,900 | 63,770,000 | 0 | 39,317,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR and Statewide Programs | | | | | | | | |
| Administration - SBR | 3,566,000 | 2,967,200 | 598,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration - Prison Recidivism | 1,385,700 | 385,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 |
| Engineering Initiative | 5,000,000 | 0 | 5,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WICHE | 1,021,900 | 1,021,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid | 3,737,400 | 3,316,800 | 420,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - UCOPE | 5,983,800 | 1,983,800 | 4,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Financial Aid - New Century | 1,330,400 | 73,200 | 1,257,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Minority Scholarships | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Tuition Assistance | 47,100 | 47,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Student Fin. Aid - Engineering Loan Repaym | 50,000 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T.H. Bell Teacher Incentive Loans | 1,999,100 | 623,300 | 1,200,000 | 0 | 175,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campus Compact | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electronic Coursework/UEC | 746,500 | 535,700 | 12,000 | 0 | 198,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Higher Education Technology Initiative | 7,709,700 | 2,445,600 | 5,264,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Programs | 303,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 303,100 | 0 |
| Hearing Impaired | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Scholar Initiative | 500,000 | 0 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jobs Now Initiative | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Academic Library Council | 3,183,500 | 2,883,500 | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total SBR | 38,711,300 | 16,480,900 | 20,552,700 | 0 | 374,600 | 0 | 303,100 | 1,000,000 |
| 9 INSTITUTION & SBR TOTAL | \$1,136,756,700 | \$49,638,700 | \$693,605,400 | \$0 | \$377,069,200 | \$1,745,800 | \$4,205,400 | \$10,492,200 |
| Litab College of Applied Technology | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgerland | \$11 095 100 | \$271.000 | \$6 702 300 | \$2 677 000 | 1 444 800 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Davis | 11 415 200 | 479.000 | 6 220 900 | 2,057,500 | 1,450,000 | ¢0 | ¢0 | 0 |
| Davis | 1052,000 | 476,000 | 0,329,600 | 2,937,300 | 1,050,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie | 1,952,900 | 0 | 764,500 | 1,038,400 | 150,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mountainland | 5,065,100 | 200 | 1,058,000 | 3,745,900 | 261,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ogden Weber | 12,676,100 | 446,200 | 7,605,000 | 3,075,800 | 1,549,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salt Lake/Tooele | 3,425,500 | 1,607,600 | 937,500 | 551,400 | 329,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southwest | 2,382,400 | 442,500 | 582,100 | 1,197,800 | 160.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Llintah Basin | 5 974 000 | 1 851 500 | 723 200 | 2 325 800 | 1 073 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2 600 100 | 2 100 100 | 500,000 | 2,323,000 | 1,073,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 3,006,100 | 3,106,100 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Equipment | 2,262,400 | 801,900 | 1,460,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT Administration | 1,773,400 | 233,700 | 1,119,700 | 420,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UCAT TOTAL | \$61,630,300 | \$9,240,700 | \$27,782,600 | \$17,989,600 | \$6,617,400 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Utah Education Network | | | | | | | | |
| UEN | \$35 <u>,</u> 114,800 | \$ <u>2</u> 61,100 | \$5,919,600 | \$15,146,000 | 170,900 | \$0 | \$13,492,000 | \$125,200 |
| UEN TOTAL | \$35,114,800 | \$261,100 | \$5,919,600 | \$15,146,000 | \$170,900 | \$0 | \$13,492,000 | \$125,200 |
| GRAND TOTAL - USHE (w/ UCAT) & UEN | \$1 233 501 800 | \$59 140 500 | \$727 307 600 | \$33,135,600 | \$383 857 500 | \$1 745 800 | \$17 697 400 | \$10 617 400 |

Table 1 Utah System of Higher Education Fiscal Year 2007-08 Implementation Report on

Average Salary Increases by Employee Classification

| | | Regular | Adjunct | Teaching | F | 0. " | Wage | Institution |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|------------|--------|---------|-------------|
| Institution | Line Item | Faculty | Faculty | Assistants | Executives | Staff | Payroll | Average |
| UU | E&G | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | SOM | 5.00% | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | RDEP | 5.00% | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | Lele Health | | | | | 5.00% | 5 000/ | 5.00% |
| | Poison | | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | Siesmograph | | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | NH Museum | | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | Arbor | | | | 5 000/ | 5.00% | 5 000/ | 5.00% |
| | KUED | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | USTAR | | | | | F 000/ | | 5.00% |
| | U Hospital Minoro Lloopital | | | | | 5.00% | | 5.00% |
| | Miners Hospital | | | | | 5.00% | | 5.00% |
| | | | | | | E 000/ | E 000/ | 5.00% |
| | Eu DIS | | | | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| USU | E&G | 4.96% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 6.53% | 4.82% | 3.50% | 4.94% |
| | UBCEC | 5.46% | 3.50% | | | 4.75% | | 4.94% |
| | SECEC | 3.50% | 3.50% | | | 3.79% | | 4.94% |
| | BCCEC | 7.77% | 3.50% | | 7.50% | 5.35% | 3.50% | 4.94% |
| | TWCEC | 7.13% | 3.50% | | | 4.29% | | 4.94% |
| | AES | 3.50% | | | | 4.41% | 3.50% | 4.94% |
| | UWRL | 4.34% | 3.50% | | | 5.97% | | 4.94% |
| | Соор | 5.07% | | | 5.11% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 4.94% |
| | Ed Dis | | | | | 3.96% | | 4.94% |
| WSU | E&G | 5.42% | 5.00% | | 4.55% | 5.22% | 5.00% | 5.25% |
| SUU | F&G | 7.10% | 7.00% | | 6.00% | 7.90% | 7.00% | 7.30% |
| | Ed Dis | | | | | 5.00% | | 5.00% |
| | Rural | | | | | 7.00% | | 7.00% |
| Snow | E&G | 6.32% | 6.00% | | 4.93% | 7.19% | 9.80% | 7.20% |
| DSC | F&C | 5.00% | 3 50% | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 3 50% | 1 80% |
| 030 | Zion | 5.0070 | 5.5070 | | 5.0070 | 5.00% | 3.50% | 4.00% |
| | Lion | | | | | 0.0070 | 0.0070 | 1.7070 |
| CEU | All Lines | 5.00% | 11.11% | | 2.60% | 5.00% | 3.50% | 5.00% |
| UVSC | E&G | 5.00% | 5.00% | | 5.00% | 5.05% | 4.50% | 5.00% |
| | Ed Dis | | | | | 5.05% | 4.50% | 5.00% |
| SLCC | All Lines | 5.00% | 6.00% | | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| CDD | A due la | | | | (250) | 4 700/ | | 1.010/ |
| SBR | Admin | | | | 6.25% | 4.73% | | 4.91% |
| | ULC | | | | | 5.0078 | | 5.0070 |
| UCAT | Admin | | | | 11.00% | 6.50% | | 9.00% |
| | BATC | 8.00% | 8.00% | | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% |
| | DATC | | | | | | | |
| | DXATC | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% |
| | MATC | 3.66% | | | 4.84% | 4.04% | | 3.94% |
| | OWATC | 5.75% | 3.00% | 4.40% | 3.35% | 5.75% | 3.00% | 5.50% |
| | SLTATC | 3.50% | 3.50% | | 3.50% | 3.50% | | 3.50% |
| | SWATC | 5.00% | 5.00% | | TBA | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| | UBATC | | | | | | | |

Notes: DATC - Not Available at the time of Print

| ENDOW | MEN | T | I N | V E S | 6 T M | E N | T S | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| CATEGORY OF INVESTMENT | U of U | USU | WSU | SUU | SNOW | DIXIE | UVSC | SLCC |
| Other Investments | 1.24% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.009 |
| Pooled Investments | 89.00% | 45.29% | 86.35% | 33.54% | 66.09% | 64.07% | 10.05% | 3.259 |
| Corporate Bonds/Notes | 0.00% | 0.65% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.83% | 0.009 |
| Stocks | 2.66% | 5.91% | 10.69% | 1.37% | 3.18% | 19.44% | 63.54% | 0.00% |
| Government Investments | 0.41% | 29.96% | 0.00% | 19.27% | 31.22% | 10.42% | 14.46% | 0.009 |
| Cash Equivalent (PTIF, CDs, Checking) | 6.69% | 18.19% | 2.96% | 45.82% | -0.50% | 6.08% | 11.12% | 96.759 |





* Note: UCAT & UHEAA do not have endowments; CEU information is unavailable at this time
| OTHER INVESTMENTS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--|
| CATEGORY OF INVESTMENT | U of U | USU | WSU | SUU | SNOW | DIXIE | UVSC | SLCC | UCAT | UHEAA | |
| Other Investments | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.46% | 2.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| Pooled Investments | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.77% | 0.00% | 13.95% | 0.00% | 0.63% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 65.75% | |
| Corporate Bonds/Notes | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.60% | 13.84% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| Stocks | 0.32% | 0.00% | 5.96% | 0.00% | 1.44% | 0.00% | 11.53% | 0.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| Government Investments | 49.59% | 48.21% | 42.86% | 28.35% | 15.37% | 0.00% | 1.51% | 1.46% | 0.00% | 0.00% | |
| Cash Equivalent (PTIF, CDs, Checking) | 50.09% | 51.79% | 46.95% | 69.53% | 69.25% | 100.00% | 84.74% | 84.57% | 100.00% | 34.25% | |





*Note: CEU's information is unavailable at this time



*Note: CEU's information is unavailable at this time



*Note: CEU's information is unavailable at this time

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

FROM: Mark H. Spencer

SUBJECT: <u>Delegation Reports</u>

I have reviewed the Capital Facilities Delegation Reports for the University of Utah and Utah State University. Both reports are accurate and appropriate summaries of current projects.

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

| ΤO· | State Board of | Regents |
|-----|----------------|---------|
| 10. | | Regents |

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>USHE – Impact of Information Technology</u>

Computing and the Internet are invaluable tools that serve faculty and students by providing broad access to educational information in all formats. Information from anywhere in the world can be delivered to a faculty and student desktop or laptop. These tools have improved the breadth, diversity, and quality of education and research. They have also improved the efficiency and convenience of business and academic service processes.

Computing and the Internet have also provided a global delivery system where *anyone* can share and receive information. Students and faculty can use powerful search engines to find educational information and courses for virtually any subject. The quantity and quality of competitors that can provide on-line courses, learning objects, library materials, and certificate and degree programs has increased dramatically in recent years. It causes one to ask these questions: If, in the future, many of the services provided by the Utah System of Higher Education may be delivered by competitors, possibly at a low cost and high quality, how will Utah's colleges and universities alter their strategies to compete? Should the added capability and competition empowered by computing and the Internet be considered a disruptive threat, or do these technologies provide a grand opportunity to improve the accessibility, quality, efficiency, and accountability of institutions within the Utah System of Higher Education?

We believe that these technologies offer a tremendous opportunity to improve higher education. The committee will be presented with information regarding the importance of computing and the Internet, and their potential impact on higher education.

Commissioner's Recommendation

Information Item only. No action is needed.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS/SH

Impact of Computer and the Internet on Higher Education

Few understand the full degree of their operational dependence on computer systems or the extent to which IT plays a role in shaping their institution's strategic direction.

Alan Greenspan /Ben Bernake

- Information Technology has led to substantial gains in productivity and innovation in U.S. business and industry, keeping our country in a leadership position in the international economy.
- Higher education needs technology to be productive and innovative to maintain its lead in the world.

Threat or Opportunity

Should the added capability and competition empowered by computing and the Internet be considered a disruptive threat, or do these technologies provide a grand opportunity to improve the accessibility, quality, efficiency and accountability of institutions within the Utah System of Higher Education?

Strategic Question

In the future, many of the services provided by the Utah System of Higher Education may be delivered on line by competitors, possibly at a lower cost. If this is the case how will Utah's colleges and universities alter their strategies to compete?

Concerns: Business vs. Education CEO U President

- Growth
- Global competition
- IT as an enhancer
- IT as an inhibitor
- Information overload
- Merger & acquisition
- Regulation
- Return on assets

- Accessibility
- □ Affordability
- Accountability
- Interdisciplinary
- Technology transfer
- Student engagement
- Cyberinfrastructure
- International experience
- Development

IT Services for Students

Students depend on IT for virtually every aspect of their academic career.

- Registration
- Tuition payment
- Financial aid
- Fees and activities
- Library and research information
- Course materials
- Faculty and student communication and collaboration
- Residential living and campus life

- Homework assignments, and tests
- Viewing and listening to lectures
- Lab experimentation
- Creation and submission of original papers, art, music
- Media production
- News reporting
- Complex mathematic and statistical computation
- Course evaluations

IT Services for Faculty

Teaching (imparting knowledge) and Research (creating knowledge) depend on IT infrastructure.

- Communications with students, staff and colleagues (worldwide)
- Distribution of course information
- On-line courses
- Media on demand
- Classroom video capture
- Classroom network access
- Student grades

- Submission of research grants and applications
- Computational research
- Access to journals and other research data
- Publishing
- Collaboration with global colleagues

And more . . .

IT Services for the Administration

Administrative and asset management functions come to a halt without IT systems.

- Payroll and human resource management
- Budgeting
- Accounting
- Financial services
- Inventory, asset tracking
- Building access
- Police information

- Building and classroom scheduling
- Building access
- Heating / air conditioning
- Utilities
- Security alarms and surveillance
- Sprinkling systems

And on, and on, and on . . .



🥺 obsolete before plateau

Percentage of IT Use in Instruction in the US

- Course management software 48.9%
- Electronic mail 83.9%
- □ Commercial courseware 29.4%
- Computer simulations 17.2%
- □ Internet resources 57.9%
- □ Web sites for class materials 56.2%
- □ Learning objects 22.2%
- Online courses 18% of enrollments & growing; 70% in business training





Competition/Opportunity

- Online courses from other institutions
- For-profit colleges with a blended online classroom flexible experience
- Learning objects (multimedia units of a course)
- Commercial courses
- Google (Its mission is to provide all scholarly books, periodicals and audio-video materials on line searchable. Google has the combined business revenues of NBC, CBS, ABC and Fox.)
- Offerings by competitors that focus on satisfying students as consumers



Education Home

Web Search

Book Search

Spreadsheets

Earth

Maps

Docs &

Bloaaer

SketchUp

Calendar

<u>Personalized</u> Homepage

Google Apps for Education

Picasa

for Educators

Welcome to Google for Educators

Google recognizes the central role that teachers play in breaking down the barriers between people and information, and we support educators who work each day to empower their students and expand the frontiers of human knowledge. This website is one of the ways we're working to bolster that support and explore how Google and educators can work together.

As a start, we're inviting you to share your best ideas for using technology to innovate in the classroom.

To your left, you'll find a teacher's guide to Google products, including basic information about each tool, examples of how educators are using them, and lesson ideas. You'll also find lesson plans and videos from our partners at Discovery Education focusing on two of our most popular teaching tools: Google Earth and Google SketchUp.

We think of this site as a platform of teaching resources – for everything from blogging and collaborative writing to geographical search tools and 3D modeling software – and we want you to fill it in with your great ideas.

You can explore a Google tool you've never tried before, then tell us what you think about it. Or road test our lesson ideas, then follow the links to submit your own. And if you'd like to share your expertise with fellow educators, we encourage you to send us your story – we'd love to feature it on this site.

We also invite you to subscribe to the Google Teachers' Newsletter – your source of authoritative updates on Google tools and features, tips, and other information relevant to teachers.

Student Speakout Results

Students from more than 80 schools worldwide participated in Google's Global Warming Student Speakout! <u>Check out their top 50 ideas</u> to combat global warming and the USA Today ad that we published on November 27th to put their ideas in the spotlight.

Google Teacher Newsletter



R

Major Trends

- Virtually all new consumers/users are digital natives.
- Web 2.0 the move away from static information toward real time interaction, involvement, collaboration, experience.
- "Workplace" architecture built upon an "Enterprise" architecture of information, processes, and infrastructure.
- "Search" and "Navigation" overshadow traditional library-like information sources.
- Technology roles converting to business process innovation roles.

WORKPLACE ARCHITECTURE

ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE

BUSINESS PROCESS

INFORMATION & CONTENT

TECHNOLOGY

Students arrive with different life experiences and expectations.

- They are used to receiving info very fast.
- They like to parallel process and multi-task.
- They prefer graphics before text.
- □ They prefer random access (hypertext).
- They function best when networked.
- □ They thrive on instant results.
- □ They prefer games to drill and practice.
- They expect to create the context of their online experience.
- They arrive with "entitlement" expectations for campus workplace services.

Digital natives expect services to accommodate their preferences.

- □ Information online, not "in line"
- Information on-demand, free of place or time
- Blended classroom and online experience
- Flexible schedule for working students
- Relevant and timely content
- More team collaboration
- More content from multiple sources
- Interactive voice, video and data content
- Ability to contribute, as well as consume, content/knowledge

World-Wide Emerging Technology Trends

- Innovation will come from other parts of the world other than the U.S.
- The Chinese have skipped the Internet first generation.
- Growth will occur in Asia, and continue to decrease in Western Europe.
- U.S. Industry is compulsively outsourcing abroad.
- Software is moving from forms-based applications to business processes.
- Networks are migrating to IP and optical networking technologies.

World-Wide Emerging Technology Trends

- Improved speech recognition
- Fuel cells and improved battery life
- More GPS-enabled, location-aware services
- Moore's Law (increasing chip density)
- More network bandwidth(100 terabyte with a single fiber) 60% broadband in US
- More computing power
- More storage

IT Strategic Plan 2008

- The CIO's of the Institutions of higher education planning efforts will be focused this year on the added value computers and the Internet can provide to improve the business process, teaching and research.
- We will give a report this fall.

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>USHE – Update on Institutional Health Plan Changes for 2007-08</u>

In 2003, Regents requested an annual update regarding management of health and dental plans. In addition, Regents directed USHE institutions to develop health insurance plans equivalent in relative benefit richness to the state employee health plan no later than FY 2007. Summer 2005 Regents reviewed the second health benefits richness study. The study illustrated how institutions adjusted benefits and coverage in their health plans to meet the goal established in 2003. Regents at that time were satisfied that institutions had met the goal established in 2003 and asked that an annual report be submitted outlining changes to health and dental plans.

Attachments 1 and 2 summarize health and dental plans for each USHE institution and UCAT campus, respectively. Each attachment contains four tables. Table one shows historical percentage increases for health benefits at each institution. Table two identifies 2007-08 cost and coverage provisions for health benefits. Table three describes the 2007-08 plan changes. Table four presents the cost data for each institution's 2007-08 dental plan.

Attachment 3 summarizes recent health benefit common practices and benchmarks identified in the Kaiser Family Foundation's *Employer Health Benefits 2006 Annual Survey*.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This is a discussion item only; no action is needed.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS/KLH Attachments

Table 1 SUMMARY OF USHE HEALTH INSURANCE INCREASES SINCE 1997-98

| | 97-98 | 98-99 | 99-00 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | 07-08 | Average ⁽¹⁾ |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------------|
| UU | 5.0% | 4.0% | 0.0% | 14.0% | 35.0% | 12.4% | 9.5% | 10.1% | 15.0% | 7.8% | 9.8% | 11.1% |
| USU | 7.6% | 1.9% | 2.5% | 8.2% | 13.3% | 13.9% | 7.0% | 5.5% | 11.8% | 8.2% | 10.9% | 8.3% |
| WSU ⁽²⁾ | 3.0% | 3.0% | 20.8% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 13.1% | 12.0% | 14.4% | 13.2% | 10.0% | 8.7% | 9.8% |
| SUU | 12.1% | 12.0% | 10.5% | 12.5% | 6.0% | 2.0% | 8.0% | 5.5% | 5.1% | 6.4% | 5.9% | 7.8% |
| Snow | 5.0% | 7.7% | 3.0% | 17.0% | 14.0% | 11.0% | 6.4% | 11.5% | 5.7% | 7.2% | 10.3% | 9.0% |
| DSC | 5.0% | 4.3% | 18.5% | 15.0% | 11.5% | 7.5% | -8.3% | 17.0% | 14.0% | 7.2% | 10.3% | 9.3% |
| CEU | 7.0% | 2.9% | 37.0% | 15.0% | 8.4% | 13.0% | 6.2% | 11.5% | -6.6% | 7.2% | 10.3% | 10.2% |
| UVSC | 5.0% | 9.2% | 12.9% | 23.0% | 13.3% | 1.4% | 10.6% | 9.7% | 10.8% | 6.4% | 9.3% | 10.1% |
| SLCC | 5.0% | 5.0% | 24.8% | 8.2% | 11.0% | 10.5% | 18.7% | 6.1% | 11.8% | 5.4% | 10.0% | 10.6% |
| Average (1) | 6.1% | 5.6% | 14.4% | 13.6% | 12.5% | 9.4% | 7.8% | 10.1% | 9.0% | 7.3% | 9.5% | 9.6% |

Notes:

(1) Simple averages

(2) WSU 2006-07 increase is an average between 2 plans (12.8% and 7.2%)

Attachment 1

Table 2 USHE Health Insurance Plans 2007-08

| | | | | | UofU | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Insurance Provider | | Blue Cross Blue Sheild | | | Value Care | | U | Iniversity of Utah Health P | lan |
| | Basic | Comprehensive | Advantage | Basic | Comprehensive | Advantage | Basic | Comprehensive | Advantage |
| Length of Contract (Years) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2007-08 Total Premium Increase (Percent) | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% |
| Annual Premium Cost to Institution | 7.070 | 7.070 | 7.070 | 7.070 | 7.070 | 7.070 | 7.070 | ,,,,,, | 7.070 |
| Sinale | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 | \$4.673 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 | \$7,895 |
| Family | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 | \$10,602 |
| Annual Premium Cost to Employee | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$508 | \$876 | \$508 | \$242 | \$610 | \$813 | \$145 | \$513 | \$715 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$858 | \$1,479 | \$1,821 | \$410 | \$1,031 | \$1,373 | \$245 | \$866 | \$1,208 |
| Family | \$1,152 | \$1,987 | \$2,446 | \$550 | \$1,385 | \$1,844 | \$328 | \$1,163 | \$1,622 |
| Employee Premium % Share | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 9.8% | 15.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 15.8% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 15.8% | 9.8% |
| Employee + 1 dependent | 9.8% | 15.8% | 18.7% | 9.8% | 15.8% | 18.7% | 9.8% | 15.8% | 18.7% |
| Family | 9.8% | 15.8% | 18.7% | 9.8% | 15.8% | 18.7% | 9.8% | 15.8% | 18.7% |
| Key Coverage Provisions | | | | | | | | | |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max | | | | | | | | | |
| Individual | Medical : \$2,000 in-net & | Medical : \$1,500 / Rx: | Medical : \$1,500 in-net & | Medical : \$2,000 in-net & | Medical : \$1,500 / Rx: | Medical : \$1,500 in-net & | Medical : \$2,000 in-net & | Medical : \$1,500 / Rx: | Medical : \$1,500 in-net & |
| | \$3,000 out-net / Rx: \$1,000 | \$1,000 UUHC - \$2,154 | \$3,000 out-net / Rx: \$1,000 | \$3,000 out-net / Rx: \$1,000 | \$1,000 UUHC - \$2,154 | \$3,000 out-net / Rx: \$1,000 | \$3,000 out-net / Rx: \$1,000 | \$1,000 UUHC - \$2,154 | \$3,000 out-net / Rx: \$1,000 |
| | UUHC - \$2,154 Non-UUHC | Non-UUHC | UUHC - \$2,154 Non-UUHC | UUHC - \$2,154 Non-UUHC | Non-UUHC | UUHC - \$2,154 Non-UUHC | UUHC - \$2,154 Non-UUHC | Non-UUHC | UUHC - \$2,154 Non-UUHC |
| | | M // / A4500/D | M | | M # 1 A4 500 / D | | | M # 1 44 500 / D | |
| Family | Medical: \$6,000 in-net & | Medical: \$4,500 / RX: | Medical: \$4,500 in-net & | Medical: \$6,000 in-net & | Medical: \$4,500 / RX: | Medical: \$4,500 in-net & | Medical: \$6,000 in-net & | Medical: \$4,500 / RX: | Medical: \$4,500 in-net & |
| | \$0,000 001-Het / KX: \$5,000 | \$3,000 00HC - \$0,402 | \$0,000 out-net / KX: \$5,000 | \$0,000 001-Het / KX: \$3,000 | \$3,000 00HC - \$0,402 | \$0,000 out-net / KX: \$3,000 | \$0,000 001-Het / RX: \$3,000 | \$3,000 00HC - \$0,402 | \$0,000 001-Het / RX: \$3,000 |
| | UURC - \$0,402 NUII-UURC | NUII-UUHC | UURC - \$0,402 NUII-UURC | UURC - \$0,402 NUII-UURC | NUII-UUHC | 00HC - \$0,402 NUII-00HC | UURC - \$0,402 NUII-UURC | NOII-OUHC | |
| Hospitalization (1st day) | | | | | | | | | |
| Deductible | \$500 (Overall deductible - | \$250 (Overall deductible - | \$250 (Out-of-network only - | \$500 (Overall deductible - | \$250 (Overall deductible - | \$250 (Out-of-network only - | \$500 (Overall deductible - | \$250 (Overall deductible - | \$250 (Out-of-network only - |
| | not Hospital specific) | not Hospital specific) | Deductible not Hospital | not Hospital specific) | not Hospital specific) | Deductible not Hospital | not Hospital specific) | not Hospital specific) | Deductible not Hospital |
| | | | specific) | | | specific) | | | specific) |
| Co-pay | 30% in-network / 50% out- | 20% | 10% in-network / 35% out- | 30% in-network / 50% out- | 20% | 10% in-network / 35% out- | 30% in-network / 50% out- | 20% | 10% in-network / 35% out- |
| | of-network | | of-network | of-network | | of-network | of-network | | of-network |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 70% in-network / 50% out- | 80% | 90% in-network / 65% out- | 70% in-network / 50% out- | 80% | 90% in-network / 65% out- | 70% in-network / 50% out- | 80% | 90% in-network / 65% out- |
| Emorranau Boom | of-network | | of-network | of-network | | of-network | of-network | | of-network |
| Deductible | \$500 (Overall deductible | \$250 (Overall deductible | \$0 | \$500 (Overall deductible | \$250 (Overall deductible | \$0 | \$500 (Overall deductible | \$250 (Overall deductible | \$0 |
| Deductible | not FR specific) | not FR specific) | 90 | not FR specific) | not FR specific) | \$U | not FR specific) | not FR specific) | ψ |
| Co-pay | 30% in-network / 50% out- | 20% | \$75 for Medical Emergency | 30% in-network / 50% out- | 20% | \$75 for Medical Emergency | 30% in-network / 50% out- | 20% | \$75 for Medical Emergency |
| | of-network | | | of-network | | | of-network | | |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 70% in-network / 50% out- | 80% | 100% for Medical | 70% in-network / 50% out- | 80% | 100% for Medical | 70% in-network / 50% out- | 80% | 100% for Medical |
| | of-network | | Emergency | of-network | | Emergency | of-network | | Emergency |
| Office Visit Co-pay | 30% after deductible | 20% after deductible | \$20 in-network / 35% after | 30% after deductible | 20% after deductible | \$20 in-network / 35% after | 30% after deductible | 20% after deductible | \$20 in-network / 35% after |
| | | | deductible out-of-network | | | deductible out-of-network | | | deductible out-of-network |
| Proscription Banafits | | | | | | | | | |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max | | | | | | | | | |
| Individual | | | | | | | | | |
| Family | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Deductible | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| Generic | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / |
| | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC |
| Brand Name - Preferred | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / |
| Brond Name, New Destanced | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC | 25% Non-UUHC |
| Brand Name - Non -Preferred | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy/ | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy / | 20% UUHC Pharmacy/ |
| | 3370 INOU-UOHC | 2010-UUHC | 2010-110/1 0/2CC | 33% INOU-DOHC | 3370 INOU-DOHC | 2010-UUHC | 3370 INDI-DUHC | 3370 INOU-DOHC | 33% INOU-DOHC |

Table 2 USHE Health Insurance Plans 2007-08

| | | | | <u>U</u> | SU | | | | W | <u>/SU</u> |
|--|------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Insurance Provider | | Regence BCBS (Premiums Based | S - "White Plan" I on Salary Levels) | | | Regence BCB (Premiums Based | BS - "Blue Plan" f on Salary Levels) | | EMIA | Altius |
| | Salary <\$23,000 | Salary \$23,001 - \$35,000 | Salary \$35,001 - \$54,000 | Salary >\$54,001 | Salary <\$23,000 | Salary \$23,001 - \$35,000 | Salary \$35,001 - \$54,000 | Salary >\$54,001 | | |
| Length of Contract (Years) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2007-08 Total Premium Increase (Percent) | 10.9% | 10.9% | 10.9% | 10.9% | 10.9% | 10.9% | 10.9% | 10.9% | 8.2% | 9.3% |
| Annual Premium Cost to Institution | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,838 | \$3,840 | \$3,826 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,665 | \$8,908 | \$7,910 |
| Annual Dramium Coast to Employee | \$12,504 | \$12,304 | \$12,304 | \$12,304 | \$12,304 | \$12,304 | \$12,304 | \$12,304 | \$12,071 | \$11,420 |
| Single | \$176 | \$205 | \$251 | \$304 | \$337 | \$412 | \$528 | \$665 | \$288 | \$288 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$326 | \$388 | \$495 | \$594 | \$722 | \$879 | \$1,153 | \$1,405 | \$668 | \$668 |
| Family | \$448 | \$540 | \$693 | \$837 | \$1,033 | \$1,266 | \$1,659 | \$2,025 | \$965 | \$965 |
| Employee Premium % Share | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 4% | 5% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 10% | 12% | 15% | 7% | 7% |
| Employee + 1 dependent | 4% | 4% | 5% | 6% | 8% | 9% | 12% | 14% | 7% | 8% |
| Family | 3% | 4% | 5% | 6% | 8% | 9% | 12% | 14% | 7% | 8% |
| Key Coverage Provisions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max | \$2.000 | ¢2.000 | \$2.000 | \$2,000 | \$2.500 | ¢2 500 | ¢2 E00 | \$2 500 | ¢1 200 | ¢1 200 |
| Individual | \$3,000 | \$2,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$2,300 | \$2,500 | \$2,300 | \$2,500 | \$1,200 | \$1,200 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$2,400 | \$2,400 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hospitalization (1st day) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deductible | \$750 | \$750 | \$750 | \$750 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$400 | \$400 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Co-pay | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$30 | \$30 |
| 00 pay | \$230 | \$250 | \$250 | ψ230 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | 430 | 450 |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 95% | 95% |
| 5 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Emergency Room Deductible | \$750 | \$750 | \$750 | \$750 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$400 | \$400 |
| Deductible | \$120 | \$150 | \$120 | \$1.00 | \$230 | \$230 | \$200 | \$230 | \$400 | \$400 |
| Со-рау | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$200 | \$100 | \$100 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Office Visit Co-pay | \$35 | \$35 | \$35 | \$35 | \$30 | \$30 | \$30 | \$30 | 20 | 20 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prescription Benefits | | | | | | | | | | |
| rearry Out of Pocket Max | \$1.500 | \$1.500 | \$1.500 | \$1.500 | \$1.250 | \$1.250 | \$1.250 | \$1.250 | | |
| Family | \$1,500 | \$1,000 | \$1,500 | ψ1,000 | \$1,200 | ψ1,200 | \$1,200 | \$1,200 | | |
| Deductible | \$100 | \$100 | \$100 | \$100 | \$100 | \$100 | \$100 | \$100 | | |
| Generic | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | \$5 | 20% (\$5 min) | 20% (\$5 min) |
| Decad Name - Decferred | 200/ | 200/ | 2007 | 200/ | 259/ | 250/ | 250/ | 250/ | 250((610) | 250((\$10) |
| Brand Name - Preferred | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 35% | 25% (\$10 min) | 25% (\$10 min) |
| Brand Name - Non - Preferred | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 35% (\$20 min) | 35% (\$20 min) |
| | | | | | | | | | . , | . / |

Table 2 USHE Health Insurance Plans 2007-08

| 2007 00 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | <u>SUU</u> | | Snow | | <u>D</u> : | <u>sc</u> | <u>CI</u> | EU | UVSC | <u>SLCC</u> |
| Insurance Provider | Regence BCBS | PHEP Preferred | PHEP Advantage | PHEP Summit | PHEP Advantage | PHEP Preferred | PHEP Preferred | PEHP Summit | EMIA | BCBS |
| Length of Contract (Years) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2007-08 Total Premium Increase (Percent) | 5.9% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 9.3% | 10.0% |
| Annual Premium Cost to Institution | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$3,611 | \$4,407 | \$4,376 | \$4,376 | \$4,460 | \$4,551 | \$4,611 | \$4,563 | \$4,257 | \$4,676 |
| Employee + 1 dependent Family | \$8,160 \$11,734 | \$9,096 \$12,132 | \$9,032 \$12.046 | \$9,032 \$12.046 | \$9,196 \$12,276 | \$9,384 \$12.527 | \$9,519 \$12,707 | \$9,409 \$12.561 | \$9,834 \$14,203 | \$10,578 \$14,757 |
| Annual Premium Cost to Employee | | */ | | | + -= | * -=,==- | +-=,-=- | | *** | * |
| Single | \$272 | \$486 | \$175 | \$175 | \$91 | \$343 | \$296 | \$0 | \$54 | \$72 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$614 | \$997 | \$351 | \$351 | \$188 | \$706 | \$599 | \$0 | \$126 | \$144 |
| Family | \$883 | \$1,338 | \$480 | \$480 | \$251 | \$943 | \$799 | \$0 | \$182 | \$240 |
| Employee Premium % Share | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 7% | 10% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 7% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 2% |
| Employee + 1 dependent | 7% | 10% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 7% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 1% |
| Family | 7% | 10% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 2% |
| Key Coverage Provisions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max Individual | \$1,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$1,500 | \$1,500 |
| Family | \$2,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| Hospitalization (1st day) Deductible | \$150 | \$250/\$500 | \$250/\$500 | \$250/\$500 | | | \$250 | \$250 | \$50 | \$0 |
| Со-рау | 20% | 15% | 10% | 10% | \$150 | \$250 | 15% | 10% | 10% | \$175 |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 100% | 85% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 85% | 85% | 90% | 90% | 80% |
| Emergency Room Deductible | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| Co-nav | \$100 | \$75 | \$75 | 7500% | \$100 | \$100 | \$75 | \$75 | \$150 | \$0 |
| | 1000/ | 1000/ | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 1000/ | 1000/ | 100% | ¢150 |
| Coverage alter deductible/co-pay | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | \$150 |
| Office Visit Co-pay | \$20 or \$30 | \$25 | \$20 | \$20 | \$20 | \$25 | \$20 or \$25 | \$20 or \$25 | \$20 | \$20 |
| Prescription Benefits Yearly Out of Pocket Max Individual Family Deductible | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generic | \$5 | 25%, \$5 Min | 25%, \$5 Min | \$5 | 25% | 25% | 25% (\$5 min) | \$5 | 20% | \$7 |
| Brand Name - Preferred | 30% | 30%, \$5 Min | 30%, \$5 Min | \$15 | 30% | 30% | 30% (\$5 min) | \$15 | 30% | \$30 |
| Brand Name - Non -Preferred | 50% | 50%, \$5 Min | 50%, \$5 Min | \$35 | 50% | 50% | 50% (\$5 min) | \$35 | 50% | \$55 |
| L | | | | | | | | | | |

| Table 3 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------|-------------|
| USHE Health Insurance Costs a | nd Cove | rage | | | | |
| Coverage Provision Changes Effective 7/1/07 | | U | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Category Changes | <u>UU</u> | <u>USU</u> | <u>WSU</u> | <u>SUU</u> | UVSC | <u>SLCC</u> |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max | | | | | | |
| Individual | | | | | | |
| USU - Blue Change in-network out-of-pocket maximum from \$2,000 to \$2,500 | | ~ | | | | |
| USU - White Change in-network out-of-pocket maximum from \$2,500 to \$3,000 | | • | | | | |
| Family | | | | | | |
| USU - Blue Change in-network out-of-pocket | | | | | | |
| maximum from \$4,000 to \$5,000 | | v | | | | |
| USU - White Change in-network out-of-pocket maximum from \$5,000 to \$6,000 | | ~ | | | | |
| Annual Deductible | | | | | | |
| Individual | | | | | | |
| USU - Blue Change in-network deductible from \$150 to \$250 | | ~ | | | | |
| USU - White Change in-network deductible from \$500 to \$750 | | • | | | | |
| USU - Blue Change out-of-network deductible from \$200 to \$500 | | ~ | | | | |
| USU - White Change out-of-network deductible from \$1,000 to \$1,500 | | ~ | | | | |
| Family | | | | | | |
| USU - Blue Change in-network deductible from \$450 to \$500 | | ~ | | | | |
| USU - White Change in-network deductible from \$1,000 to \$1,500 | | ~ | | | | |
| USU - Blue Change out-of-network deductible from \$600 to \$1,000 | | ~ | | | | |
| USU - White Change out-of-network deductible from \$2,000 to \$3,000 | | ~ | | | | |
| Hospitalization (1st day) | | | | | | |
| Deductible | | | | | | |
| UVSC - From No Deductible to \$50 per person per plan year (Inpatient hospital deductible). | | | | | ~ | |
| Co-Pay | | | | | | |
| USU - BlueChange hospital outpatient copay from \$100 to \$200 (applies after deductible) | | • | | | | |
| USU - White Change hospital outpatient copay from \$150 to \$250 (applies after deductible) | | ~ | | | | |
| UVSC - From \$100 day one, \$75 day 2-4 to 10% coinsurance | | | | | ~ | |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | | | | | | |
| USU- Blue Change hospital outpatient from 100% after deductible and copay to 80% after deductible and copay | | ~ | | | | |
| USU- White Change hospital outpatient from 100% after deductible and copay to 70% after deductible and copay | | • | | | | |
| Emergency Room | | | | | | |
| Co nov | | | | | | |
| USU Rhup Change emergency room consy from \$100 to \$200 | | | | | | |
| USU - White Change emergency room copay from \$150 to \$250 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| (continued) | | | | | | |
| Prescriptions/Pharmacy | | | | | | |
| Deductible | | | | | | |

SLCC

Table 3 USHE Health Insurance Costs and Coverage Coverage Provision Changes Effective 7/1/07 ບບ USU WSU SUU UVSC Category Changes USU - Blue & White Add a \$100 Rx deductible for 6 brand name drugs only Generic UVSC - From 20% (min \$7, max \$15) to 20% annual coinsurance max of \$1,000/\$2,000. **Brand Name - Preferred** UVSC - From 30% (min \$14, max \$30) to 30% annual coinsurance max of \$1.000/\$2.000. SLCC-co pay increased from \$25 to \$30 Brand Name - Non -Preferred UVSC - From No Formulary to 50% annual coinsurance max of \$1,000/\$2,000. SLCC-co pay increased from \$50 to \$55 Other Changes SUU - Eligible medical expenses in excess of the first \$500 will be subject to contract year deductible and employee will pay 20% of eligible Medical Expenses which will be applied toward Maximum Coinsurance. WSU - Lifetime maximum benefit Increased from 1,000,000 to \$2,000,000,00 UVSC - All inpatient, Outpatient, and Major Diagnostic testing moved from a copayment to a coinsurance of 10% UVSC - Addition of Adult Immunizations, Office copayment (\$20) (excludes immunizations required exclusively for foreign travel) UVSC - Addition of TMJ (Temporomandibular Joint Disorder), 50% with a maximum coverage level of \$500 (lifetime max) UVSC - Adoption Benefit change, from \$2500 within 90 days of birth, per child to \$4000 within 1 year of birth , per child. UVSC - TPN (Total Parenteral Nutrition) benefits change, from 50%, max of \$10,000/per year to 90%/10%, max of \$100,000 (lifetime).

UVSC - Nationwide Provider Network (Out of State Coverage, from swing option of plan (70%/30%),PLUS balance billing to swing option of plan (70%/30%), NO balance billing for Beech Street providers.

UVSC - Addition of an EAP (Employee Assistance Program) with 10 consultations per year.

SLCC - Mail Order Preferred Rx co pay changed from \$25 to \$60, Mail Order Non-preferred Rx co pay changed from \$50 to \$137.50

UU-Wellness program introduced. If employee participates, we deduct up to \$40 from their monthly premium (if monthly premium is less than \$40, employee pays zero).

Notes

No Changes to Snow, CEU, or DSC Plans

Table 4 USHE Dental Insurance Providers, Premiums, and Enrollment 2007-08

| | UU | USU | WSU | SUU | SNOW | DSC | CEU | UVSC | SLCC |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|------|---------|
| Insurance Provider/Third Party Administrator | BCBS | BCBS | EMIA | Regence BCBS | Dental Select | PEHP | EMIA | EMIA | BCBS |
| 2007-08 Total Premium Increase (Percent) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.2% | 8.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Annual Premium Cost to Institution per Employee | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$196 | \$302 | \$242 | \$312 | \$331 | \$526 | \$257 | \$53 | \$364 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$450 | \$526 | \$429 | \$547 | \$649 | \$669 | \$457 | \$67 | \$646 |
| Family | \$710 | \$954 | \$793 | \$1,043 | \$977 | \$969 | \$844 | \$98 | \$1,159 |
| Annual Premium Cost to Employee | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$121 | \$125 | \$60 | \$78 | \$0 | \$28 | \$57 | \$13 | \$54 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$277 | \$218 | \$107 | \$137 | \$0 | \$35 | \$101 | \$17 | \$90 |
| Family | \$437 | \$396 | \$198 | \$261 | \$0 | \$51 | \$188 | \$24 | \$143 |

Attachment 2

Table 1 SUMMARY OF UCAT HEALTH INSURANCE INCREASES

Since 2001-02

| | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | 07-08 | Average ⁽¹⁾ |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------------|
| BATC ⁽²⁾ | 14.4% | 12.6% | 0.0% | 13.3% | | | 7.8% | 9.6% |
| DATC | 17.0% | 12.0% | 7.8% | 5.4% | 10.6% | 6.7% | 10.3% | 10.0% |
| DXATC ⁽³⁾ | 11.5% | 7.5% | -8.3% | 17.0% | 14.0% | 7.2% | 10.3% | 8.5% |
| MATC ⁽⁴⁾ | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 11.9% | 8.6% | 7.7% | 9.4% |
| OWATC | 13.0% | 0.7% | 7.4% | 11.5% | 20.0% | 8.1% | 6.0% | 9.5% |
| SLTATC | 18.3% | 12.0% | 8.5% | 5.0% | 12.0% | 7.2% | 10.3% | 10.5% |
| SWATC | 7.5% | 13.0% | 10.3% | 7.0% | 10.0% | 2.2% | 6.3% | 8.0% |
| UBATC | 12.0% | 12.0% | 8.5% | 5.5% | 11.8% | 7.2% | 10.3% | 9.6% |
| Average (1) | 12.8% | 10.4% | 5.1% | 9.5% | 10.5% | 6.8% | 8.6% | |

(1) Simple averages

(2) BATC 2005-06 & 2006-07 Rate increases not available at the time of printing

(3) DXATC is an average increase across the two plans for 2006-07. As of 2006-07 DXATC is on its own insurance plan

(4) Mountainland Applied Technology College has implented its own plan for 04-05. Previously used UVSC's plan.

Table 2 UCAT Health Insurance Plans 2007-08

| | BATC | | DATC | | DX | ATC | MATC | <u>OW</u> | ATC |
|---|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Insurance Provider | EMIA | PHEP | PHEP | PEHP | PHEP | PHEP | EMIA | PEHP Summit | PHEP |
| | | Advantage | Preferred | Summit Care | Advantage | Preferred | | Care | Advantage |
| 2007-08 Total Premium Increase (Percent) | 7.8% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 7.7% | 6.0% | 6.0% |
| Annual Premium Cost to Institution per Employee | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$4,734 | \$4,472 | \$4,564 | \$4,472 | \$4,426 | \$4,760 | \$4,380 | \$3,373 | \$3,764 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$10,704 | \$9,221 | \$9,409 | \$9,221 | \$9,127 | \$9,814 | \$10,119 | \$6,982 | \$7,793 |
| Family | \$15,394 | \$12,310 | \$12,561 | \$12,310 | \$12,184 | \$13,102 | \$14,615 | \$9,444 | \$10,541 |
| Annual Premium Cost to Employee per Employee | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | \$0 | \$91 | \$343 | \$91 | \$137 | \$147 | \$0 | \$334 | \$372 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$0 | \$188 | \$708 | \$188 | \$282 | \$304 | \$0 | \$691 | \$771 |
| Family | \$0 | \$251 | \$945 | \$251 | \$377 | \$405 | \$0 | \$934 | \$1,042 |
| , | * 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Employee Premium % Share | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 0.0% | 2.0% | 7.0% | 2.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 9.0% | 9% |
| Employee + 1 dependent | 0.0% | 2.0% | 7.0% | 2.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 9.0% | 9% |
| Family | 0.0% | 2.0% | 7.0% | 2.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 9.0% | 9% |
| Key Coverage Provisions | | | | | | | | | |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max | | | | | | | | | |
| Individual | \$1,500 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| Family | \$3,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$2,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| Hospitalization (1st day) | | | | | | | | | |
| Deductible | \$0 | \$250 / \$500 | \$250 / \$500 | \$250 / \$500 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | \$500/\$1000 | \$500/\$1000 |
| Со-рау | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$150 | \$150 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 100% | 90% | 85% | 90% | 90% | 85% | 100% | 80% | 80% |
| Emergency Room | | | | | | | | | |
| Deductible | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | |
| Со-рау | \$50 | 75/125 non- | \$75 | 75/125 non- | \$75 | \$75 | \$100 | \$50 | \$50 |
| | | contracted | | contracted | | | | | |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 80% | 80% |
| Office Visit Co-pay | \$10 | PCP 20/Specialist | PCP 25/Specialist | PCP 20/Specialist | \$20 | \$25 | \$20 | \$20 | \$20 |
| | | 25 | 25/Uof U 40 | 25 | | | | | |
| Prescription Benefits | | | | | | | | | |
| | \$5 | 25% 30 day/5 | 25% 90 day/5 | 5/30 day | 75% of discounted | 75% of discounted | 20% (min \$7, max | 20% | 20% |
| | | minimum | minimum | | cost; \$5 min. | cost; \$5 min. | \$25) | | |
| Generic | | | | | | | | | |
| | \$15 | 30% 30 day/5 | 30% 90 day/5 | 15/30 day | 70% of discounted | 70% of discounted | n/a | 25% | 25% |
| | | minimum | minimum | | cost; \$5 min. | cost; \$5 min. | | | |
| Brand Name - Preferred | | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Covered | 35% 30 day/30 | 50% 90day/5 | 35/30 day | 50% of discounted | 50% of discounted | 30% (min \$14, max | 50% | 50% |
| | | minimum/60 max | minimum | | cost; \$5 min. | cost; \$5 min. | \$30) | | |
| Brand Name - Non-preferred | | | | | | | | | |
Table 2 UCAT Health Insurance Plans 2007-08

| | <u>SLTATC</u> | | | <u></u> | <u>UBATC</u> | |
|---|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------|--------------|-----------|
| Insurance Provider | PHEP | PEHP | PHEP | EMIA | PEHP | PEHP |
| | Preferred | Summit Care | Advantage | | Altius | Preferred |
| 2007-08 Total Premium Increase (Percent) | 10.3% | 10.3% | 10.3% | 6.3% | 10.3% | 10.32% |
| Annual Premium Cost to Institution per Employee | | | | | | |
| Single | \$4,564 | \$4,472 | \$4,472 | \$3,397 | \$4,472 | \$4,564 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$9,409 | \$9,221 | \$9,221 | \$7,564 | \$9,221 | \$9,409 |
| Family | \$12,561 | \$12,310 | \$12,310 | \$10,837 | \$12,310 | \$12,561 |
| Annual Premium Cost to Employee per Employee | | | | | | |
| Single | \$343 | \$91 | \$91 | \$273 | \$91 | \$343 |
| Employee + 1 dependent | \$708 | \$188 | \$188 | \$608 | \$188 | \$708 |
| Family | \$945 | \$251 | \$251 | \$871 | \$251 | \$945 |
| Employee Premium % Share | | | | | | |
| Single | 7% | 2% | 2% | 7% | 2% | 7% |
| Employee + 1 dependent | 7% | 2% | 2% | 7% | 2% | 7% |
| Family | 7% | 2% | 2% | 7% | 2% | 7% |
| Key Coverage Provisions | | | | | | |
| Yearly Out of Pocket Max | | | | | | |
| Individual | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| Family | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| Hospitalization (1st day) | | | | | | |
| Deductible | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$250 | \$250 | \$250 |
| Со-рау | 0% | 0% | 0% | \$0 | 10% | 15% |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 85% | 90% | 90% | 100% | 90% | 85% |
| Emergency Room | | | | | | |
| Deductible | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10% | \$0 | \$0 |
| Со-рау | \$75 | \$75 | \$75 | 0% | \$75 | \$75 |
| Coverage after deductible/co-pay | 80% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 100% | 100% |
| Office Visit Co-pay | \$25 | \$20 | \$20 | \$25 | \$20 | \$25 |
| Prescription Benefits | | | | | | |
| | Plan pays 75% of | \$5 copay | Plan pays 75% of | 20% | \$5 | 25% |
| | discounted cost | | discounted cost | | | |
| Generic | | | | | | |
| | Plan pays 70% of | \$15 copay | Plan pays 70% of | 30% | \$15 | 30% |
| | discounted cost | | discounted cost | | | |
| Brand Name - Preferred | | | | | | |
| | Plan pays 50% of | \$35 copay | Plan pays 50% of | 50% | \$35 | 50% |
| | discounted cost | | discounted cost | | | |
| Brand Name - Non-preferred | | | | | | |

Table 3 UCAT Health Insurance Costs and Coverage Coverage Provision Changes Effective July 1, 2007

| Category Changes | BATC DATC DXATC MATC OWATC SLTATC SWATC L | UBATC |
|--|---|-------|
| Hospitalization (1st day) | | |
| Deductible | | |
| OWATC - Increased from \$250/\$500 to \$500/\$1,000 | \checkmark | |
| | | |
| Other Changes | | |
| DATC - Preferred -Well Care services now have a \$25 copay | V | |
| DATC - Preferred - Specialty Pharmacy change - Member pays | ✓ | |
| 20% of discounted cost, up to maximum copayment | | |
| 20% of discounted cost, up to \$100 maximum copayment | \checkmark | |
| UBATC - PEHP - Precscription speciality from \$50 copy to %80 | | |
| coverage up to \$100 maximum | | ~ |
| UBATC - PEHP - Well Care now has an office copay of \$25 instead | 1 | ~ |
| of \$300 year allowance | | · |
| | | |

Table 4 UCAT Dental Insurance Providers, Premiums, and Enrollment 2007-08

Attachment 2

| BATC | | DATC | | DXATC | MATC | OWATC | | SLTAT | C | SWATC | UBATC |
|---------|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| EMIA | PEHP Traditional | PEHP Select | PEHP Preferred | PEHP | EMIA | EMIA | PEHP Traditional | PEHP Preferred | Dental Select Platinum | EMIA | PEHP Preferred |
| 8.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.8% | 0.0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$604 | \$526 | \$471 | \$526 | \$526 | \$588 | \$522 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$277 | \$526 |
| \$768 | \$669 | \$671 | \$669 | \$669 | \$748 | \$662 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$202 | \$669 |
| \$1,117 | \$969 | \$972 | \$969 | \$969 | \$1,088 | \$964 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$336 | \$969 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$0 | \$168 | \$0 | \$28 | \$28 | \$0 | \$52 | \$694 | \$554 | \$471 | \$0 | \$28 |
| \$0 | \$220 | \$137 | \$35 | \$35 | \$0 | \$65 | \$888 | \$704 | \$808 | \$60 | \$35 |
| \$0 | \$315 | \$203 | \$51 | \$51 | \$0 | \$95 | \$1,284 | \$1,020 | \$1,176 | \$154 | \$51 |
| | BAIC EMIA 8.0% \$604 \$768 \$1,117 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | BATC PEHP Traditional 8.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$768 \$669 \$1,117 \$969 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$220 \$0 \$315 | BATC DATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select 8.0% 0.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$471 \$768 \$669 \$671 \$1,117 \$969 \$972 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$0 \$220 \$137 \$0 \$315 \$203 | BATC DATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select Preferred 8.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$471 \$526 \$768 \$669 \$671 \$669 \$1,117 \$969 \$972 \$969 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$28 \$0 \$220 \$137 \$35 \$0 \$315 \$203 \$51 | BATC DATC DXATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP 8.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$471 \$526 \$526 \$768 \$669 \$671 \$669 \$669 \$1,117 \$969 \$972 \$969 \$969 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$28 \$28 \$0 \$20 \$137 \$35 \$35 \$0 \$315 \$203 \$51 \$51 | BATC DATC DXATC MATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP PEHP EMIA 8.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$471 \$526 \$526 \$588 \$768 \$669 \$671 \$669 \$669 \$748 \$1,117 \$969 \$972 \$969 \$969 \$1,088 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$28 \$28 \$0 \$0 \$220 \$137 \$35 \$35 \$0 \$0 \$315 \$203 \$51 \$51 \$0 | BATC DATC DATC MATC OWATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP EMIA EMIA 8.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$471 \$526 \$526 \$588 \$522 \$768 \$669 \$671 \$669 \$669 \$748 \$662 \$1,117 \$969 \$972 \$969 \$969 \$1,088 \$964 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$28 \$28 \$0 \$52 \$0 \$220 \$137 \$35 \$35 \$0 \$65 \$0 \$315 \$203 \$51 \$51 \$0 \$95 | BATC DATC DATC MATC OWATC OWATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP EMIA EMIA EMIA PEHP Traditional 8.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% \$604 \$526 \$471 \$526 \$526 \$588 \$522 \$0 \$768 \$669 \$671 \$669 \$669 \$748 \$662 \$0 \$1,117 \$969 \$972 \$969 \$969 \$1,088 \$964 \$0 \$0 \$168 \$0 \$28 \$28 \$0 \$52 \$694 \$0 \$220 \$137 \$35 \$35 \$0 \$65 \$888 \$0 \$315 \$203 \$51 \$51 \$0 \$95 \$1,284 | BATC DATC DATC MATC OWATC OWATC SETATO EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP EMIA EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Preferred PEHP PEHP Traditional PEHP Preferred PEHP PEHP PEHP Traditional PEHP P | BATC DATC DXATC MATC OWATC SETATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred Dental Select Platinum 8.0% 0.0% \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 | BATC DATC DXATC MATC OWATC SETATC SWATC EMIA PEHP Traditional PEHP Select PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred PEHP Preferred Dental Select Platinum EMIA 8.0% 0.0% \$202 \$1,117 \$969 \$969 \$1,088 \$964 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$336 \$0\$10\$137\$335\$35\$0 |

NOTES:

USHE Finance, Facilities, and Accountability Committee

Report on Common Practices and Benchmarks in Health Benefits June 2007

Common Practices and Benchmarks

I. Cost of Health Insurance

A. Premium Increases - The cost of job-based health insurance rose by 7.7% in 2006.
 This is the third consecutive year that insurance premiums showed a declining rate of growth.
 Increases for the previous 6 years were 9.2% in 2005, 11.2% in 2004, 13.9% in 2003, 12.7% in 2002, 11% in 2001, and 8.3% in 2000.

1. Smaller Rate Increases Outpace Inflation and Wage Gains - Despite the slowdown in rate increases, premium rate increases (7.7%) continue to exceed inflation (3.5%) and wage gains (3.8%).

2. Larger Premium Increases for Small and Large Firms - Employees in small firms experienced larger increases than large firms in 2006 (8.8% vs. 7.0%).

3. Wide Variation in Premium Increases for Workers and Firms - 13% of covered workers experienced increases greater than 15% while 42% of covered workers experienced Increases of less than or equal to 5%.

4. Fully-insured vs. Self-insured - Premium equivalents for self-funded plans (6.8%) rose at a lower rate than premiums for fully insured plans (8.7%). (See Figure 1)





Source: Kaiser and HRET, 2006

5. State/Local Government Sector - In 2006 premium increases for the State/Local Government were similar to the average premium increases for all industry sectors (See Figure 2).



Source: Kaiser and HRET, 2006

B. Annual Premium Costs of Single and Family Coverage - Average annual premiums including employer and employee share equal \$4,242 for single coverage and \$11,480 for family coverage.

1. PPO Premiums - Average annual premiums are \$4,385 for single and \$11,765 for family coverage.

2. HMO Premiums - HMOs have the second lowest cost with annual premiums of \$4,049 for single coverage and \$11,278 for family coverage. HDHP/SO plans had the lowest annual premiums with \$3,405 for single coverage and \$9,484 for family coverage.

3. Regional Differences - Cost of coverage in the West is no longer the lowest. Cost of coverage in the Midwest is now the lowest with the West as second lowest. Cost of coverage remains the highest in the Northeast.

II. Health Insurance Choice

- A. Most Available Plan Option PPO coverage continues to be the most available plan option, with 79% of covered employees able to choose a PPO plan. HMO is the next available plan type with 43% of covered employees having this option. This is down from 44% in 2005.
- **B. Multiple Plan Options** The number of covered workers who can choose from multiple plans is 49%. Workers in the large firms are more likely to have more than one plan option (65%), while workers in the small firms are the least likely (20%).

III. Market Shares of Health Plans

- A. PPO Enrollment More than half of covered workers (60%) enroll in PPO plans.
- **B. HMO Enrollment** Enrollment in HMO plans fell to 20% of total workers compared to 21% in 2005. The West Region is continues to have a higher enrollment in HMO plans than other regions (29%).

IV. Employee Contribution for Premiums

A. Dollars Contributed - The average monthly workers' contributions for single coverage is \$52 in 2006, while family coverage contributions is \$248. The annual average rates for single coverage and family coverage are \$627 and \$2,973, respectively (See Figure 3).



Source: Kaiser and HRET, 2006

B. Employee Percentage Contributed - 3 different sources (see Table 1)

1. Kaiser and HRET: Workers continued to pay about 16% for single coverage and 27% for family coverage (See Figure 4).

a) Employers Fully Covering Premiums - Twenty-three percent of covered workers have the full cost of single premiums paid by their employer compared with 9% who have the full cost of family premiums covered by the employer.

2. 2004 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey - Nationally, workers pay 24% of the premium for family coverage and 18% of the premium for single coverage. In Utah, workers pay 28% of the premium for family coverage and 20% for single coverage.

3. U.S. Department of Labor - Employee contributions toward the premium for single coverage were 18% and 30% for family coverage.

| | Employee Share of Premium | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| | US | 5 | Uta | Utah | | | |
| Survey | Single | Family | Single | Family | | | |
| Kaiser/HRET, 2006 | 16.0% | 27.0% | | | | | |
| MEP Survey, 2004 | 18.0% | 24.0% | 20.0% | 28.0% | | | |
| Dept. of Labor, 2006 | 18.0% | 30.0% | | | | | |

Figure 4. Percentage of Employee Contribution to Premium



Source: Kaiser and HRET, 2006

V. Employee Cost Sharing

A. Deductibles - In 2006, annual deductibles in PPO plans - the most common plan type - increased over 2005. Average deductibles for single PPO Coverage are \$473 for preferred providers and \$710 for family coverage with a separate per person deductible.

B. Coinsurance -The vast majority of covered workers (82%) in HMOs, PPOs, POSs face a fixed-dollar co-payment rather than a percentage coinsurance (11%) when they visit a physician.

C. Co-payments- Among covered workers with co-payments around 20% pay a co-payment for in-network services of \$5 or \$10 per visit, 64% pay \$15 or \$20 per visit and 15% pay \$25 or or higher per visit.

VI. High Deductible Health Plans and Savings Account Options

A. Availability of HDHP Options - Seven percent of firms now offer HDHP plans, up from 4% in 2005, but the difference is not statistically significant. The number of firms offering the HDHP plan appears likely to grow over the next year.

VII. Prescription Drug Benefits

A. Prescription Benefit Coverage - Ninety-eight percent of covered workers in employee sponsored health plans have a prescription benefit. Of these 90% participate in a tiered cost sharing formula.

B. Three or Four-tier Cost-Sharing Arrangements Increasing - The use of tiered cost sharing arrangements to encourage the use of generic drugs and preferred brand name drugs has increased over the past year growing from 55% of covered workers in 2002 to 63% in 2003, 68% in 2004 and 74% in 2005 and 2006.

C. Pharmaceutical Co-payments - The average drug co-payments for generic (\$11), preferred (\$24) and non-preferred (\$38) drugs increased slightly over the last year. Average co-payments for a four-tier drug are \$74.

D. Pharmaceutical Co-payments - The average drug co-payments for generic (\$10), preferred (\$22) and non-preferred (\$35) drugs increased slightly over the last year. Average co-payments for a four-tier drug are \$63.

E. Pharmaceutical Coinsurance - Cost-sharing for workers with coinsurance averages 20% for generic, 25% for preferred and 33% for non-preferred drugs and 42% for four-tier drugs.

VIII. Plan Funding

A. Level of Self-Funding - Similar to 2005, 55% of covered employees are in a plan that is completely or partially self-insured in 2006. This has remained relatively stable over the last few years.

B. Related to Size of Firm - The amount of covered workers in self-funded plans varies dramatically by size of firm. Thirteen percent of covered workers in small firms (3 to 199 workers) are in self-insured plans compared to 53% of workers in mid-size firms (200 to 999 workers), 77% in large firms (1,000 - 4,999 workers) and 89% of workers in jumbo firms (5000+ workers).

C. Coverage of Self Insured Plans - Firms that self-insure are least likely to cover workers in HMO plans (33%) and most likely to cover workers in PPO plans (63%)

Sources

 Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research and Educational Trust (HRET). 2006. *Employer Health Benefits:* 2006 Annual Survey. Found at <u>http://www.kff.org/insurance/7527/upload/7527.pdf</u>, March 19, 2007.

A national survey of 400 questions to 3,159 employers categorized by industry, size of firm, and region. *Note:* All data comes from this report unless otherwise referenced.

• Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Center for Cost and Financing Studies. 2004. 2004 *Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS) - Insurance Component*. Accessed through the Kaiser Family Foundation "State Health Facts Online" website, found at

<u>http://statehealthfacts.org/cgi-</u> <u>bin/healthfacts.cgi?action=compare&category=Health+Costs+%26+Budgets&subcategory=Employer%2dBased+Health+Premiums&topic=Single+</u> <u>Coverage</u> March 21, 2007.

The Medical Expenditure Panel Survey - Insurance Component is an annual survey of establishments that collects information about employer-sponsored health insurance offerings in the United States.

 U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2006. National Compensation Survey: Employee Benefits in Private Industry in the United States, March 2006. Found at <u>http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ebs/sp/ebsm0004.pdf</u> March 21, 2007.

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

| TO: | State Board of Regents |
|----------|--|
| FROM: | Richard E. Kendell |
| SUBJECT: | USHE - Legislative Auditor General: A Performance Audit of Compliance with UMIFA |

lssue

A recent audit by the Legislative Auditor General of five USHE institutions found several instances of non-compliance with policy. Commissioner's staff are working with representatives of all institutions to bring current practice into conformance with policy, and suggest changes in policy which are appropriate based on the experience of the past eighteen months.

Background

Utah's public colleges and universities endorsed legislation (HB255) in the 2005 Session to consolidate investment guidelines for endowment funds and operating funds. With this change, investment of institutional endowments became subject to the Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act (UMIFA) rather than the State Money Management Act. Regent policy R541, *Management and Reporting of Institutional Investments*, was amended in June 2005 to be consistent with HB255.

The Commissioner was notified in January, 2007, that the Legislative Auditor General intended to perform an audit of institutional performance under UMIFA. The audit team reviewed investment practices at five institutions, and in every case, discovered areas: where institutions moved too slowly to implement changes required by policy; where trustees lacked sufficient information to accomplish their oversight role; or where the work of internal audit staff was inadequate to detect non-compliance.

The USHE expresses appreciation for the efforts of the Legislative Auditor General. While the instances of non-compliance were relatively minor in scope, and have now for the most part been resolved, any non-compliance is troubling and will be addressed. Following page 33 of the audit report are attached letters of response from the Commissioner, the University of Utah, and Weber State University.

Commissioner's staff will convene a working group of appropriate institutional representatives to review lessons learned, required changes in practice, and policy changes which will provide better guidance to institutions.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This memorandum and attached report are intended for information.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS Attachments

REPORT TO THE UTAH LEGISLATURE Number 2007-09 **A Performance Audit Of Compliance with UMIFA** May 2007 Audit Performed By: Audit Manager **Rick Coleman** Audit Supervisor Kade Minchey Audit Staff Aaron Eliason

Table of Contents

| Page |
|---|
| Digest |
| Chapter I Introduction |
| UMIFA Law Governs Higher Education Endowment Funds 1 |
| Audit Scope and Objectives |
| Institution Management Not Fully Tracking Investment Compliance |
| Insufficient Tracking Has Resulted in Some Compliance Problems. 13 |
| Recommendations 19 |
| Chapter III Governance and Oversight Of Investments Can Be Improved 21 |
| Regents Can Influence Better Oversight Through Investment Policy. 22 |
| Trustees Do Not Have Sufficient Information to Accomplish Oversight Role |
| Internal Auditors Work Inadequate To Detect Policy Noncompliance |
| Recommendations |
| Agency Responses |

Digest of A Performance Audit of Compliance with UMIFA

Prudent and effective management and oversight of endowment funds is necessary. In 2005 the governance and oversight structure for higher education endowment funds changed from the Money Management Act to the Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act (changed in 2007 to UPMIFA).

We were asked to audit the system of higher education for compliance with the Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act (UMIFA). Accordingly, we reviewed investment compliance with UMIFA and the approved investment policies. We also reviewed oversight and controls of the governance system.

UMIFA Law Governs Higher Education Endowment Funds. UMIFA, as amended in 2005, is the governing law over higher education endowment funds. It requires the Board of Regents to establish an endowment fund investment policy for state higher education institutions. It also allows higher education institutions to establish their own endowment fund investment policies, which two institutions have done. Utah higher education institutions have significant investments in endowment funds.

UMIFA replaced the Money Management Act as the governing legislation over endowment funds. UMIFA came about because of improper management and inadequate governance over the investment of operating funds. One institution of higher education lost several million dollars in operating funds through investing in stocks and the Legislature had to appropriate new money to cover the loss of those operating funds. This history demonstrates the need to have adequate controls over institutional investments.

Institution Management Not Fully Tracking Investment Compliance. Investment policies are designed to ensure an appropriate return to risk tolerance. Once the investment policy is established, adherence to the policy means the approved return to risk tolerance is

Chapter I: Introduction

Chapter 2: Institutions Not in Compliance with Portions of Investment Policy followed. The Regent investment policy contains certain permissible investments with limited asset allocation. The Regent policy is intended to be a safe harbor for investments. Institutions can opt out of the regent investment policy with approval from the institutions' trustees and Board of Regents.

Since adherence to the investment policy is important, tracking to ensure compliance with the policy is essential. However, we found that institution management has not been fully tracking compliance with the investment policy. Ability of the institutions to track compliance is important. Institutions should be careful not to have a portfolio that is too complicated to track. The Regents should require institution management to track all requirements of the investment policy. If institutions do not have the expertise or staff to fully track investment compliance they, should consider pooling their funds with a more sophisticated institution in the state system of higher education or, with another qualified, competent investment entity.

Insufficient Tracking Has Resulted in Some Compliance Problems. As previously discussed, institution management has not been adequately tracking the requirements of the investment policy. One consequence of insufficient tracking is that institutions may not be aware of investment policy noncompliance.

All five higher education institutions we audited had some degree of policy noncompliance with the Regent investment policy. Four of the five institutions we audited were under the Regent policy for all of fiscal year 2006. The U of U was transitioning to their own policy, and adopted it a few months into the fiscal year, thereby only being under the Regent policy for a short while.

- 1. We recommend that Regent policy be amended to require institution management to fully track compliance with all requirements of the applicable investment policy.
- 2. We recommend that institutions consider pooling their endowment funds with a more sophisticated institution within the state system of higher education, or with another investment entity if they are unable to fully track compliance with the applicable investment policy.

Chapter 2 Recommendations

Chapter 3: Governance and Oversight of Investments Can Be Improved **Regents Can Influence Better Oversight Through Investment Policy.** The governance and oversight structure in place has not detected the institutions' policy noncompliance. The Regent investment policy needs to be clarified to be more effective in governing institutions' investments. The investment policy should be revised to include provisions such as rebalancing, requiring target allocations, and clarifying investment vehicles. The commissioner's staff should review the investment policy and seek ways to clarify and, where appropriate, strengthen requirements in the policy. The commissioner's staff should also, where appropriate, seek ways to help educate and guide the institutions toward policy compliance.

Trustees Do Not Have Sufficient Information to Accomplish Oversight Role. The institutions' board of trustees have an important oversight role that can function better with improved information from institution management. The Board of Regents have delegated responsibility to the trustees to manage institutions investments in compliance with the investment policy. However, the trustees are not receiving adequate information to fully understand and know if the institutions are in compliance with the policy.

Internal Auditors Work Inadequate To Detect Policy Non-Compliance. We found that the internal audit work performed at each institution was inadequate and did not detect institutions' policy noncompliance. The Regents have implemented agreed-upon procedures that require the internal auditors to attest to the institutions compliance with investment policy. However, auditors incorrectly attested to institutions' compliance with state law and investment policy.

The internal audit function has been established as the primary oversight entity. Internal auditors are the only entity that review detail of the investment policy for compliance. The Board of Regents relies on the auditors' opinion that the institutions are in compliance.

Chapter 3 Recommendations

- 1. We recommend that the Board of Regents analyze and review their investment policy to determine appropriate revisions and clarifications. Items that should be considered in the review are: Clarifying the asset allocation ranges in the investment policy Directing institutions to develop target allocations and manage their endowment pool accordingly Adding language to the policy that would require further portfolio diversification Including guidance and direction for re-balancing Reviewing required reporting deadlines and adjusting to ensure for reasonableness and appropriateness 2. We recommend that commissioner staff seek ways to better communicate policy requirements and, where appropriate, help educate institutions of their responsibility to fully track investment compliance. 3. We recommend that the Board of Regents develop a uniform report format for the institutions, which addresses each of the requirements of the investment policy. 4. We recommend that institutional board of trustees direct institution management to provide them with a standard monthly report demonstrating compliance with all investment policy requirements. 5. We recommend that the Board of Regents and institutions' board of trustees approve investment policies, including investment guidelines, and other investment policy direction, and subsequent amendments. 6. We recommend that institutions' internal auditors perform sufficient work in accordance with statutory requirements and the appropriate
 - investment policy to correctly attest to institution investment compliance.
 - 7. We recommend that commissioner staff help train internal auditors on applicable statutory requirements and appropriate investment policy.

Chapter I Introduction

Governing law over higher education endowment funds changed in 2005. Audit found some noncompliance with new law and new investment policy.

The law change in 2005 allowed institutions to create their own investment policies or follow a Board of Regent default policy. For over 30 years, the Money Management Act governed endowment fund investing. Specifically, endowments were governed through Rule 2 of the Money Management Council. Then, in 2005, the law changed, making the Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act (UMIFA) the governing law over endowment funds. The law changed again in 2007, to the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds act (UPMIFA). Changes in 2007 with UPMIFA did not alter the system of governance and oversight in place with UMIFA. With UMIFA and UPMIFA, oversight shifted from the Money Management Council to the Board of Regents and Institutions' board of trustees.

This audit reviews the management and oversight controls over institutional endowment funds since the Legislature changed the governance structure from the Money Management Council to the Board of Regents. We believe the control weaknesses shown in this audit need to be corrected to ensure proper protection of endowment funds in the future.

UMIFA Law Governs Higher Education Endowment Funds

UMIFA, as amended in 2005, is the governing law over higher education endowment funds. It requires the Board of Regents to establish an endowment fund investment policy for state higher education institutions. It also allows higher education institutions to establish their own endowment fund investment policies, which two institutions have done. Utah higher education institutions have significant investments in endowment funds.

History of Money Management Act Shows Importance of Proper Controls and Governance

The Money Management Act was adopted about 30 years ago because of improper management and inadequate governance over the investment of operating funds at an institution of higher education. One institution lost several million dollars in shorter term operating funds through investing in stocks, and the Legislature had to appropriate new money to cover the loss of those operating funds. This history demonstrates the need to have adequate controls over institutional investments. While the school's loss dealt with operating funds, this audit deals with endowment funds.

Those charged with overseeing endowment funds at the institutions, or institution management, need the freedom to invest to maximize longrange return, but management controls and proper oversight to limit risk and ensure prudence are also necessary. Investment officers have the job of balancing the risk of an investment with the return it is expected to receive within the specifications of applicable laws and investment policies.

We believe the control weaknesses shown in this audit needs to be addressed. With over \$600 million in the institutions' endowment funds, strong oversight and controls seem particularly prudent.

UMIFA Law Changed in 2005 to Include Higher Education Endowment Funds

UMIFA is the governing law over endowment funds for incorporated, unincorporated, or governmental organizations that are organized and operated exclusively for educational, religious, charitable, or other beneficent purposes. In 2005, UMIFA was changed specifically to include endowment funds of state higher education institutions. Previously, endowment funds of higher education institutions were governed under the Money Management Act.

Under the Money Management Act, Rule 2 of the Money Management Council governed higher education institutions endowment funds for 30 years. The Money Management Council was the oversight body responsible for making rules and ensuring endowment funds were invested according to those rules. This responsibility now rests with the Board of Regents and institutions' board of trustees.

UMIFA as amended in 2005 gave the Board of Regents the responsibility to establish asset allocations and guidelines for investing the endowment funds of higher education institutions. It also allowed institutions to adopt their own endowment fund investment policies.

Before the law change in 2005, endowment funds were governed under the Money Management Act. Law changed again in 2007, but it did not change the governance or oversight of endowment funds.

2005 law change gave the Board of Regents authority to approve or disapprove institutions' investment policies.

Regents have delegated some authority over endowment funds to institutions' trustees. In the 2007 General Legislative Session, the UMIFA law was replaced by the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA). However, the governance structure over endowment funds with the Board of Regents as the oversight body remains the same. *Utah Code* citations in this report refer to UPMIFA, as the UMIFA section has been removed from the code.

UMIFA Law Gives Regents Authority Over Investment Policy

The Board of Regents has authority over institutions' investments to establish asset allocations and guidelines for investment funds. The Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA) requires that an institution follow the Regent policy unless it has developed a policy of its own that has been approved by the Regents. UPMIFA allows the institutions to draft their own investment policies, but each policy must be approved by the Regents before becoming effective. *Utah Code* 51-8-303(2)(a) states:

A higher education institution may not invest its endowment funds in violation of the State Board of Regents' guidelines unless the State Board of Regents approves an investment policy that has been adopted by the higher education institution board of trustees.

Since the institutions must follow the Regents' policy or get approval from the Regents to have their own policies, the Regents have accepted responsibility to know if the institutions are in compliance with the Regent investment policy.

To know if the institutions are in compliance with the investment policy, the Regents have delegated responsibilities to each institution's board of trustees. The Regents require the trustees to monitor investments to ensure compliance with the investment policy, and report back to the Regents. The Regent investment policy states:

The Board delegates to each institutional Board of Trustees full responsibility to manage and report institutional investments in compliance with this general policy. Each institutional Board of Trustees shall adopt institutional policy and procedures regarding investments (including any changes in such policy and procedures), designate a public treasurer and approve the format of reports submitted for its review.

In accordance with UMIFA, the Board of Regents adopted new endowment fund allocation ranges and investment guidelines into Rule 541; or the investment and reporting policy. The rule was adopted in June 2005 and it became effective July 1, 2005. The rule specifies permissible investments, provides asset allocation requirements, and lays out various reporting requirements. The report goes into detail on these requirements in chapters II and III.

Institutions can opt out of the permissible investment, asset allocation, and conflict of interest portion of the investment policy. However, all institutions must follow the portion of the investment policy dealing with trustees' responsibilities and required reporting. The Regents require the institution to incorporate those sections into their own policies. Further, the Regents have statutory authority to approve or disapprove any institutions' investment policy.

Some Institutions Have Adopted Their Own Endowment Investment Policies

Utah Code [51-8-303(3)] allows institutions to opt out of the Regent investment policy and adopt their own policies. Two institutions, the University of Utah (U of U) and Utah State University (USU) have adopted a separate policy. The U of U received approval for their policy in December 2005, and USU received approval in October 2006.

Utah Higher Education Institutions Have Significant Investment in Endowment Funds

The institutions of higher education in the state have collected and built their endowment dollars over the years. The larger institutions naturally have collected a greater amount of endowment funds. However, each school has sizable funds that need to be properly managed and controlled.

Endowment funds are different than most government funds. Whereas most government funds are appropriated operating funds that are intended to be used in the short-term future, endowment funds are privately donated permanent funds that are meant to remain for the life of

Institutions may develop their own investment policies, but are required to follow Regent reporting requirements.

The principal of endowment funds is to remain inviolate for the life of the institution. the institution. Only a portion of an endowment fund's annual increase is available to be spent. Endowment funds are commonly used to provide scholarships, help specific academic programs, or fund other university needs. Because of the difference in investment time frames, endowment funds can properly be invested in higher-return and less liquid investments than operating funds. The following figure illustrates the size of each institution's endowment fund at the end of fiscal year 2006.

Figure 1.1 Higher Education Endowment Funds as of June 30, 2006. These numbers have been reported to the Regent's, by the institutions. Together, the University of Utah and Utah State account for 86% of higher education endowment funds.

| Higher Education Institution | Endowment Funds (In Millions) | Percent of Total |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
| U of U | \$416 Million | 68% |
| USU ¹ | 110 | 18 |
| WSU | 44 | 7 |
| Dixie | 10 | 2 |
| SUU | 12 | 2 |
| UVSC | 9 | 1 |
| SLCC | 6 | 1 |
| Snow | 4 | 1 |
| UCAT | 1 | 0 |
| CEU ² | Not Available | N/A |
| Total | \$612 Million | 100% |

¹ USU number differs from that reported to the Regents' due to some USU accounting errors discovered during the audit.

2 CEU unable to provide information, FY 2005 number was \$14 million.

These figures should include endowment dollars held by foundations, if the foundation's assets are included in the institution's audited statement of net assets. Quasi endowment dollars, or those not externally restricted, are also included in this report.

Over \$600 million exists in endowment funds. The U of U and USU account for 86 percent of the institutions' aggregated endowment.

Endowment Funds Are Also Held by Institution Foundations

Most higher education institutions have created private, non-profit foundations. Some of these foundations also hold endowment funds. These endowment funds held by the foundations are contractually obligated to the institution by the donor. The following figure illustrates endowment holdings by foundations at the schools audited.

Figure 1.2. Higher Education Endowment Funds Held by Foundations as of June 30, 2006. Foundations' endowment dollars are currently smaller than institutions', but at least one school is putting an increased amount of future donations into foundations.

| Institution | Institution Endowment (In Millions) | Foundations Endowment (In Millions) | Total (In Millions) |
|---------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| U of U ¹ | \$416 Million | \$0 | \$416 Million |
| USU | 101 | 9 | 110 |
| WSU | 38 | 6 | 44 |
| SUU | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| Dixie ² | 10 | 9 | 19 |

¹ U of U does not have a primary institution foundation. The institution does have a hospital foundation with a small endowment of about \$500,000.

² Dixie's number is different than figure 1.1 because the foundation assets are not reported with the institutions.

Questions About Foundations Exist. During the course of the audit, several questions were raised about foundations. Two of the primary questions about foundations are:

- Do state law and regent investment policy apply to endowment funds held by foundations?
- Should the state auditor audit endowment funds contractually obligated to the institutions, but held by foundations?

Foundation Questions Are Important and Regents Should Seek Answers. The questions about the role of foundations and what controls should be placed on the endowment funds they hold are important.

Regents should clarify questions about foundations holding endowment funds.

endowment funds.

These questions were beyond the scope of this audit but should be reviewed and answered by the Board of Regents, commissioner's staff, institutions' board of trustees and institution management. Protection of funds obligated to the institutions is important, history has shown that controls need to be in place to protect funds.

Audit Scope and Objectives

We were asked to audit the Utah System of Higher Education in order to determine if the higher education institutions are in compliance with the Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act (UMIFA), changed in the 2007 Legislative session to the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA). The scope of our audit was to review the following areas:

- Compliance with UMIFA and endowment fund investment policies by institutions of higher education
- Oversight and controls of the governance system

This Page Left Blank Intentionally

Each of the five institutions audited had some degree of noncompliance with the Regent investment policy.

Institutions are not fully tracking compliance with the investment policy.

Chapter II Institutions Not in Compliance With Portions of Investment Policy

Higher education institutions at each of the five audited institutions had some degree of investment policy noncompliance during fiscal year 2006. Compliance with investment policy is important because it helps with diversification and protection of the endowment portfolio.

Policy noncompliance occurred because management at the five institutions did not properly track their endowment funds in strict accordance with investment rules. Consequently, some endowment funds are invested in instruments not approved by the Board of Regents. We recommend that the Regents require institution management to fully track compliance with all investment requirements.

Institution Management Not Fully Tracking Investment Compliance

Investment policies are designed to ensure an appropriate return to risk tolerance. Once the investment policy is established, adherence to the policy means the approved return to risk tolerance is followed. The Regent investment policy contains certain permissible investments with limited asset allocation requirements. The Regent policy is intended to be a safe harbor for investments. Institutions can opt out of the regent investment policy with approval from the institutions' trustees and Board of Regents.

Since adherence to the investment policy is important, tracking to ensure compliance with the policy is essential. However, we found that institution management has not been fully tracking compliance with the investment policy. Ability of the institutions to track compliance is important. Institutions should be careful not to have a portfolio that is too complicated to track. The Regents should require institution management to track all requirements of the investment policy. If institutions do not have the expertise or staff to fully track investment compliance they, should consider pooling their funds with a more sophisticated institution or, with another qualified, competent investment entity.

Investment Policy Has Safeguards To Protect Endowment Funds

The Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA) embodied in *Utah Code* title 51 and section 08, requires the Board of Regents to establish asset allocations and guidelines for investing endowment funds. Accordingly, the Board of Regents established an investment and reporting policy, in Regent Rule 541. If an institution's board of trustees decide they have a different investment approach *Utah Code* 51-8-303(3) allows them to opt out of the Regent investment policy and seek approval for their own.

Rule 541, or the investment policy, is designed to safeguard endowment funds. The investment policy weighs risk and return motives and is designed to maximize return with an acceptable risk structure. To accomplish this risk/return level, the regents have a two-tiered investment policy. First, investments must fall into one of three categories of permissible investments. Second, the overall endowment portfolio must follow certain asset allocation requirements.

Regent Investment Policy Allows Only Certain Permissible Investments. The Regent's investment policy allows institutions to invest in three investment vehicles and any investment vehicle required by the donor. Through contractual agreements donors can require institutions to hold certain investments such as stocks, bonds, and treasury notes. The three investment vehicles are intended to provide a safe harbor for institutions. The following list illustrates the three approved investment vehicles.

- Mutual funds or common trust funds from banks, must be SEC registered.
- Any investment vehicle sponsored by the "Common Fund" (Common Fund is used by many institutions of higher education)
- Investments allowed in *Utah Code* 51-7-11, such as the State of Utah Public Treasurers' Investment Fund (PTIF)

Regent investment policy is designed to safeguard endowment funds. The Regents believe that pooled investment funds have less risk. Accordingly, individual stocks are not a permissible investment under the Regent investment policy. Additionally, corporate bonds with a maturity of more than 365 days are not allowed. Other individual investments, such as real estate, would also not be allowed.

Investment Policy Has Broad Asset Allocation Requirements.

Asset allocation is considered to be an important aspect of managing investment risk and return. The Regents' investment policy mandates how much or how little of certain asset classes an institution may hold in their portfolio. It also includes other provisions that attempt to minimize risk. For example, the policy requires investment in larger companies if an institution decides to invest in equities, the policy limits exposure to sector funds, and limits exposure to developing markets. The five asset allocation rules are shown below.

- If equities are held, a minimum of 25 percent of the equity portfolio must be invested in companies of at least \$10 billion in market capitalization
- A minimum of 25 percent in investment grade fixed income
- A maximum of 3 percent in any one sector fund
- A maximum of 5 percent in equity or fixed income funds of developing markets
- A maximum percentage of between 0 and 30 percent in alternative investments and between 0 and 20 percent in absolute return and long/short hedge funds, depending on the size of the institutions endowment.

Even with these requirements, the Regents' policy gives considerable latitude to institutions in investing their endowment funds. Based on the foregoing rules in the Regents' policy, institutions could invest within the following broad asset allocation ranges:

- Fixed Income: 25 to 100 percent
- Equities: 0 to 75 percent
- Alternatives: 0 to 30 percent (depending on the size of the endowment)

These provisions help safeguard assets by requiring some investment in assets which are relatively lower in risk, and by limiting an institution's exposure to higher-risk investments. When institutions do not track

Regent investment policy allows for broad asset allocations. compliance with these requirements, they lose the built-in safeguard benefits of the policy.

Institution Management Should Better Track Compliance

Management at each institution should institute a tracking mechanism to help them monitor and ensure compliance. Currently, institutional management is not tracking all policy requirements. The expertise and staffing ability to track compliance is essential. Tracking compliance is important; institutions should not have such complicated portfolios that make it too difficult to track.

Investment Tracking Effort Can Be Improved. Institution management has simply not been tracking and ensuring compliance with the investment policy. When management does not track all the requirements of the investment policy, the risk of not being aware of all the policy requirements is greater.

Investment policy contains safeguards important for management to follow. Therefore, management should institute a tracking mechanism to ensure that they are in compliance with all the provisions of the investment policy. Management should then use the tracking mechanism to assure their institution's board of trustees and the Board of Regents that they are in full investment compliance.

Ability to Track Compliance Is Important. Some of those in institution management have commented that tracking compliance with all the policy's provisions would be too time consuming and not feasible. If true, then institutional management should consider a different investment approach. It is not prudent for the institutions to have such complicated investments if they lack the staff, knowledge, or expertise to track compliance. The investment policy exists to perform an important function of safe guarding the institutions' assets.

Several options exist for institutions that lack the staff and/or sophistication of investing and tracking compliance. One option is for the schools to pool their funds with a more sophisticated institution. *Utah Code* 51-8-102(8) and 51-8-401(1) states,

Investment tracking with policy requirements can be improved.

Ability to track compliance is necessary and important. Manager means either the state treasurer or a higher education institution that accepts responsibility for the management of the endowment funds of a different higher education institution. . .an institution may delegate to an external agent the management and investment of an institutional fund to the extent that an institution could prudently delegate under the circumstances.

The U of U investment guidelines also provide for them to manage other institutions' funds.

Accordingly, institutions may use another higher education institution in the state system or an independent firm to manage the money. Several well-qualified firms exist that will manage an institution's fund in accordance with their investment policy. USU is currently researching this option.

Tracking all the provisions of the investment policy is essential for institutions to know they are in compliance. We recommend that the Board of Regents require institution management to track fully all requirements of the investment policy.

Insufficient Tracking Has Resulted in Some Compliance Problems

As previously discussed, institution management has not been adequately tracking the requirements of the investment policy. One consequence of insufficient tracking is that institutions may not be aware of investment policy noncompliance.

All five higher education institutions we audited had some degree of policy noncompliance with the Regents' investment policy. Four of the five institutions we audited were under the Regent policy for all of fiscal year 2006. The U of U was transitioning to their own policy, and adopted it a few months into the fiscal year; thereby, only being under the Regent policy for a short while.

Methodology of Compliance Review

Our criteria for the audit was the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA) and the Board of Regents investment

Institutions can pool their endowments funds with other institutions or gualified entities.

Institutions are not in compliance with some investment policy requirements. Rule 541. We also reviewed the U of U's and USU's investment policies. All higher education institutions were under Regent investment rule 541 for the entire fiscal year 2006, except the U of U, who operated under the rule for five months until their policy was approved in December 2005 (USU's policy was approved in October 2006).

We did not conduct a complete compliance review for the institutions. Instead we audited for general policy compliance and stopped when one or more concerns were uncovered. It is likely that further concerns would have been revealed with further audit work. Again, a prime concern was to understand if the management and Regent oversight system is functioning sufficiently. One or two undetected policy problems at each institution were sufficient to test the oversight structure and determine concerns with the system. We note that some of the specific compliance problems mentioned in this audit may themselves have a minor effect. The larger concern is that management and the oversight system were not tracking compliance and therefore had not detected the compliance problems.

We further acknowledge that the new rules and oversight system have been in place a short time, fiscal year 2006 being the first full year. We believe that some confusion exists with the new UMIFA law (now UPMIFA) and the Regents investment policy, Rule 541. Recommendations in this audit should be followed to help management and the oversight system correctly function.

Compliance Problems Varied At Four Institutions Under Regent Investment Rule

The four institutions under the Regent investment policy during fiscal year 2006 each had some degree of investment policy noncompliance. The institutions' policy problems and the causes for the policy noncompliance differ with each of the schools. However, if management at the schools would have strictly tracked the investment policy rules and managed according to them, all schools would have been compliant.

The Figure 2.1 illustrates the policy noncompliance with investment Rule 541 by the other institutions audited. Greater discussion and detail concerning the institutions' compliance problems are discussed after the figure.

We did not conduct a full compliance review. Institutions may have further noncompliance than what is listed in this audit. **Figure 2.1 Noncompliance with Rule 541 Requirements.** Four of the five schools we reviewed were not in compliance with either permissible investments or the required asset allocations.

| Institutions | Percent Non-Compliance | Areas of Noncompliance |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Dixie State College | 27% | Held common stocks and unallowed corporate bonds. |
| Weber State University | 1^1 | Held common stocks. And did not meet asset allocation requirement for fixed income. |
| Southern Utah University | 20 | Held common stocks. |
| Utah State University | 1 | Held unallowed corporate bonds. |

¹ 1% refers to common stock held. Asset allocation noncompliance discussed below.

Dixie State College Held Individual Stocks And Long-Term Corporate Bonds. Dixie was not in compliance with the Regents' approved investment policy because they held individual stocks and corporate bonds not allowed under the policy. The Regent policy requires that stocks and corporate bonds be held in a commingled fund. The stocks and bonds held by Dixie were worth about \$2.8 million of their \$10 million endowment portfolio (as of June 30, 2006). The college continues to hold stocks and unallowed corporate bonds. Consequently, Dixie is currently out of compliance with the investment policy.

Another concern is that Dixie does not track the asset allocation for their entire portfolio, but rather tracks how much of their portfolio is with each investment manager. Tracking the asset allocation for their entire portfolio will help them better manage their risk and return.

Weber State University Held Individual Stock and Did Not Follow Some Allocation Requirements. Weber State University (WSU) was not in compliance with either the permissible investments portion of the policy or the asset allocation requirements. During fiscal year 2006 Weber held shares of common stock for two companies. WSU continues to hold shares of common stock for the two companies.

Institutions had various noncompliance concerns.

> Dixie College held and still holds common stock and long-term corporate bonds, neither of which is allowed by the Regent Investment Policy.

This practice is not allowed by the Regents' investment policy. These stocks were worth approximately \$400,000, about 1 percent of their total endowment fund. The rest of their endowment fund was invested in permissible investments.

WSU believes that they have understandable reasons for holding the stock, but never asked or received formal permission from the Regents to do so. According to WSU, their investment committee approved the holding of both stocks, but this occurred under the old rules of the Money Management Council, when individual stocks were allowed.

Weber states that they hold one of these stocks so that students can attend shareholder meetings; therefore, the ownership of this stock serves educational purposes. While this is understandable, the university needs to get approval through the proper channels. *Utah Code* 51-8-303(3) allows trustees of the institutions to adopt their own investment policies. Thus, one option for WSU to take, if they desire to hold individual stock, is to adopt and seek approval for a policy that allows this.

Along with holding some shares of common stock, WSU was also not in compliance with one of the asset allocation requirements. The following figure illustrates WSU's allocation compliance concerns.

Figure 2.2 WSU Asset Allocation, FY 2006. Weber State was out of compliance with the required minimum fixed income asset allocation at the end of multiple quarters. Highlighted sections indicate compliance problems.

| Asset Class | Required Allocation | WSU's Allocation Fiscal Year 2006 | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | 1 st qtr. | 2 nd qtr. | 3 rd qtr. | 4 th qtr. |
| Fixed Income | Minimum 25% | 23% | 24% | 24% | 27% |

University officials brought up a concern to us about rebalancing. Though the university should have been compliant with the asset allocations regardless of a rebalancing provision, they bring up a good point. The university is concerned because the Regent investment rule provides no guidance on rebalancing. Without a rebalancing provision, the school may be in compliance with the allocation requirements at one

WSU holds some individual stock not allowed by the investment policy.

WSU was also not in compliance with the minimum fixed income requirement. point in time; if the market really favors one class of investments in particular, those allocations could change, leaving the school out of compliance in the interim. The school does bring up an important issue; however, we believe that the lack of policy tracking, not the rebalancing issue, accounts for the noncompliance.

We do agree that a rebalancing provision may be appropriate for the Regents to include in their policy. The Regents should study and discuss the pragmatics of a rebalancing provision discussed more in Chapter III.

Southern Utah University Held Individual Stocks. SUU held several individual stocks during the entirety of fiscal year 2006, which is in violation of the investment policy. The university has now sold the stock, and appears to be in compliance. The university for many years prior to fiscal year 2006 bought and sold stocks as part of their investment strategy.

The practice of holding individual stocks was allowed under the Money Management Council rules. However, the Regent investment policy is structured as a safe harbor for investments. Thus, individual stock is not a permissible investment in the new policy. The university is able to adopt their own investment policy, if they feel the Regents' policy is too restrictive.

SUU indicated that they were aware of the need to sell the stocks, but were confused with the time table for becoming compliant. Regent staff did notify the institution, during the second half of the fiscal year, of the need to sell the stocks. The institution still continued to hold stocks until the end of the fiscal year.

Utah State University Held Long-Term Corporate Bonds. USU also was not in full compliance with the Regent investment policy (Rule 541). USU held individual corporate bonds with various maturity dates greater than 365 days. Regent investment policy allows institutions to hold corporate bonds, but they must be accepted under *Utah Code* 51-7-11. This section allows for fixed-rate corporate obligations that:

- are rated "A" or higher or the equivalent of "A" or higher by two nationally recognized statistical rating organizations, one of which must be by Moody's Investors Service or Standard and Poor's
- are publicly traded

SUU held individual stocks during FY 2006, a practice not allowed by Regent investment policy.

USU had long-term corporate bonds, not allowed by the Regent investment policy. • have a remaining term to final maturity of 365 days or less or are subject to a hard put at par value or better, within 365 days

The corporate bonds held by USU were worth \$700,000, a relatively small portion of their endowment fund, less than 1 percent.

USU Officials were not aware that the Regent investment policy was more restrictive than Rule 2 of the Money Management council; hence, they did not divest the corporate bonds disallowed by the Regent investment policy. If management had been tracking all investment rules, this concern could have been identified and corrected.

After the time period audited, USU adopted their own investment policy, which allows for the holding of long-term corporate bonds. Accordingly, the bonds held by USU are now in compliance with their investment policy.

U of U Temporary Policy Violation Occurred

The U of U was not compliant while under the Board of Regent investment policy because the U of U did not anticipate being under the Regent policy. The U of U policy permits investments not allowed under the Regent policy. The Regent investment policy became effective July 1, 2005. Commissioner staff have indicated that the Regents allowed the schools 90 days to become compliant with their investment policy. The U of U's policy was approved December 2005. Consequently, for about two months, the U of U was out of compliance with Regent rules.

During this period the U of U held some investments with long-term commitments, which made it difficult and unreasonable to liquidate during the period they were governed by the Regents' investment policy. The university also held some common stock. The U of U's noncompliance is understandable, but nevertheless, could have been avoided. The university should have asked the Regents for permission to continue with the investment during the transition.

The next chapter discusses the oversight system, which has not been aware of the institutions' policy noncompliance. A primary part of the oversight system is the internal audit function. Internal auditors can

U of U not in compliant with Regent investment policy during transition period to their own investment policy. benefit from more comprehensive information from management to test for accuracy, which, in turn, will help the entire oversight structure.

Recommendations

- 1. We recommend that Regent policy be amended to require institution management to fully track compliance with all requirements of the applicable investment policy.
- 2. We recommend that institutions consider pooling their endowment funds with a more sophisticated institution within the state system of higher education, or with another investment entity if they are unable to fully track compliance with the applicable investment policy.
This Page Left Blank Intentionally

Oversight structure in place did not detect instances of policy noncompliance.

Chapter III Governance and Oversight Of Investments Can Be Improved

The governance and oversight structure in place has not detected the institutions' policy noncompliance. The Board of Regents, in their oversight role, receive only high-level information and therefore rely greatly on internal auditors at the institutions to perform in-depth compliance audits. The regents, in their governance role, should review and analyze their investment policy for needed clarifications and additions.

The board of trustees for each institution performs an oversight role in their meetings by reviewing investments reports. However, these reports have not been adequate in detailing all policy requirements and showing compliance to them. Trustees should request from their staff more thorough reports to help them in their oversight function.

The internal auditors have not adequately performed their oversight role. The auditors have failed to detect the institutions' investment policy noncompliance, thereby depriving the Regents of this information. Internal auditors should take measures to ensure that future audits are adequate in detecting any investment policy violations.

Oversight System Not Detecting Policy Violations

The current oversight system is composed of three entities: the Board of Regents, institutions board of trustees, and the internal auditors. Figure 3.1 illustrates the various layers of oversight currently in place and briefly describes the functionality of the oversight entity.

Figure 3.1 Endowment Oversight Structure. Compliance measurement with all investment policy requirements is not a substantial part of the current oversight system.

| Oversight Role | Implementation |
|---|---|
| Board of | Regents |
| Annually, Regents receive a summary of endowment holdings and ab auditor's attestation of compliance. As stated by Utah Code , Regents also receive monthly reports detailing deposits and investments (51-8-303(4)). | The Regents' annual review provides a comparative summary. Regents rely on internal auditors' attestation of compliance. The monthly reports vary by institution, but don't provide a complete compliance picture. |
| Institution Boa | ard of Trustees |
| As stated by Utah Code , Trustees also receive monthly reports detailing deposits and investments (51-8-303(4)). The Regent investment policy also requires they receive quarterly reports. | The monthly and quarterly reports vary greatly by institution. None of the reports address all the investment policy requirements. Consequently, trustees may not be aware of all policy requirements. |
| Internal | Auditors |
| The Board of Regents requires an annual audit. Internal auditors are to review all details and attest to institutions' policy compliance. | Auditors have not adequately reviewed investments. Auditors have incorrectly certified investments as compliant when they have not been. |

As discussed in the previous chapter (Chapter II), institutions have not been in compliance with investment policy requirements. The above oversight system has not detected the institutions' noncompliance.

Regents Can Influence Better Oversight Through Investment Policy

The Regent investment policy needs to be clarified to be more effective in governing institutions' investments. The investment policy should be revised to include provisions such as rebalancing, requiring target allocations, and clarifying investment vehicles. The commissioner's staff should review the investment policy and seek ways to clarify and, where appropriate, strengthen requirements in the policy. The commissioner's staff should also, where appropriate, seek ways to help educate and guide the institutions toward policy compliance.

Oversight system composed of Regents, institution trustees, and internal auditors.

Regents and commissioner's staff can clarify investment policy and better train institutions on the policy.

Policy Clarifications Can Help Steer Compliance

The Regent's investment policy is vague in certain areas and does not adequately address other investment needs. The Regents should review their policy with the institutions to clarify and revise where appropriate. These clarifications should make it easier for institutions to understand the requirements imposed on them, thereby aiding compliance. Some points to consider when revising the policy are:

Clarify Asset Allocation Ranges. The investment policy has asset allocations but could be more clearly presented. The Regents should make these allocation ranges more apparent.

Require Target Allocations. We found that at least one school has not established target allocations for their endowment funds. The regent policy does provide some guidance in asset allocation but only within broad ranges. Target allocations, on the other hand, give specific allocation goals for each asset class. Having target allocations is an industry-accepted way of managing investment fund portfolios. Without targets, institutions are lacking the strategic guidance that targets provide in managing endowment funds.

Ensure Greater Portfolio Diversification. The policy needs further direction on portfolio diversification. We have been told that one of the aims of the policy is to ensure that the endowment funds are in diversified investments, a key to managing a portfolio's risk. The Regent policy may attempt to achieve diversification through the rules above but diversification itself is not mentioned as a principal or requirement in the policy. Without providing more guidance on diversification, the Regents may see endowment fund portfolios that are not as diverse and consequently not as safe as they would like. The policy currently allows an institution to overinvest in certain parts of the economy. For example, it appears that under the regent policy, an institution could invest 75 percent of its endowment funds in real estate investment trusts (REITs). However, the Regent investment policy is intended to encourage diversification.

Establish a Rebalance Provision. Rebalancing is a necessary and common item for an investment policy. A rebalancing provision allows institutions to stay within target ranges without incurring significant

Some clarifications to the investment policy are needed.

Greater attention to portfolio diversification is needed in the Regent investment policy. transaction fees. Weber State University has requested the Regents add a rebalancing provision to the policy.

Reports Deadlines and Purpose. Regents should clarify the purpose of compliance reports and, at a minium, require that they show a more complete picture of required policy requirements.

Figure 3.2 Investment Policy Required Reports. Current compliance reports are inadequate to show full compliance with investment policy. These reports have also been untimely.

| Monthly Reports to Trustees. | "Each institutional Board of Trustees shall approve monthly reports of portfolio activity" R541-4.3. |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Report Deadline | Monthly or as often as trustees meet |
| Quarterly Reports to Trustees. | "Each institutional Board of Trustees shall approve quarterly reports of the institution's entire portfolio, showing costs and market amounts for each investment and maturity dates where applicable" R541-4.3. |
| Report Deadline | Quarterly |
| Annual Money Management Report. | "Annually, each institution shall submit, on forms provided by the Commissioner of Higher Education, a summary report of its money management activities for the year. This report shall include an auditor's opinionregarding [fairness of presentation and compliance with applicable law and policy]" R541-4.10. |
| Report Deadline | November 30 |
| Comparative Annual Summary | "The Office of the Commissioner shall compile a comparative annual summary of investment results from the audited reports and submit the summary for Board approval at its December meeting. After approval, the report shall be forwarded to the Legislature and Governor" R541-4.12. |
| Report Deadline | December Regent Meeting |

The Regents' investment policy reports deadlines that have not been adhered to. Dixie College and the College of Eastern Utah have not been reporting monthly to the Regents and, in some cases, their trustees. The other institutions have been reporting monthly. While the reports provide some information on compliance, they do not address all areas of investment policy requirements. We recommend that the Board of

Regents can clarify reports to require a more complete picture of policy compliance. Regents develop a uniform report format for the institutions, which addresses each of the requirements of the investment policy.

Timely information is pertinent to be able to correct policy noncompliance in a expeditious manner. The investment policy requires the Comparative Annual Summary be presented to the Regents by December of each year. However, this has not yet occurred. The fiscal year 2006 report (ending June 2006) is not scheduled to be reported until several months after the December deadline. This late reporting does not allow the Legislature and Governor to review timely reports. Regents should ensure their report deadlines are adhered to.

Clarifying these points will help establish a clearer direction for endowment investing. Thus, the commissioner's staff should analyze and review the investment policy for incorporation of these points and others deemed important.

Regent Staff Can Help Train Institutions

Staff at the Board of Regents can play a greater role in informing the institutions of investment policy requirements. Commissioner staff can help institutions become compliant by better informing them of the requirements.

Commissioner staff can also, where appropriate, help train some of the institutions on investment best practices. Training may also include details on how to best track investments according to the investment policy. We recommend that commissioner staff seek ways to better communicate policy requirements and where appropriate help educate institutions regarding investment compliance tracking.

Trustees Do Not Have Sufficient Information to Accomplish Oversight Role

The institutions' board of trustees have an important oversight role that can function better with improved information from institution management. The Board of Regents have delegated responsibility to the trustees to manage institutions' investments in compliance with the investment policy. However, the trustees are not receiving adequate

Required deadlines for reports have not been met.

Commissioner staff can help inform and train institutions with requirements in their investment policy. information to fully understand and know if the institutions are in compliance with the policy.

We recommend that institutional board of trustees direct institution management to provide them with a standard monthly report demonstrating compliance with all investment policy requirements. Trustees could also review the role of the investment committee to decide if any additional responsibilities are appropriate.

Trustee Oversight Role Can Function Better

The Regents' investment policy delegates investment responsibility to each institution board of trustees. However, the trustees are not receiving adequate information to monitor compliance. Further, investment committees organized by the institutions are serving well in an advisory capacity, but are not charged with specific compliance oversight responsibilities.

Utah Code and Regent Investment Policy Gives Trustees Responsibilities over Investments. The trustees have a defined function over endowment funds. The Utah Code provides general suggestions and requirements for the trustees' involvement and has these requirements for trustees:

- May adopt a separate investment and conflict of interest policy
- If separate policy is adopted, then trustees have requirement for defining responsibilities of certain groups as well as to determine risk level, etc
- Receive monthly reports from the institution detailing the deposit and investment of funds

The Board of Regents' investment policy more specifically defines the trustees' responsibilities. The investment policy requires the trustees to:

- Manage and report institutional investments in compliance with general investment policy
- Adopt policies and procedures regarding investments
- Approve format of reports submitted for its review
- Approve monthly and quarterly reports

Reports showing a more complete compliance picture can help trustees in their oversight role.

Trustees have a defined role in oversight over endowment funds. Investment advisory committees help with strategic investment decisions, but are not charged with specific compliance oversight. Investment Advisory Committees Provide Investment Guidance Rather Than Oversight. The advisory committees consist of qualified professionals who help the institutions on strategic investment decisions, but do not have an oversight role. The investment committees' role is not clearly defined in statute but is developed in more detail in each school's policies. Both the University of Utah and Utah State have made their investment committees advisory in nature. Some of the responsibilities of these committees include, among other things:

- Reviewing current economic conditions and future economic forecasts
- Reviewing the University's current investment portfolio and investment results
- Reviewing the pool's current investment strategy and advising the administration on the strategy to be employed
- Advising the administration on the engagement, termination, or continuation of investment advisors, consultants, independent investment managers, banks, and/or trust companies
- Advising the administration as to the adoption of appropriate operating guidelines or practices relating to the administration and investment of endowed funds, and the allocation of investment earnings

The two institutions with investment advisory committees do appear to be receiving valuable assistance and guidance from their committees. Overall, it appears that the role of the committee is to provide competent investment knowledge to the school and help steer the institution toward strategically sound investments. Trustees might review the role of the investment committee to decide if any additional responsibilities are appropriate.

Better Information Can Help Trustees in Their Oversight Role

In reviewing minutes from several trustees' meetings, we are certain that trustees are both receiving and approving investment reports. However, the information presented to the trustees is not adequate to determine if the institutions are in full compliance. Reports to trustees' vary greatly by school. Further, the institutions' public treasurers are certifying in the reports to trustees that they have been in compliance with the policy, when they have not been. Trustees should require more complete reporting from institutional management.

Institution public treasurers have attested compliance with state law and investment policy, when they have not been in compliance.

Regents and trustees should approve all investment policies and guidelines at the schools. The investment policy requires that trustees "approve the format of reports submitted for its review." The trustees should require from management at the institutions that reports presented to them contain information on all investment policy requirements. Further, public treasurers' assertions should be correct, and the trustees should be aware of all investment policy guidelines.

Public Treasurers' Assertions Require More Knowledge. Institution management, which includes the public treasurers, must have sufficient knowledge to attest to the compliance of the investments. The Regent investment policy requires public treasurers to assert compliance with the appropriate law. The policy states:

All reports should include the public treasurer's assertion that, to the best of the treasurers knowledge, the institution is in compliance with the State Money Management Act, the Rules of the State Money Management Council, and the Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act.

Public treasurers or institutional management have been attesting compliance with the law, when they were not in compliance. The treasurers must obtain sufficient knowledge of the investments to know if they are in compliance. Hence, the institution must more fully track investments, so the public treasurer is fully knowledgeable and aware of any policy noncompliance problems.

U of U Trustees Did Not Approve Investment Guidelines. The trustees as a body did not approve the school's investment guidelines. Instead, the guidelines, along with the policy, (investment policy had been previously approved by trustees) went straight to the Regents for approval. The investment guidelines contain the specific investment strategy for the institution. The trustees should approve the investment policy and guidelines, and any subsequent amendments. The *Utah Code* and the Regent investment policy also require the Regents to approve any subsequent changes to an institution's investment policy.

The U of U endowment fund investment guidelines contain responsibilities for the trustees. For the trustees at the U of U, or any other institution, to properly direct and govern investing activity at the institution it is important for them to direct and approve all investment direction and guidelines. We recommend that the Board of Regents and institutions board of trustees approve investment policies, including investment guidelines, and other investment policy direction, and subsequent amendments.

Internal Auditors Work Inadequate To Detect Policy Noncompliance

We found that the internal audit work performed at each institution was inadequate and did not detect institutions' policy noncompliance. The Regents have implemented agreed-upon procedures that require the internal auditors to attest to the institution's compliance with investment policy. However, auditors incorrectly attested to institutions' compliance with state law and investment policy.

The internal audit function has been established as the primary oversight entity. Internal auditors are the only entity that review detail of the investment policy for compliance. The Board of Regents relies on the auditors' opinion that the institutions are in compliance. We recommend that the institutions' internal auditors perform sufficient work in accordance with UMIFA and the appropriate investment policy to correctly attest institution investment compliance.

Internal Auditors Work Insufficient To Certify Compliance

Audit work performed by internal auditors was not adequate to certify compliance with investment policy. Internal auditors have been certifying investment compliance for several years. However, changes occurred in 2005 that affected the relevant criteria used in a compliance audit. We found that the auditors either did not use the new investment policy or misunderstood the policy and consequently inaccurately certified investment compliance.

Internal Auditors at Each of the Five Institutions We Visited Had Lapses in Their Audit Work. The internal auditors' work was insufficient for primarily two reasons. First, some internal auditors did not use the correct investment policy when testing for compliance. Second, other internal auditors were aware of the appropriate investment policy but either did not test for compliance with all the provisions in the

Internal auditors did not detect policy noncompliance and, thus, incorrectly attested to compliance.

Auditor work was not adequate to detect policy noncompliance. investment policies or did not understand the policy. The following chart shows the concerns of each institution.

Figure 3.3 Internal Audit Concerns. Various reasons exist for why internal auditors did not detect policy noncompliance.

Auditors did not perform adequate audits for different reasons.

| Institution | Audit Problem |
|-------------|--|
| U of U | Used the wrong law and policy for endowment funds when testing for compliance. Auditors used the Money Management Act and rules of the Money Management Council. |
| USU | Used the correct law and policy (UMIFA and Regent Investment policy), but did not understand the policy. Consequently, impermissible investments were not identified. |
| WSU | Used the correct law and policy (UMIFA and Regent Investment policy), but did not evaluate all investment policy requirements. |
| SUU | Used the wrong law and policy for endowment funds when testing for compliance. Auditors used the Money Management Act and rules of the Money Management Council. |
| Dixie | Used the correct law and policy (UMIFA and Regent Investment policy), but did not understand there were asset allocation requirements. Also, did not detect impermissible investments. |
| | |

Because of these problems the institutions' policy violations were neither detected nor corrected.

Oversight Function Impaired By Auditors' Insufficient Work

The system of oversight set up by the Regents relies entirely on the internal auditors to examine compliance with the details of the investment policy. The commissioner's staff have developed agreed upon procedures with each of the institution's internal auditors. These agreed upon procedures require the auditors to attest compliance with investment policy. The agreed-upon procedures state:

Internal auditors are required to attest to the accuracy and completeness of the numbers in the annual Report of Cash, Cash Equivalents and Investments. . . internal auditors are required to express an opinion regarding the institution's compliance with the laws and policies governing investment activity. These laws include. . .Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act,

Regents rely entirely on work by internal auditors to know if institutions are in compliance with policy requirements. Regent Policy R541, and individual institutional investment policies.

While each institution internal audit office agreed to these procedures, some did not comply with it. As previously shown some audit offices did not audit in accordance with UMIFA and Regent rule 541. More complete reporting and tracking by institutional management should help the auditors test for compliance.

We recommend that commissioner's staff help train internal auditors on the UMIFA law and appropriate investment policy. It is imperative for the auditors to perform correct audits or the oversight bodies will not receive accurate information.

Recommendations

- 1. We recommend that the Board of Regents analyze and review their investment policy to determine appropriate revisions and clarifications. Items that should be considered in the review are:
 - Clarifying the asset allocation ranges in the investment policy
 - Directing institutions to develop target allocations and manage their endowment pool accordingly
 - Adding language to the policy that would require further portfolio diversification
 - Including guidance and direction for re-balancing
 - Reviewing required reporting deadlines and adjusting to ensure for reasonableness and appropriateness
- 2. We recommend that commissioner staff seek ways to better communicate policy requirements and, where appropriate, help educate institutions of their responsibility to fully track investment compliance.
- 3. We recommend that the Board of Regents develop a uniform report format for the institutions, which addresses each of the requirements of the investment policy.
- 4. We recommend that institutional board of trustees direct institution management to provide them with a standard monthly

More complete reports by institution management will also help auditors test for compliance. report demonstrating compliance with all investment policy requirements.

- 5. We recommend that the Board of Regents and institutions' board of trustees approve investment policies, including investment guidelines, and other investment policy direction, and subsequent amendments.
- 6. We recommend that institutions' internal auditors perform sufficient work in accordance with statutory requirements and the appropriate investment policy to correctly attest to institution investment compliance.
- 7. We recommend that commissioner staff help train internal auditors on applicable statutory requirements and appropriate investment policy.

Agency Response

May 17, 2007

Mr. John Schaff Legislative Auditor General W315 State Capitol Complex Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Dear Mr. Schaff:

Thank you for allowing us to respond to your report titled "A Performance Audit of Compliance with UMIFA." In general, the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) agrees with the findings and recommendations included in the audit report. Technically speaking, instances of non-compliance did exist at each of the five institutions. However, as indicated in the audit report, most of those instances were relatively minor and have since been resolved (WSU and DSC will be making appropriate corrections).

We note that the fiscal year selected for audit was the first year under the new UMIFA law and associated governance structure. This was truly an implementation year in every sense of the word, with an almost 30-year history of investing, reporting, and auditing being changed virtually overnight. The change involved 10 institutions, multiple oversight bodies (regents, trustees, internal auditors), and multiple offices at each institution (treasurers, controllers, auditors, financial officers, etc). The communication and coordination efforts required during this transition were significant, and the audit has clearly identified some items that were not adequately addressed. The new UMIFA standard and structure represent a watershed event for the USHE. All of the associated adjustments, while beneficial for both the State and the System, continue to require enhanced communication, and training efforts.

The USHE acknowledges, accepts, and appreciates the findings related to weaknesses in the oversight and governance structures. The fact that cases of non-compliance (small as they were) went undetected by the oversight mechanism is indeed troubling. Commissioner's staff will immediately begin a review designed to remedy the deficiencies noted in the audit report. The following responses to the individual audit recommendations detail specific steps to be taken.

<u>Recommendation 19-1:</u> Concur. The Board will amend current policy to clarify that institutions are required to track all aspects of investment compliance.

<u>Recommendation 19-2:</u> Concur. The Board will investigate those cases where institutions lack the resources to track full compliance with investment policies. Where practical, staff will consider the benefits of pooling funds with more sophisticated institutions within the USHE.

<u>Recommendation 32-1:</u> Concur. The Board will (1) clarify asset allocation ranges; (2) require institution-specific target allocations (several institutions already maintain target allocations); (3) further endorse the concept of diversification and require a prudent level of diversification even within the pooled and commingled investments already permitted by policy; (4) provide guidance on the issue of portfolio re-balancing; and (5) adjust reporting deadlines to reflect requirements currently outlined in the USHE agreed-upon-procedures document.

<u>Recommendation 32-2:</u> Concur. The Office of the Commissioner will take additional steps to meet regularly with institutional personnel involved in the investment oversight process, with the goal of better educating and communicating with respect to policy and reporting requirements.

<u>Recommendation 32-3:</u> Concur. In consultation with institutional representatives, the Board will develop a uniform monthly report designed to demonstrate compliance with all investment policy requirements.

<u>Recommendation 32-4:</u> Concur. Institutional boards of trustees will be asked to review and track investment compliance based on the uniform monthly report referenced in recommendation 32-3.

<u>Recommendation 32-5:</u> Concur. The Board will clarify its current position, that all investment policies, guidelines, and other related guidance, as well as subsequent changes to those documents, must be approved by both trustees and regents.

<u>Recommendation 32-6:</u> Concur. As noted in the response to recommendation 32-2, the Office of the Commissioner will meet regularly with internal auditors to better educate and communicate on matters related to investment compliance.

<u>Recommendation 32-7:</u> Concur. As noted in the response to recommendation 32-2, the Office of the Commissioner will meet regularly with internal auditors to better educate and communicate on matters related to investment compliance.

Again, we appreciate the chance to respond to this audit. We believe we can comply fully with each of the recommendations. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS/BRF



May 16, 2007

Mr. John M. Schaff Legislative Auditor General W315 State Capitol Complex Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Re: Performance Audit of Compliance with UMIFA

Dear Mr. Schaff:

On behalf of the University of Utah, thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above-referenced report concerning the investment of endowment funds in the State System of Higher Education. We appreciate the professionalism and effort of your staff in performing the audit.

Prudent and effective oversight and management of endowment investments is of critical importance to the University of Utah. We were intimately involved as UMIFA was developed, evaluated, and enacted in 2005 as well as associated policies of the Utah State Board of Regents and the University of Utah. Prime objectives throughout the process were to improve safeguards, strengthen accountability, and achieve greater transparency with respect to our endowment investments. We believe the Legislature deserves great credit for the positive impact of this legislation on the State's educational institutions.

We welcome your recommendations to further strengthen our existing controls and oversight processes. We agree with each of the recommendations and are looking forward to implementing them.

Sincerely,

Amore B. Combe

Arnold B. Combe Vice President

c: Michael K. Young, President

University of Utah 201 South Presidents Circle, Room 209 Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9012 Phone: (801) 581-6404 • Fax: (801) 581-4972

WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

May 16, 2007

Mr. John M. Schaff, CIA Auditor General Legislative Auditors Office W 315 State Capitol Complex Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5315

Dear John,

Weber State University appreciates the review of its endowment investment activities — that has recently been completed by your office. The audit team of Rick Coleman, Kade Minchey and Aaron Eliason have been thorough and fair. We agree with the findings of the audit as they relate to Weber State University and we will implement the audit recommendations as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

MZ

Dr. Norm Tarbox Vice President for Administrative Services

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Utah State University – Approval to Sell Buildings approved by the Executive</u> <u>Committee</u>

This memorandum reports action taken by the Executive Committee of the State Board of Regents at a public meeting held on Thursday, May 17, 2007. The Executive Committee approved a request from Utah State University officials to sell two buildings on the Innovation Campus to a private development corporation and enter into a ground lease with the developer.

Attachments to this memorandum include the Commissioner's recommendation to the Executive Committee and briefing information from Utah State University.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This agenda item is for information only.

Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

REK/MHS Attachments

May 17, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee, State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Utah State University – Approval to Sell Two Buildings</u>

Utah State University officials request approval to sell two buildings on the Innovation Campus to a private development corporation and enter into a ground lease with the developer. Woodbury Corporation has previously partnered with other USHE institutions to develop leased space on institutional land. Woodbury has made an offer to USU to purchase two buildings, known as RP1 (#1747) and RP2 (#1787), and to remodel RP2. RP1 is currently leased to InTech charter school. Woodbury would continue the lease arrangement with InTech for RP1 as well as a portion of RP2.

The proposed purchase price is approximately \$2 million, and the ground lease is proposed at \$55,000 per year with CPI increases every three years. The purchase price is equal to or slightly above appraised value, and the lease rate is favorable to the University. This proposal spares the University the cost of remodeling RP2, and provides funds for USU's USTAR commitment. A term sheet and executive overview are attached. This sale and lease were approved by the USU Board of Trustees on May 16, 2007.

The University is requesting Board of Regents approval of the sale and lease. It would be noted however that there are conflicting Regent policies regarding the need for approval. Policy R491 delegates to USU "all powers" to operate its Research Park. But, R710 and R712 suggest that Regent approval is required for external entities to operate facilities on leased institutional property. The Commissioner believes that Regent approval is prudent.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends that the Executive Committee of the State Board of Regents authorize Utah State University to sell two buildings, RP1 and RP2, enter into a ground lease with the buyer.

REK/MHS Attachments Richard E. Kendell Commissioner of Higher Education

Term Sheet for Sale of 1747 & 1787 (RP1 & RP2)

Research Park Way, USU Innovation Campus

Woodbury Corporation has made an offer to USU to purchase the two building and to remodel RP2. In addition, RP1 is currently leased to InTech charter high school and they need to expand their space to accommodate additional students for the 2007/2008 school year. Woodbury has agreed to continue to lease RP1 to InTech and the north half of RP2. They will also to remodel that portion RP2 to meet the school's requirements. The remainder of RP2 will be remodeled for use as a multitenant facility. They have proposed the lease agreement to the InTech board and it has been accepted.

We have reached agreement with Woodbury as to purchase price for the buildings and also to a new ground lease for the 3 parcels of land that the buildings and parking lots occupy. The following table gives the key terms of the transaction:

| Item | RP1 | RP2 |
|--|--|---|
| Appraised value | \$1,230,000 | \$710,000 |
| Purchase price | \$1,230,000 | \$788,000 |
| Gross SF | 15,150 SF | 19,396 SF |
| Renovations necessary for future use | None- previous renovations were done in 2006 InTech \$800K USU \$48K | \$1,088,000 |
| Ground lease duration \$55k/year | 40 years + 10 year option to renew | 40 years + 10 year option to renew |
| Ground lease payments | Initial \$15,700/acre (market value) Increase every three years by CPI | Initial \$15,700/acre (market value) Increase every three years by CPI |
| Closing | No later than May 31, 2007 | No later than May 31, 2007 |
| Requirements for closing | Purchase agreements, ground lease, cross easement for parking access | Purchase agreements, ground lease, cross easement for parking access |

Proposed RP1/RP2 sale BOT and Regents Executive Review

May 5, 2007

Background

- USU has commitment to InTech Charter school with respect to location on Innovation Campus
 - InTech currently leases RP1 and needs expansion space for 3rd and 4th year students
 - Only logical expansion is into portion of RP2
 - RP2 needs extensive renovation to meet needs of school and upgrade to current codes
 - Neither InTech nor USU have adequate funds for renovation
- USU has immediate cash need to secure the USTAR "in kind" donation for new research building
- USU has negotiated with Woodbury Corp to create a solution that meets the needs of InTech and USU



RP 1 & RP2 sale

 Appraisals received from Bodell-Drimmelen for both buildings (paid for by Woodbury)

| | RP1 | RP2 |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Appraised value (After renovation) | \$1,230,000 | \$1,794,264 |
| Renovation costs | ~\$850,000 (actual) ~\$800K by InTech ~\$50 by IC | \$1,088,233 (estimated) |
| Net appraised values | \$1,230,000 | \$710,000 |
| Purchase price proposal | \$1,230,000 | \$788,000 |
| Total Proceeds | | \$2,018,000 |

Status: Letter of Intent with purchase price received; draft contract received

IC Governing Board approved , pending BOT & Regents approval

Use of Proceeds

- Help service bond and finish build out for the "620 building" used for "in kind" donation to USTAR
- Provide additional funds to build infrastructure for the IC Expansion (Innovation Campus)
- Provide support to TCO to partially relieve Research office burden
- Other purposes as directed by the President

Pros/Cons of Sale

Pros

- Provides facility for HS on schedule
- \$2,018,000 cash up front for other purposes such as 620 building, IC infrastructure
- Creates an up to date remodel of RP2 with safety issues addressed
- Reduces future financial risk for IC due to renovations/repairs/vacancy rate/competition in park
- Guaranteed cash flow at market rate for new ground lease (~\$55K/year with CPI escalation)

<u>Cons</u>

- May use portion of ground lease to help subsidize InTech HS
- Potential loss of revenue long term (beyond ~30 years)

| | | | USU Retains O | wnership | | | Sell Bui | lding | |
|----------------|---------|----------|----------------------|-------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | Rida | | | | | | | | |
| | Lease | Vacancy | Mgmt | Replacement | Net | Cumm. | Net | Cumm. | Cumm. |
| | Revenue | Loss | Expense | Allowance | Cash | NPV | Cash | NPV | NPV |
| Year | 3% | 15% | 8% | 10% | Flow | %2 | Flow | 7% | Variance |
| C | | | | | | · | 1.230.000 | 1.230.000 | 1.230.000 |
| • - | 154,530 | | (12.362) | (15.453) | 126.715 | 118,425 | 27,500 | 1,255,701 | 1,137,276 |
| · ~ | 159.166 | • | (12.733) | (15.917) | 130,516 | 232.423 | 28.325 | 1.280.441 | 1,048,018 |
| 1 m | 163.941 | (24,591) | (13.115) | (16,394) | 109.840 | 322.085 | 29,175 | 1.304.256 | 982,171 |
| 4 | 168,859 | (25,329) | (13,509) | (16.886) | 113,136 | 408,396 | 30,050 | 1,327,181 | 918,786 |
| ۍ ۲ | 173,925 | (26.089) | (13,914) | (17,392) | 116,530 | 491,480 | 30,951 | 1,349,249 | 857,770 |
| 9 | 179,143 | (26,871) | (14,331) | (17,914) | 120,026 | 571,458 | 31,880 | 1,370,492 | 799,035 |
| 7 | 184.517 | (27,678) | (14,761) | (18,452) | 123,626 | 648,446 | 32,836 | 1,390,941 | 742,495 |
| 80 | 190,052 | (28,508) | (15,204) | (19,005) | 127,335 | 722,556 | 33,822 | 1,410,626 | 688,069 |
| თ | 195,754 | (29,363) | (15,660) | (19,575) | 131,155 | 793,896 | 34,836 | 1,429,574 | 635,678 |
| 10 | 201,627 | (30,244) | (16,130) | (20,163) | 135,090 | 862,569 | 35,881 | 1,447,814 | 585,246 |
| 11 | 207,675 | (31,151) | (16,614) | (20,768) | 139,143 | 928,674 | 36,958 | 1,465,373 | 536,698 |
| 12 | 213,906 | (32,086) | (17,112) | (21,391) | 143,317 | 992,309 | 38,066 | 1,482,275 | 489,966 |
| 13 | 220,323 | (33,048) | (17,626) | (22,032) | 147,616 | 1,053,564 | 39,208 | 1,498,545 | 444,981 |
| 14 | 226,933 | (34,040) | (18,155) | (22,693) | 152,045 | 1,112,530 | 40,385 | 1,514,207 | 401,677 |
| 15 | 233,740 | (35,061) | (18,699) | (23,374) | 156,606 | 1,169,291 | 41,596 | 1,529,283 | 359,992 |
| 16 | 240,753 | (36,113) | (19,260) | (24,075) | 161,304 | 1,223,931 | 42,844 | 1,543,796 | 319,865 |
| 17 | 247,975 | (37,196) | (19,838) | (24,798) | 166,143 | 1,276,527 | 44,129 | 1,557,766 | 281,239 |
| 18 | 255,415 | (38,312) | (20,433) | (25,541) | 171,128 | 1,327,158 | 45,453 | 1,571,214 | 244,056 |
| 19 | 263,077 | (39,462) | (21,046) | (26,308) | 176,262 | 1,375,896 | 46,817 | 1,584,159 | 208,264 |
| 20 | 270,969 | (40,645) | (21,678) | (27,097) | 181,549 | 1,422,811 | 48,221 | 1,596,621 | 173,809 |
| 21 | 279,098 | (41,865) | (22,328) | (27,910) | 186,996 | 1,467,973 | 49,668 | 1,608,616 | 140,643 |
| 22 | 287,471 | (43,121) | (22,998) | (28,747) | 192,606 | 1,511,447 | 51,158 | 1,620,163 | 108,716 |
| 23 | 296,095 | (44,414) | (23,688) | (29,610) | 198,384 | 1,553,296 | 52,693 | 1,631,279 | 77,983 |
| 24 | 304,978 | (45,747) | (24,398) | (30,498) | 204,335 | 1,593,580 | 54,274 | 1,641,979 | 48,399 |
| 25 | 314,128 | (47,119) | (25,130) | (31,413) | 210,466 | 1,632,358 | 55,902 | 1,652,278 | 19,921 |
| 26 | 323,552 | (48,533) | (25,884) | (32.356) | 216,780 | 1,669,686 | 57,579 | 1,062,193 | (7,493) |
| 27 | 333,258 | (49,989) | (26,661) | (33,326) | 223,283 | 1,705,619 | 59,306 | 1,671,737 | (33,882) |
| 28 | 343,256 | (51,488) | (27,460) | (34,326) | 229,981 | 1,740,209 | 61,085 | 1,680,925 | (59,284) |
| 29 | 353,553 | (53,033) | (28,284) | (35,355) | 236,881 | 1,773,505 | 62,918 | 1,689,769 | (83,737) |
| 30 | 364,160 | (54,624) | (29,133) | (36,416) | 243,987 | 1,805,557 | 64,806 | 1,698,282 | (107,275) |
| 31 | 375,085 | (56,263) | (30,007) | (37,508) | 251,307 | 1,836,411 | 66,750 | 1,706,477 | (129,934) |
| 32 | 386,337 | (57,951) | (30,907) | (38,634) | 258,846 | 1,866,111 | 68,752 | 1,714,366 | (151,746) |
| 33 | 397,928 | (59,689) | (31,834) | (39,793) | 266,611 | 1,894,701 | 70,815 | 1,721,960 | (172,742) |
| 34 | 409,865 | (61,480) | (32,789) | (40,987) | 274,610 | 1,922,223 | 72,939 | 1,729,270 | (192,953) |
| 35 | 422,161 | (63,324) | (33,773) | (42,216) | 282,848 | 1,948,715 | 75,127 | 1,736,306 | (212,409) |
| 36 | 434,826 | (65,224) | (34,786) | (43,483) | 291,334 | 1,974,217 | 77,381 | 1,743,080 | (231,137) |
| 37 | 447,871 | (67,181) | (35,830) | (44,787) | 300,074 | 1,998,766 | 79,703 | 1,749,600 | (249,165) |
| 38 | 461,307 | (69,196) | (36,905) | (46,131) | 309,076 | 2,022,397 | 82,094 | 1,755,877 | (266,520) |
| 39 | 475,146 | (71,272) | (38,012) | (47,515) | 318,348 | 2,045,144 | 84,557 | 1,761,919 | (283,225) |
| 40 | 489,401 | (73,410) | (39,152) | (48,940) | 327,898 | 2,067,041 | 87,093 | 1,767,735 | (299,306) |

RP1

| | | | USU Ret | ains Ownership | | | | Sell Bui | lding | |
|-------|---------|---|-------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Bldg | | | | | | | | | |
| | Lease | | Vacancy | Mgmt | Replacement | Net | Cumm. | Net | Cumm. | Cumm. |
| Vear | Revenue | Renov. | Loss 15% | Expense 8% | Allowance | Cash | NPV 7% | Elow | 7% 7% | NPV Variance |
| 1 641 | 0/0 | | 0/21 | a/2 | | | - | | 2 | |
| 0 | | | | | | | | 788,000 | 788,000 | 788,000 |
| * | ŀ | (140,931) | • | | • | (140,931) | (131,711) | 27,500 | 813,701 | 945,412 |
| 2 | 213,356 | (140,931) | (32,003) | (17,068) | (21,336) | 2,017 | (129,949) | 28,325 | 838,441 | 968,390 |
| e | 219,757 | (140,931) | (32,964) | (17,581) | (21,976) | 6,306 | (124,802) | 29,175 | 862,256 | 987,058 |
| 4 | 226,349 | (140,931) | (33,952) | (18,108) | (22,635) | 10,723 | (116,621) | 30,050 | 885,181 | 1,001,803 |
| 5 | 233,140 | (140,931) | (34,971) | (18,651) | (23,314) | 15,273 | (105,732) | 30,951 | 907,249 | 1,012,982 |
| 9 | 240,134 | (140,931) | (36,020) | (19.211) | (24.013) | 19,959 | (92,433) | 31,880 | 928,492 | 1,020,925 |
| ~~ | 247.338 | (140,931) | (37,101) | (19,787) | (24.734) | 24,785 | (76,998) | 32,836 | 948,941 | 1,025,939 |
| 8 | 254,758 | (140,931) | (38,214) | (20,381) | (25,476) | 29,757 | (59,679) | 33,822 | 968,626 | 1,028,305 |
| თ | 262,401 | (140,931) | (39,360) | (20,992) | (26,240) | 34,877 | (40,708) | 34,836 | 987,574 | 1,028,282 |
| 10 | 270,273 | (140,931) | (40,541) | (21,622) | (27,027) | 40,152 | (20,297) | 35,881 | 1,005,814 | 1,026,111 |
| 11 | 278,381 | | (41,757) | (22,270) | (27,838) | 186,515 | 68,315 | 36,958 | 1,023,373 | 955,058 |
| 12 | 286,733 | ı | (43,010) | (22,939) | (28,673) | 192,111 | 153,615 | 38,066 | 1,040,275 | 886,660 |
| 13 | 295,335 | | (44,300) | (23,627) | (29,533) | 197,874 | 235,725 | 39,208 | 1,056,545 | 820,819 |
| 14 | 304,195 | , | (45,629) | (24,336) | (30,419) | 203,810 | 314,767 | 40,385 | 1,072,207 | 757,440 |
| 15 | 313,320 | , | (46,998) | (25,066) | (31,332) | 209,925 | 390,853 | 41,596 | 1,087,283 | 696,430 |
| 16 | 322,720 | , | (48,408) | (25,818) | (32,272) | 216,222 | 464,095 | 42,844 | 1,101,796 | 637,701 |
| 17 | 332,402 | · | (49,860) | (26,592) | (33,240) | 222,709 | 534,599 | 44,129 | 1,115,766 | 581,167 |
| 18 | 342,374 | 1 | (51,356) | (27,390) | (34,237) | 229,390 | 602,467 | 45,453 | 1,129,214 | 526,747 |
| 19 | 352,645 | , | (52,897) | (28,212) | (35,264) | 236,272 | 667'299 | 46,817 | 1,142,159 | 474,361 |
| 20 | 363,224 | • | (54,484) | (29,058) | (36,322) | 243,360 | 730,687 | 48,221 | 1,154,621 | 423,933 |
| 21 | 374,121 | ı | (56,118) | (29,930) | (37,412) | 250,661 | 791,225 | 49,668 | 1,166,616 | 375,391 |
| 22 | 385,345 | | (57,802) | (30,828) | (38,534) | 258,181 | 849,500 | 51,158 | 1,178,163 | 328,663 |
| 23 | 396,905 | • | (59,536) | (31,752) | (39,691) | 265,926 | 905,597 | 52,693 | 1,189,279 | 283,682 |
| 24 | 408,812 | , | (61,322) | (32,705) | (40,881) | 273,904 | 959,596 | 54,274 | 1,199,979 | 240,383 |
| 25 | 421,077 | ı | (63,161) | (33,686) | (42,108) | 282,121 | 1,011,576 | 55,902 | 1,210,278 | 198,702 |
| 26 | 433,709 | | (65,056) | (34,697) | (43,371) | 290,585 | 1,061,614 | 57,579 | 1,220,193 | 158,579 |
| 27 | 446,720 | ŀ | (67,008) | (35,738) | (44,672) | 299,302 | 1,109,781 | 59,306 | 1,229,737 | 119,957 |
| 28 | 460,122 | • | (69,018) | (36,810) | (46,012) | 308,282 | 1,156,147 | 61,085 | 1,238,925 | 82,778 |
| 29 | 473,925 | 1 | (71,089) | (37,914) | (47,393) | 317,530 | 1,200,780 | 62,918 | 1,247,769 | 46,989 |
| 30 | 488,143 | • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | (73,221) | (39,051) | (48,814) | 327,056 | 1,243,744 | 64,806 | 1,256,282 | 12,538 |
| 31 | 502,787 | • | (75,418) | (40,223) | (50,279) | 336,868 | 1,285,103 | 66,750 | 1,264,477 | (20,625) |
| 32 | 517,871 | • | (77,681) | (41,430) | (51,787) | 346,974 | 1,324,915 | 68,752 | 1,272,366 | (52,549) |
| 33 | 533,407 | | (80,011) | (42,673) | (53,341) | 357,383 | 1,363,238 | 70,815 | 1,279,960 | (83,279) |
| 34 | 549,409 | • | (82,411) | (43,953) | (54,941) | 368,104 | 1,400,130 | 72,939 | 1,287,270 | (112,860) |
| 35 | 565,892 | | (84,884) | (45,271) | (56,589) | 379,147 | 1,435,642 | 75,127 | 1,294,306 | (141,336) |
| 36 | 582,868 | ł | (87,430) | (46,629) | (58,287) | 390,522 | 1,469,826 | 77,381 | 1,301,080 | (168,746) |
| 37 | 600,354 | , | (90,053) | (48,028) | (60,035) | 402,237 | 1,502,733 | 79,703 | 1,307,600 | (195,133) |
| 38 | 618,365 | | (92,755) | (49,469) | (61,837) | 414,305 | 1,534,409 | 82,094 | 1,313,877 | (220,532) |
| 39 | 636,916 | r | (95,537) | (50,953) | (63,692) | 426,734 | 1,564,901 | 84,557 | 1,319,919 | (244,983) |
| 40 | 656,024 | • | (98,404) | (52,482) | (65,602) | 439,536 | 1,594,254 | 87,093 | 1,325,735 | (268,519) |

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

- TO: State Board of Regents
- FROM: Richard E. Kendell
- SUBJECT: <u>Action Item: Revisions to Policy R513, Tuitions Waivers for Dependents of Military Personnel Who</u> <u>Die in the Line of Duty</u>

Background

In 2007 the Utah State Legislature enacted H.B. 309, "Scott B. Lundell Tuition Waiver for Military Members' Surviving Dependents," sponsored by Representative Gregory H. Hughes. This bill provides for a waiver of undergraduate resident tuition for surviving dependents of Utah residents who are killed or die of injuries received while serving in the military on federal active duty. As drafted, the policy includes a surviving spouse as a dependent. The dependent must meet Utah student residency requirements, and the courses must be applicable to completing a course of study for an undergraduate degree or certificate.

Under provisions of the bill, the Utah Adjutant General shall certify the dependents' eligibility for the waiver. Our office has been working with the Adjutant General's Office and learned that since this waiver applies to military dependents of those who have served in any branch of the military and is not limited to members of the Utah National Guard, they have arranged for this responsibility to be carried out by the Utah Department of Veterans Affairs.

At the time this bill was enacted, it was estimated that 18 Utah dependents could ultimately qualify for this waiver. Since many children of service men and women killed in action are very young, the impact of this waiver may be felt over many years. The bill provides that the Board of Regents may seek legislative appropriation to reimburse institutions for the cost of providing these waivers.

The proposed amendment and a copy of HB 309 are attached.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends that the Board of Regents approve revisions to policy R513, Tuitions Waivers for Dependents of Military Personnel Who Die in the Line of Duty, as proposed.

May 31, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Amendments to R512, Determination of Resident Status</u>

<u>Issue</u>

During the 2007 session, the Utah Legislature passed, and Governor Huntsman signed, H.B. 118 ("Residency Requirements for In-State Tuition"), which significantly changed the requirements for obtaining resident student status. Consequently, the Board needs to adopt a new Board policy that reflects the changes in the new law, which takes effect July 1, 2007.

Background

For the past several years, Utah has had one of the most restrictive laws in the country with respect to the requirements for out-of-state students to obtain resident tuition rates. The Board's current policy, R512, which reflects this law, requires nonresident students to maintain continuous Utah residency for three (3) years, or complete 60 credit hours while maintaining continuous Utah residency, whichever comes first, in order to be eligible for resident student tuition. However, H.B. 118 eliminates these inflexible requirements and makes it much easier for nonresident students to qualify for in-state tuition rates.

Importantly, H.B. 118 authorizes each institution to set its own resident tuition policy, so long as such policy does not require less of nonresident students than the completion of one (1) year of continuous Utah residency and proof of financial independence, or more than the current 3-year/60-credit hour rule. After several meetings with institutional residency and budget officers, as well as the Council of Presidents, we are recommending adoption of the attached amended policy, which contains several key points:

In section 4.3, the policy states that, unless an institution sets a different policy, the general rule will be that a nonresident student may now qualify for resident student tuition by establishing Utah domicile, maintaining continuous Utah residency for one (1) year from July 1, 2007, or any date thereafter, and providing proof of financial independence (i.e., the student cannot be claimed as a dependent on another person's tax returns). Our understanding is that all of the institutions will be implementing the one-year waiting period for undergraduates but that some may be maintaining more restrictive rules for graduate programs. The decision was made by the Council of Presidents to not allow for any retroactive application of the one-year waiting period because the law does not take effect until July 1, 2007, and because the institutions need a year to undertake appropriate

budget and enrollment planning to adjust for changes in the revenue stream that this change in policy will cause.

- In sections 4.4 and 4.5, we will maintain the old 3-year/60 credit hour rules for one year while the law and policy are in transition, in order to accommodate students already in our system who may be able to qualify for resident student tuition earlier than July 1, 2008 under these rules. Our intent is to bring this policy back to the Board next summer to permanently delete these old rules and make the one-year waiting period the standard from July 1, 2008 moving forward.
- Section 4.8 stipulates that students applying for resident student status after one year of Utah residence will need to provide evidence of financial independence. We will work with the institutions to develop a model declaration form in order to help residency officers verify a student's financial status.
- The policy contains new provisions creating new ways for nonresident students to be exempted from the one-year waiting period, including sections 5.6 (Parent Domiciled in Utah for at Least 12 Months) and 5.7 (Extenuating Circumstances).
- The policy also contains new provisions creating new waivers of nonresident tuition, including sections 7.2 (Exemption of Nonresident Tuition for Certain Foreign Nationals) and 7.4 (Exemption of Nonresident Tuition as Athletic Scholarships).
- Section 8.2 reiterates our current policy on reciprocity, but adds a new provision indicating that an institution may restrict reciprocity by requiring a transferring student to complete a certain number of credit hours (not to exceed 60) as a condition of receiving resident student status at the receiving institution.

Based on the feedback we have received from the presidents and institutional representatives, we believe this amended policy has consensus support, and that it will result in better enrollments and more student-friendly environments on our campuses. David Doty, Kimberly Henrie, and others in our office will continue to work with institutional representatives over the course of the next year to monitor the budget and enrollment implications of the policy, and to address any implementation issues that may arise.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends approval of the amended policy R512 as presented.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK:DD Attachment

R512, Determination of Resident Status

[DRAFT 5.31.07]

R512-1. Purpose

To define "resident" student for purposes of tuition in the Utah System of Higher Education.

R512-2. References

- 2.1. Utah Code Ann. §53B-8-102 (Definition of Resident Student)
- 2.2. Utah Code Ann. §23-13-2 (Definition of Domicile)
- **2.3.** Utah Code Ann. §31A-29-103 (Definition of Domicile)
- **2.4.** Utah Code Ann. §41-1a-202 (Definition of Domicile)
- 2.5. Utah Code Ann. § 53B-8-101 et seq. (Tuition Waivers & Scholarships)
- **2.6.** Policy and Procedure <u>R510</u>, Tuition and Fee Policy
- 2.7. Policy and Procedure R513, Tuition Waivers & Reductions

R512-3. Definitions

3.1. Domicile - For purposes of this policy, the term "domicile" shall be defined consistent with general Utah law defining domicile, and shall mean the place:

3.1.1. where an individual has a fixed permanent home and principal establishment;

3.1.2. to which the individual if absent, intends to return; and

3.1.3. in which the individual, and the individual's family, voluntarily reside, not for a special or temporary purpose, but with the intention of making a permanent home.

3.2. Parent – As used in this policy, the term "parent" means the biological or adoptive parent of the student, regardless of whether the parent has legal custody of the student or whether the parent claims the student as a dependent.

3.3. Resident Student - An individual who:

3.3.1. can prove by substantial evidence, based on the totality of the circumstances, that, prior to the first day of classes for the term the student seeks to attend as a resident student, he or she has established and maintained for the requisite period of time set forth in this policy, domicile in Utah and satisfied relevant waiting periods and other criteria, where applicable; or

3.3.2. meets one or more of the other criteria defining "resident student" set forth in this policy.

R512-4. Criteria for Resident Student Status – Waiting Period as Evidence that Residence in Utah was Established for Educational Reasons

4.1. Institutional Discretion to Set Policy for Resident Student Status -

4.1.1. Policies for Students Enrolled in Credit-Bearing Degree Programs --Each institution may, at its discretion, and at the recommendation of the president, implement its own policy regarding the criteria for resident student status for either undergraduate students or graduate students, or both, in credit-bearing degree programs, that deviates from the criteria set forth in this policy. Such a policy shall not be more lenient than requiring a one-year waiting period as set forth herein in section 4.3, or be more strict than requiring students to maintain 3 years of continuous residency or complete 60 credit hours, whichever comes first.

4.1.2. Policies for Non-Credit Programs -- Because most non-credit applied technology programs are short-term (require less than a year to complete), the Utah College of Applied Technology and other USHE institutions offering non-credit courses or programs may, at their discretion, implement a policy that does not require residency classification for students enrolled in non-credit courses or programs.

4.2. General Rule—A person who comes to Utah for the purpose of attending a public institution of higher education must satisfy one of the following criteria in order to be eligible for resident student status:

4.3. Establishing Utah Domicile and Maintaining Continuous Utah Residency for Three (3) Years One Year (12 calendar months) and Declaring Financial Independence- Unless otherwise stipulated by institutional policy, any person who has come to Utah and established residency for the purpose of attending an institution of higher education may establish resident student status by, prior to registration the first day of classes of the term the student seeks to attend as a resident student: (A) demonstrating by objective evidence that he or she has established domicile in Utah , including, but not limited to, Utah driver's license, employment in Utah, payment of Utah resident income taxes, and Utah banking connections, the establishment of a domicile in Utah and that the student does not maintain a domicile elsewhere; or (B) and maintained continuous Utah residency for three (3) years one year (12 calendar months) beginning July 1, 2007 or any

date thereafter, regardless of the number of credit hours earned; and (B) submitting a declaration of financial independence to include documentation that the student is not claimed as a dependent on the tax returns of any person who is not a resident of Utah.

4.4. Completion of Sixty (60) Credit Hours - Any person who has come to Utah and established residency for the purpose of attending an institution of higher education may obtain resident student status prior to July 1, 2008 by, prior to registration as a resident undergraduate student the first day of classes of the term the student seeks to attend as a resident student, establishing domicile in Utah, and maintaining continuous Utah residency while completing sixty (60) semester credit hours at a regionally accredited Utah higher education institution. or an equivalent number of applicable contact hours at the Utah College of Applied Technology.

4.5. Establishing Utah Domicile and Maintaining Continuous Utah Residency for Three (3) Years - Any person may establish resident student status prior to July 1, 2008 by, prior to the first day of classes of the term the student seeks to attend as a resident student, demonstrating by objective evidence that he or she has established domicile in Utah and maintained continuous Utah residency for three (3) years, regardless of the number of credit hours earned.

4.6. Creating Utah domicile - In determining whether an individual has established domicile in Utah, and is therefore a bona fide resident eligible for resident student tuition, institutions in the Utah System of Higher Education will review all relevant documentation submitted by the student, and make the residency determination based on the totality of the evidence. Students applying for resident student status are expected to submit as much of the following documentation as possible:

4.6.1. A Utah high school transcript issued in the previous year (previous 12 months) confirming attendance at a Utah high school in the previous 12 months;

4.6.2. Utah voter registration dated at least three (3) months (90 days) prior to the student's application for resident student status;

4.6.3. Utah driver license or identification card with an original date of issue or renewal date at least three (3) months (90 days) prior to the student's application for resident student status;

4.6.4. Utah vehicle registration dated at least three (3) months (90 days) prior to the student's application for resident student status;

4.6.5. Evidence of employment in Utah for at least three (3) months (90 days) prior to the student's application for resident student status;

4.6.6. Proof of payment of Utah state income tax for the previous year;

4.6.7. A rental agreement or mortgage document showing the student's name and Utah address for at least 12 months prior to application for resident student status; and

4.6.8. Utility bills showing the student's name and Utah address for at least 12 months prior to application for resident student status;

4.7. "Continuous" residency - For purposes of this policy, proof of maintenance of continuous physical presence in Utah is sufficient to prove "continuous residency." Having established domicile in Utah An individual will not jeopardize his or her status as a "continuous" resident solely by absence from the state for less than 30 days during the 12month period the individual seeks to count as the requisite waiting period. For example In addition: (a) A student who was a seeks resident student status of Utah for tuition purposes may be absent from the state for purposes such as temporary employment, education, or religious, charitable, or military service and continue to be considered a resident for tuition purposes provided he or she has not taken action to establish domicile elsewhere during his or her absence from Utah. (b) A student with long term ties to Utah, who has graduated from a Utah high school, if the absence and who has been absent from the state is for a period of less than 48 12 months, may be considered a resident for tuition purposes if evidence can be presented showing that the student has reestablished established a Utah domicile. and has not taken action to establish domicile elsewhere during his or her absence from the state of Utah for the purpose of attending an education institution as a resident of any other state. (c) An unmarried person 23 years of age or younger who moves to Utah, has a Utah resident parent, and demonstrates objective evidence of domiciliary intent, is immediately eligible to apply for resident student status.

4.8. Declaration of Financial Independence - In addition to submitting objective evidence of domicile, a person seeking resident student status following 12 months of continuous residence in Utah must also submit a declaration of financial independence, which must include, at a minimum, evidence that the person is not claimed as a dependent on the federal or state tax returns of any person who is not a resident of Utah. Institutional residency officers may require such documentation at the time of initial application for resident student status, and at any time thereafter to verify a student's continued eligibility for resident student tuition.

R512-5. Resident Student Status Based on Evidence of Residence in Utah for Noneducational Reasons—No Waiting Period Required if Presumption of Nonresident Status Rebutted

5.1. Rebuttable Presumption of Non-Resident Status - A person who enrolls as a postsecondary student at a Utah institution prior to living in Utah for more than 24 12 continuous months, and who is therefore unable to meet the waiting period criteria prior to meeting the criteria for resident student status set forth in section 4 of this policy, is presumed to have moved to Utah for the purpose of attending an institution of higher education will ordinarily be deemed a non-resident student for tuition purposes unless he or she presents It is presumed that a non resident student continues to reside in Utah primarily for the purpose of pursuing higher education and continues to be a non-resident
student so long as he or she is enrolled as a student at a Utah institution of higher education. However, the student may rebut this presumption, and avoid the one year waiting period, by evidence demonstrating that the student moved to Utah and established domicile for noneducational reasons. i.e., for a purpose unrelated to attending a Utah institution of higher education. A student may rebut the presumption of nonresident status and seek resident student status immediately, without satisfying the one-year continuous residency requirement, by submitting evidence of Utah residence arising from one or more of the following circumstances:

5.2. United States Armed Forces Personnel Who are Utah Residents Prior to Active Duty Assignment or Deployment Outside Utah—Personnel of the United States Armed Forces who had Utah residency immediately prior to their deployment to active duty outside of Utah, and who reestablish residency in Utah no later than 90 days after the termination of active duty status, are immediately eligible, together with the immediate members of their families residing with them in Utah, to apply for resident student status for tuition purposes.

5.2.1. "Prior Utah Residency"—For purposes of this section, an individual will be deemed to have prior Utah residency if he or she can show, in the year immediately prior to active duty deployment, indicia of Utah domicile, such as the filing of a Utah tax return in the year prior to deployment; Utah voter registration; possession of a Utah driver's license; and establishment of Utah banking connections.

5.2.2. "Immediate Family Member"— For purposes of this section, the term "immediate family member" means the spouse or unmarried dependent child of the individual in the Armed Forces.

5.2.3. "Residing With"— For purposes of this section, "immediate family member" will be considered to be "residing with" an individual in the Armed Forces so long as the family member's domicile, or permanent address, is the same as that of the individual in the Armed Forces. If an "immediate family member" meets the domiciliary requirement, he or she may attend, with resident tuition rates, any public college or university in Utah.

5.3. Marriage to Utah Resident - A person who marries a Utah resident eligible to be a resident student under this policy and establishes his or her domicile in Utah as demonstrated by objective evidence as provided in 4.6 is immediately eligible to apply for resident student status.

5.4. Rebuttal of Non-Resident Presumption for Full Time, Permanent Employment in Utah - A person who has established domicile in Utah for full-time permanent employment may rebut the presumption of a non-resident classification as provided in subsection 5.1 of this policy only by providing substantial evidence that the reason for the individual's move to Utah was, in good faith, based on an employer requested transfer to Utah, recruitment by a Utah employer, or a comparable work-related move for full-time permanent employment in Utah. All relevant evidence concerning the motivation for the move should

be considered, including, but not limited to, such factors as: (a) the person's employment and educational history; (b) the dates when Utah employment was first considered, offered, and accepted; (c) when the person moved to Utah; (d) the dates when the person applied for admission, was admitted, and was enrolled as a postsecondary student; (e) whether the person applied for admission to a USHE institution sooner than four months from the date of moving to Utah; (f) evidence that the person is an independent person (at least 24 years of age, or not listed as a dependent on someone else's tax forms); and (g) any other factors related to abandonment of a former domicile and establishment of a new domicile in Utah for purposes other than to attend an institution of higher education. As with all such applications, the burden of proof is on the applicant to rebut the presumption of non-resident status. Furthermore, if an applicant applies for admission to a USHE institution prior to the application for employment, prior to the offer of employment, prior to the commencement of employment, or within four months of moving to Utah, absent extraordinary evidence to the contrary, it shall be strongly presumed that the person came to Utah for the purpose of attending an institution of higher education, and shall be subject to the requirements of section 4 of this policy.

5.5. Rebuttal of Non-Resident Presumption for Spouse's or Parent's Full Time Work - A spouse or dependent child of an individual who moves to Utah for full-time permanent employment, and establishes Utah domicile on that basis, is eligible to apply for resident student status. In determining the residency status of the enrolling spouse or dependent child, the institution shall consider all relevant evidence related to the individual's intent and domicile, including but not limited to, those factors set forth in subsection 4.4 of this policy documentation set forth in section 5.10 of this policy.

5.6. Parent Domiciled in Utah for at Least 12 Months – A dependent student who has at least one parent who has been domiciled in Utah for least 12 months prior to the student's application for resident student status is eligible for immediate resident student status.

5.7. Extenuating Circumstances – A person who has established domicile in Utah for child care obligations or extenuating financial or health reasons related to his or her divorce, the death of a spouse, or long-term health care needs or responsibilities related to the person's own health, or the health of an immediate family member, including the person's spouse, parent, sibling, or child, may apply for immediate resident student status upon submitting evidence that the move to Utah was, in good faith, based on such extenuating circumstances. All relevant evidence concerning the motivation for the move shall be considered, including:

5.7.1. the person's employment and educational history;

5.7.2. the dates when the long-term health care or child care responsibilities in Utah were first considered, offered, and accepted;

5.7.3. when the person moved to Utah;

5.7.4. the dates when the person applied for admission, was admitted, and was enrolled as a postsecondary student;

5.7.5. whether the person applied for admission to an institution of higher education sooner than four (4) months from the date of moving to Utah;

5.7.6. evidence that the person is an independent person who is: (A) at least 24 years of age; or (B) not claimed as a dependent on someone else's tax returns;

5.7.7. any other factors related to abandonment of a former domicile and establishment of a new domicile in Utah for purposes other than to attend an institution of higher education.

5.8. Receipt of State Social Services Benefits - A person who has been determined by a Utah governmental social or rehabilitation services agency to be a Utah resident for purposes of receiving state aid to attend a System institution and demonstrates objective evidence of domiciliary intent as provided in section 4.6 is immediately eligible to register as a resident student. Upon the termination of such government agency support, the person is governed by the standards applicable to other persons. Any time spent domiciled in Utah, as well as any credit hours earned by the individual at a Utah institution during the time the individual received government aid, shall count towards the one-year time period, or the 60 hours required, for Utah residency for tuition purposes upon termination of the government aid.

5.9. Immigrant Placed in Utah as Political Refugee - An immigrant, not otherwise qualified as a resident, is immediately eligible, upon establishment of Utah domicile, to apply for register as a resident student status, if he or she is placed involuntarily in Utah as part of a United States or Utah government relocation program for foreign refugees fleeing civil war, religious or racial persecution, political oppression, or other legitimate reason. This section does not apply to refugees who are originally placed in another state and subsequently move to Utah voluntarily.

5.10. Documentation Required to Rebut Presumption of Nonresident Status - The institution, through its registrar, or designated person, is authorized to require written documents, affidavits, verifications, or other evidence deemed necessary to determine why a student is in Utah. The burden of rebutting the presumption that the student is in Utah for educational reasons, and of establishing that a student he or she is in Utah for other than educational purposes, is upon the student. A student may be required to file any or all of the following within applicable timelines established by the institution:

5.10.1. A statement from the student describing employment and expected sources of support;

5.10.2. A statement from the student's employer;

5.10.3. Supporting statements from persons who might be familiar with the family situation;

5.10.4. Birth certificate;

5.10.6. Marriage certificate;

5.10.7. Documentation of eligibility for state social or rehabilitation services;

5.10.8. Documentation of immigration status and placement as political refugee;

5.10.9. Indicia of Utah domicile, including Utah voter registration, Utah vehicle registration, Utah driver's license or identification card, Utah state income tax return, rental contract or mortgage documents, bank records, and utility bills.

5.11. Penalties for Giving Incorrect or Misleading Information - A student who gives incorrect or misleading information to evade payment of non-resident fees shall be subject to serious disciplinary action and must also pay the applicable non-resident fees for each term previously attended.

R512-6. Exceptions to Requirements of Domicile—Resident Student Status Based on Special Circumstances

6.1. Job Corps Students - A Job Corps student is entitled to resident student status if the student: (A) is admitted as a full-time, part-time, or summer school student in a program of study leading to a degree or certificate; and (B) submits verification that the student is a current Job Corps student. Upon the termination of Job Corps enrollment/participation, the individual is governed by the standards applicable to non-Job Corps persons. Any time spent domiciled in Utah, as well as any credit hours earned by the student at a Utah institution during Job Corps enrollment, count towards the one-year time period, or the 60 credit hours, required for Utah residency for tuition purposes upon termination of Job Corp status.

6.2. Participation in Olympic Training Program - An athlete who is in residence in Utah to participate in a United States Olympic athlete training program, at a facility in Utah, approved by the governing body for the athlete's Olympic sport, shall be entitled immediately eligible for to resident status for tuition purposes. Upon the termination of the athlete's participation in such training program, the athlete shall be subject to the same residency standards applicable to other persons under this policy. Any time spent domiciled in Utah, as well as any credit hours earned by the student at a Utah institution during the Olympic athlete training program in Utah, count towards the one-year time period or the 60 hours required, for Utah residency for tuition purposes upon termination of the athlete's participation in a Utah Olympic athlete training program.

6.3. Membership in American Indian Tribe - An American Indian, not otherwise qualified as a resident, shall be entitled to resident student status if: (A) he/she is enrolled on the

tribal rolls of a tribe whose reservation or trust lands lie partly or wholly within Utah or whose border is at any point contiguous with the border of Utah, or (B) he/she is a member of a federally recognized or known Utah tribe and has graduated from a high school in Utah. A list of recognized tribes will be maintained by the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education and distributed to all campus residency officers.

6.4. Member of Utah National Guard – A person is entitled to resident student status if the person: (a) is admitted as a full-time, part-time, or summer school student in a program of study leading to a degree or certificate; and (b) submits verification, in the form of either an enlistment contract or "orders of unit assignment," that he or she is an active member of the Utah National Guard. Upon the termination of Utah National Guard enlistment or duty, the individual is governed by the standards applicable to non-Utah National Guard persons. Any time spent domiciled in Utah, as well as any credit hours earned by the student at a Utah institution during Utah National Guard enlistment, count towards the one-year time period, or the 60 credit hours, required for Utah residency for tuition purposes upon termination of Utah National Guard status.

6.4.1. Activated Members of Utah National Guard A member of the Utah National Guard who performs active duty service shall be considered to maintain continuous Utah residency under this section for the length of time that he or she maintains membership in the Utah National Guard.

6.4.2. A member of the Utah National Guard who performs active duty service outside the state of Utah shall be considered to maintain continuous Utah residency under this section.

6.5. Active Duty United States Armed Forces Personnel Who are Residents of Other States but Stationed in Utah - Personnel of the United States Armed Forces, who are residents of another state, but who are assigned to active duty in Utah, together with the immediate members of their families residing with them in Utah, are entitled to resident student status for tuition purposes during the time they are stationed in Utah on active duty. Upon the termination of active duty status, the military personnel and their family members are governed by the standards applicable to nonmilitary persons. The time spent domiciled in Utah, as well as any credit hours earned by the student at a Utah institution during the active duty in Utah, count towards the one-year time period, or the 60 hours, required for Utah residency for tuition purposes upon termination of active duty status in Utah.

R512-7. Waivers of Non-Resident Tuition—Non-Resident Students Exempt from Non-Resident Portion of Tuition

7.1. Exemption of Nonresident Tuition for Certain Graduates of Utah High Schools – To the extent allowed under federal law, a student, other than nonimmigrant alien within the meaning of paragraph (15) of subsection(a) of Section 1101 of Title 8 of the United States Code, shall be exempt from paying the nonresident portion of total tuition if the student:

7.1.1. attended high school in Utah for three or more years;

7.1.2. graduated from a high school in Utah or received the equivalent of a high school diploma in Utah;

7.1.3. registers as an entering student at an institution of higher education not earlier than the fall of the 2002-03 academic year; and

7.1.4. a student without lawful immigration status shall file an affidavit with the institution stating that the student has filed an application to legalize his or her immigration status, or will file an application as soon as he or she is eligible to do so.

7.1.5. "Entering Student" – For purposes of this section, "entering student" means a student whose first matriculation in any institution of higher education is in a public institution of higher education within the Utah System of Higher Education.

- **7.2. Exemption of Nonresident Tuition for Certain Foreign Nationals** A student shall be exempt from paying the nonresident portion of total tuition if the student:
 - 7.2.1. is a foreign national legally admitted to the United States;
 - 7.2.2. attended high school in Utah for three or more years; and

7.2.3. graduated from a high school in this state or received the equivalent of a high school diploma in this state.

7.3. International Students Without U.S. Residency Status are Deemed Nonresidents - Aliens who are present in the United States on visitor, student, or other visas which authorize only temporary presence in this country, do not have the capacity to intend to reside in Utah for an indefinite period and therefore must be classified as nonresident.

7.3.1. Aliens who have been granted immigrant or permanent resident status in the United States shall be classified for purposes of resident status according to the same criteria applicable to citizens.

7.4. Exemption of Nonresident Tuition as Athletic Scholarships – In addition to the waivers of nonresident tuition available to each institution under Utah Code Ann. § 53B-8-101 et seq., and Policy R513, each institution may, at its discretion, grant as athletic scholarships full waiver of fees and nonresident tuition, up to the maximum number allowed by the appropriate athletic conference, and as recommended by the president of each institution.

- **7.5. Exemption of Nonresident Tuition Under Tuition Waiver Policy** A nonresident student may be eligible for a full or partial waiver of nonresident tuition according to the applicable provisions of Policy R513 (Tuition Waivers and Scholarships).
- 7.6. Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) Students to be Classified as Nonresidents—A student attending a USHE institution under the Western Undergraduate Exchange program is considered to be domiciled in his or her home state, and therefore cannot use time spent in Utah as a student toward the waiting period required for resident student status.

R512-8. General Provisions

8.1. Reclassification by the Institution - If a student is classified as a resident, or granted residency by a USHE institution, the USHE institution may initiate a reclassification inquiry and in fact reclassify the student, based on any facts, error, or changes in facts or status which would justify such an inquiry, even if the error was on the part of the USHE institution.

8.2. Reciprocity and Acceptance of Another Institution's Determination

8.2.1. Transferring Students and Minimum Credit Hour Policies – A USHE institution may implement a policy that requires undergraduate or graduate students transferring from another USHE institution to demonstrate completion of a minimum number of credit hours as a condition of receiving resident student status, so long as such policy does not require transferring students to complete more than 60 credit hours prior to transferring.

8.2.2. Reciprocity – In the absence of a minimum credit-hour requirement, a determination to grant residency to a student at a USHE institution shall be honored at other USHE institutions, unless the student obtained residency under false pretenses, or the facts existing at the time of the granting of residency have significantly changed.

R512-9. Procedures for Determining Resident Status

9.1. Application Deadline - Students must meet institutional application deadlines for each term. Institutions may establish policy regarding acceptance of late residency applications for current term consideration. Unless institutional policy allows otherwise, institutions may not accept applications for resident student status or supporting documentation after the third week of the semester or term for which the student seeks resident student status. Ordinarily applications or supporting documentation received after the third week should be considered for the following semester.

9.2. Initial Classification - Each institution shall classify all applicants as either resident or nonresident. If there is doubt concerning resident status, the applicant shall be classified as a nonresident.

9.3. Application for Reclassification - Every student classified as a nonresident shall retain that status until he/she is officially reclassified to resident status.

9.4. Informal Discussion with Responsible Officer - If a written application for a change from nonresident to resident classification is denied, the applicant shall have the right to meet with the responsible officer for the purpose of submitting additional information and discussing the merits of his/her application.

9.5. Appeals - An applicant for resident status may appeal an adverse ruling in accordance with procedures approved by the institutional Board of Trustees. The appeal tribunal shall make an independent determination of the issues presented upon the basis of such oral and written proofs as may be presented, and shall finally determine the status of the applicant consistent with the law and these policies.

9.6. Due Process - In order to provide due process to students who may want to appeal decisions made concerning nonresident status, each institution shall be responsible for providing a means for appeals to be made. Each institution shall adopt procedures that fit the local campus situation, but the following guidelines shall be followed:

9.6.1. Procedures for appeal shall be set out in writing by the institution, subject to approval by the Office of the Commissioner.

9.6.2. The institution shall provide a hearing officer or hearing committee with appropriate clerical and other services as necessary to the effective function of the hearing process.

9.6.3. The student appealing the decision shall have the responsibility of providing evidence that proves that he/she has met the residency requirements. Students shall be given copies of the Regents' policies pertaining to determination of residency. The student shall also be given an explanation of the rationale of the decision-maker who previously ruled that the student was classified as a nonresident.

9.6.4. Both the student and the administration's representative are entitled to representation by counsel.

9.6.5. Oral and written evidence may be presented. It is not required that a formal, written, verbatim record of the proceedings be kept, but a written summary of the significant assertions and findings of the hearing shall be prepared.

9.6.6. It is not required that formal rules of evidence be followed; administrative hearing rules may be used.

9.6.7. Decisions of the appeals tribunal must be in writing and must give reasons for the decision.

9.6.8. Refund - A ruling favorable to the applicant shall be retroactive to the beginning of the academic period for which application for resident status was made, and shall require a refund of the nonresident portion of any tuition charges paid for that and subsequent academic periods.

(Adopted July 22, 1975; amended April 11, 1987, April 17, 1992, May 5,1995, January 12, 2001, October 19, 2001, July 12, 2002, April 16, 2004, December 9, 2004, April 22, 2005, April 21, 2006, and June 8, 2007)

May 31, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Institutional Reports on Campus Programs and Initiatives Related to Minority and Disadvantaged Students—Information Item

At their December 2006 meeting, the Regents approved, with some modifications, the prioritized recommendations of the USHE Task Force on Minority and Disadvantaged Students. These recommenddations provide a framework for future programs that should be funded and implemented to improve the preparation, participation, and completion rates of minority and disadvantaged students in USHE institutions.

In addition, recognizing that USHE institutions are already addressing this issue through a variety of campus programs, the Strategic Planning and Communications Committee has asked for reports from USHE institutions on such programs so they can be better informed about effective strategies currently underway. Once all of the reports are completed, we will compile a resource book of all of the institutions' "best practices" to be shared with the Board and each institution.

This month the Committee will hear reports from the University of Utah and Weber State University.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This item is for information only and requires no action.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

May 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: <u>Communication and Messaging Strategies</u>

Background

The State Board of Regents held a Messaging Meeting during its planning workshop on April 19, 2007. An overview of the May 2006 public opinion survey was presented as well as the progress of the messaging campaign, which began in August 2006.

Attendees divided into two groups representing colleges and universities. For the first time, the public relations directors of the institutions accompanied their presidents to the meeting.

Following the breakout groups, the Regents asked for a summary of themes that could be further explored and developed by the public relations professionals. The results of the evaluation are presented to the Board of Regents this month.

<u>Issue</u>

The public relations staff in the Commissioner's Office has coordinated with the institutions to provide strategies which are economical and realistic, based on the April 19, 2007 meeting. The four strategies are attached and will be expanded during the year. Beginning in April 2007, the public relations representatives will meet monthly to ensure the strategies are implemented.

Commissioner's Recommendation

<u>The Commissioner recommends the Board review and approve the recommended strategies, which could</u> be implemented immediately.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK/AC/jc Attachments



Building a Stronger State of Minds[™]

Messaging Strategies May/June 2007

Following the State Board of Regents Planning Meeting at Dixie State College on April 19, 2007, the Associate Commissioner for Public Affairs, the Communications Director, institutional public relations directors, public relations and communications directors for UHEAA, UESP, and Utah Scholars met to evaluate the potential strategies for further sharing and promoting the message of "Building a Stronger State of Minds through preparation, participation and completion."

After considering the notes generated from the "Messaging Session" for colleges and universities (the notes from April 19, 2007 are attached), apparent themes emerged:

- We need a targeted approach
- We must improve upon and create new partnerships
- We need to identify and utilize advocates
- Our legislative priorities must be shaped to match our messaging (similar to the 2007 General Session)
- We must have consistent coordination among the Commissioner's Office and the institutional public relations directors
- We need to explore/improve technology that will help students (especially disadvantaged, low-income, minority and first-generation students)

Upon review, the consensus is to present the following strategies to the Board of Regents Strategic Planning and Communications Committee and the Board of Regents for consideration and approval.

- 1. Implement a visual connection for higher education using students
 - a. The preference is to use students as the "FACES" for our messaging
 - i. Use Chairman Pitcher's "Student Success Stories" as the foundation for this effort.
 - 1. During each Board of Regents Meeting improve upon the time spent highlighting the students and then distribute a separate press release to highlight one or two of the outstanding students.
 - 2. Institutions would then promote those students whom they've submitted to their local reporters and media.
 - 3. Use photos and quotes from these students on our Web sites and promotional materials.

- 2. Improve relationships
 - a. Continue the Regents' Speakers Bureau
 - i. Several have been completed to date, but more can be done
 - ii. Improve upon relationships:
 - 1. Public education
 - a. Improve and expand marketing efforts for Utah Scholars – entering 2nd year
 - b. As a system, compile a list of high school seniors for the institutions to contact for recruitment purposes
 - 2. The Governor's Office
 - 3. The State Legislature
 - 4. Business leaders and chambers of commerce
 - a. Institutional public relations directors will help lead and organize the speakers bureaus for their local chambers of commerce
 - 5. Religious leaders
 - 6. The Utah Council for Secondary and Postsecondary Education
 - 7. U.S. Dream Academy
 - 8. The United Way
- 3. Coordinate a system wide approach and message for the 2008 General Legislative Session (similar to 2007).
- 4. Educate board members, stakeholders, the general public and students about technology resources that promote access, preparation and participation (Utah Mentor).

These strategies and their subsets appear to not only be achievable, but also economically feasible. There is consensus among the public relations representatives that this approach would fit within the existing marketing strategies within each organization and would also best unify the system's efforts. Messaging Brainstorming Notes April 19, 2007 Dixie State College

Session: Colleges

•

- Have advocates for higher education within the community

 Use local influences
- Engage business leaders (they are natural audience)
 - Give employees incentives to pursue higher education
 - o Business leaders are great mentors
 - Have businesses incorporate our logos, vice versa
- State a clear goal of higher education benefits for everyone
- Incorporate human interest/personal stories
 - Find people
 - o Involve media
- We need a mascot or leader/spokesperson
- We need more diversity in our marketing and we need to reach diverse groups
 - Reach un-reached populations
 - o Diversify approach for underprivileged kids
- Follow First Lady's "Power in You" model
- Build an understanding of "need," beginning with the State
 - Involve early grades, help youth see the need
 - Partner with public education
 - o Put branding/logos on items for kids (visual)
- Teach students "HOW" to go to college, not "WHY."
- Use current college students as leaders, examples and mentors
- Publicize Chair Pitcher's "Student Success" stories
- Increase UESP marketing
 - UESP should continue to implement payroll deduction option for employers
- Create packets/tools for student's leaders
- Focus on adult learners as well help them to make educational plans
 Oreate incentives to return to higher education
- Send daily text messages to subscribers

Session: Universities

- Sell the need for college as well as a particular institution
- Recruiting affordability, value
- Are we reaching H.S. counselors?
 - o Remedial Quality teachers to mentor
 - K-16 Efforts Streamlining (ACT)
- Direct marketing to high school parents
 - Need for opt-in contact

Session: Universities

Strategies:

- Direct mail from USHE
- Cultural leaders
- Counselors Site-based management
- Institutional focus on retention –counseling
 - "Why are we losing so many students?" research needed
 - Customer/Student focus?
 - Financial aid
- PTA Connection
- Spanish language materials
- Data tracking i.e. unique student #
- Targeted ads i.e. Hispanic marketing
- Use student success stories in telling our message
- Utilize internal resources for research

Committee of the Whole: Summary

- We need a targeted approach
- Improve and create partnerships
- Identify and utilize advocates
 - Public education help them help us
 - o Governor's Office
 - o Business Community
- What are other systems doing?
- How do we shape our legislative priorities, similar to what we did this year?
- Have consistent coordination with PR directors at institutions
- Incorporate software to help students, maybe Utah Mentor

May 31, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: Richard E. Kendell

SUBJECT: Information Item: Legislative Update

lssue

The 2007 Legislature adopted HB 396, sponsored by Rep. Kory Holdaway, which establishes the Higher Education Legislative Task Force, which will meet during the interim and prior to the 2008 legislative session. The Task Force held its first meeting in May, and is expected to meet monthly through November.

Associate Commissioner David Buhler has prepared a summary of the May meeting and a report on the topics expected to be covered at the June Task Force meeting (attached).

In addition, the Legislature's Education Interim Committee, Higher Education and Public Education Appropriations Subcommittees, have scheduled a joint meeting for June 13 from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at the offices of the Granite School District. Members of the Board of Regents, State Board of Education, and institutional presidents are encouraged to attend and participate. The meeting agenda is attached. The Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee is also scheduled to hold an interim meeting on September 12 at the Davis Campus of Weber State University.

Commissioner's Recommendation

This is an information item only. No action is necessary; however, the Commissioner urges members of the Board of Regents and institutional presidents to be aware of these legislative meetings and, as their schedules permit, attend and participate in the joint meeting scheduled for June 13, 2007.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

Report of Higher Education Task Force Prepared by David Buhler May 21, 2007

The first meeting of the Higher Education Task Force was held on Thursday, May 17, 2007. The Task Force received a report from Commissioner Kendell on Missions and Roles of the institutions of higher education, and from legislative staff on the history of the Utah College of Applied Technology (focusing on the period of 2000 to present).

Based on discussion among task force members, they plan to focus on three topics at their next meeting, which will be held on Thursday, June 21 beginning at 9:00 a.m. at the Capitol Complex (likely Room W125):

- Transferability and articulation, including student migration and participation by county, in-state, out-of-state, and international
- Length of time to graduation
- Participation among minority and low-income students

The Commissioner's Office is preparing information on each of these topics and will be suggesting presenters on each.

Indications are that the July meeting will focus on UCAT issues and alcohol/controlled substance issues on campuses.

Future meetings of the task force are scheduled for: July 19, August 17, September 20, October 18, and November 15, most likely from 9:00 a.m. until approximately noon, at the State Capitol Complex.

Task Force members are as follows:

Sen. Gregory S. Bell, Co-Chair Rep. Kory M. Holdaway, Co-Chair Rep. Ron Bigelow Rep. Melvin R. Brown Sen. Mike Dmitrich Sen. Brent H. Goodfellow Sen. Peter C. Knudson Rep. John G. Mathis Rep. Carol Spackman Moss Sen. Dennis E. Stowell Rep. Stephen H. Urquhart Rep. Mark A. Wheatley

May 31, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: State Board of Regents

From: Richard E. Kendell

Subject: <u>General Consent Calendar</u>

<u>The Commissioner recommends approval of the following items on the Regents' General Consent</u> <u>Calendar:</u>

- A. <u>Minutes</u> Minutes of the Planning Retreat and Regular Board Meeting held April 19-20, 2007, at Dixie State College in St. George, Utah
- B. Grant Proposals
 - 1. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of General Medical Sciences;; "Selenium Supplementation;" \$1,868,750. Michael Roger Franklin, Principal Investigator.
 - University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Reducible Polyamido Ethylenimine;" \$1,681,875. Sung Wan Kim, Principal Investigator.
 - University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Manipulating Signal Sequences;" \$1,681,875. Carol Lim, Principal Investigator.
 - 4. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Nucleic Acid Core;" \$1,495,000. Thomas E. Cheatham, Principal Investigator.
 - 5. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Heart Lung & Blood Institute; "TRPV1-Mediated Toxicities;" \$1,196,000. Christopher A. Reilly, Principal Investigator.
 - 6. University of Utah American Cancer Society; "Promoting Colonoscopy via Tele;" \$2,256,666. Anita Kinney, Principal Investigator.
 - 7. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Heart Lung & Blood Institute;" \$1,019,622. Kenneth W. Spitzer, Principal Investigator.
 - 8. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Diabetes; "Metabolic Syndrome;" \$3,710,462. Paul N. Hopkins, Principal Investigator.

- 9. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Eosinophil Granule Proteins;" \$2,635,071. Gerald J. Gleich, Principal Investigator.
- 10. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; "CHRCDA;" \$2,160,000. Edward B. Clark, Principal Investigator.
- 11. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Promoter Specificity;" \$1,868,750. David J. Stillman, Principal Investigator.
- 12. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Diabetes; "Diabetes in Hemochromatosis;" \$1,868,750. Donald McClain, Principal Investigator.
- 13. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Diabetes; "Mitochondrial Iron Metabolism;" \$1,868,750. Jerry Kaplan, Principal Investigator.
- 14. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of General Medical Sciences; "Drosophila Melanogaster;" \$1,868,750. Anthea Letsou, Principal Investigator.
- 15. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "OCT Transcription Factors;" \$1,681,875. Roland D. Tantin, Principal Investigator.
- 16. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Inflammation and Aging;" \$1,495,000. Lorise C. Gahring, Principal Investigator.
- 17. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Optimization and Interactive Control of Hifu Therapy;" \$2,293,775. Robert B. Roemer, Principal Investigator.
- 18. University of Utah Imquest Biosciences Inc; "Long-acting Comb Microbicides;" \$1,395,409. Patrick F. Kiser, Principal Investigator.
- 19. University of Utah Centers for Disease Control; "Travel Health;" \$1,862,331. Devon C. Hale, Principal Investigator.
- 20. University of Utah Centers for Disease Control; "The Each Child Study;" \$1,400,000. Judith S. Miller, Principal Investigator.
- 21. University of Utah Centers for Disease Control; "An Evidence-based Intervention;" \$1,339,084. Michael A. Rubin, Principal Investigator.
- 22. University of Utah National Institutes of Health; "Vertebrate Limb Myogenesis;" \$1,121,250. Gabrielle Kardon, Principal Investigator.

- University of Utah Jack Kent Cooke Foundation; "College Guide Program;" \$1,016,400. 23. Theresa A. Martinez, Principal Investigator. 24. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; "Insulin Resistance, Cognition, and Alzheimer's Disease: The Cache County Study;" \$2,731,553. Ronald Munger, Principal Investigator. 25. Utah State University – National Science Foundation; "Teaching Learning Evaluation Library;" \$1,338,185. L. Cannon, Principal Investigator. 26. Utah State University – National Science Foundation; "Socially Affable Virtual Environments (SAVE): Virtual Peers Collaborative with Young Learners Learning Technology;" \$2,180,684. Yanghee Kim, Principal Investigator. 27. Utah State University – US Department of Education; "Transition to Teaching Through Substitute Teaching (TTST);" \$3,923,204.23. Geoffrey Smith, Principal Investigator. 28. Utah State University – William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; "Tool Stewardship for the Field of Open Educational Resources;" \$1,800,000. David Wiley, Principal Investigator. 29. Utah State University - US Department of Education; "To Operate Regional Resource Center, Region No. 5, Utah State University;" \$1,300,000. John Copenhaver, Principal Investigator. 30. Utah State University – University of Utah; "National Children's Study – Cache Valley Secondary Site (Subcontract with University of Utah Medical Center);" \$11,550,182. Richard Roberts, Principal Investigator. 31. Utah State University – National Institutes of Health; "Mechanisms of Peripheral Fat Detection:" \$1,747,274. Timothy Gilbertson, Principal Investigator. 32. Utah State University – US Department of Agriculture; "Implementation of Western Region Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) Proposal;" \$2,635,858. V. Rasmussen, Principal Investigator. 33. Utah State University - US Department of Education; "Supporting Utah's Children Through Comprehensive Early Educator Development (SUCCEED);" \$4,080,542. Lisa Boyce, Principal Investigator. 34. Utah State University – US Department of Education; "Responsiveness to Intervention;" \$1,498,995. John Copenhaver, Principal Investigator.
- 35. Utah State University US Department of Defense/US Navy; "SHARC and SDS-CIB Sustainment, Modification, and Acquisition;" \$1,849,700. Niel Holt, Principal Investigator.

- C. Grant Awards
 - 1. University of Utah US Department of Education/Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; "Center for Simulation of Accidental Fires and Explosions;" \$3,084,000. David W. Pershing, Principal Investigator.
 - 2. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Center for Research; "General Clinical Research Center;" \$2,713,700. A. Lorris Betz, Principal Investigator.
 - 3. University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute for Child Health & Human Development; "National Children's Study;" \$1,499,999. Edward B. Clark, Principal Investigator.
 - 4. Utah State University US Department of Defense/US Navy; "Time Critical Sensor Image/ Data Processing;" \$1,000,000. Niel Holt, Principal Investigator.
 - 5. Utah State University NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory; "Wide-Field Infra-red Survey Explorer (WISE);" \$1,223,938. John Elwell, Principal Investigator; Scott Schick, Co-Principal Investigator.
 - 6. Utah State University Utah State Office of Education; "EBLS Charter School Fund;" \$1,539,929. Sue McCormick, Principal Investigator.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK:jc Attachments

MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS DIXIE STATE COLLEGE, ST. GEORGE, UTAH APRIL 19-20, 2007

Contents of Minutes

| Strategic Planning Meeting Thursday, April 19 | |
|---|----------------------|
| Roll Call | 1 |
| Higher Education Messaging Utah Scholars Program Utah Scholars Program Report of the University Group Discussion Report of the College Group Discussion Report of the College Group Discussion | 3 4 5 5 |
| Luncheon Speaker and Panel Discussion Status and Future of Partnerships in the Utah System of Higher Education Supporting the Comprehensive Community College Strategic Directions | 6 7 8 10 |
| Regular Board of Regents Meeting <u>Friday, April 20</u> | |
| Roll Call 1 | 11 |
| Administration of Oath of Office to Regent John H. Zenger 1 Summary of April 19 Planning Retreat 1 General Consent Calendar 1 Funding Recommendations of the Technology Initiative Advisory Board 1 | 13 14 14 15 |
| Reports of Board Committees <u>Programs Committee</u> University of Utah – Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP), Joint Master's Degree in Health | 16 |
| Care Administration and Doctor of Nursing Practice (MHA/DNP), and Master's Degree In Public Health and Doctor of Nursing Practice (MPH/DNP) Southern Utah University – Master of Public Administration (MPA) Degree | 16 16 |
| Bachelor of Integrated Studies Degree Information Calendar 1 Report of Academic Majors' Meetings 1 | 16 16 |
| Finance and Facilities Committee Regent/Trustee Acknowledgment and Disclosure Form 1 Utah State University – Approving Resolution, Refunding of 2004 Student Housing 1 Revenue Bonds 1 | 17 17 |

| Utah State University – Proposed Lease with Granite School District Weber State University – Campus Master Plan Dixie State College – Campus Master Plan Dixie State College – Delegation for Stadium Seating Land Banking Opportunities Consent Calendar USHE – Final Report on 2007-2008 Tuition and Fees USHE – 2007-2008 Capital Improvement Funding UHEAA – Information Update USHE – Information Technology Audits | 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 |
|---|--|
| <u>Strategic Planning and Communication Committee</u> Policy R212, <i>Board Self-Evaluation and Orientation</i> Institutional Reports on Campus Programs and Initiatives Relative to Minority and Disadvantaged Students (Dixie and Southern Utah University) Measuring Utah Higher Education – Update Utah Scholars Update Chief Academic Officers' (CAOs) Research Report – Quality Report on Institutional Residency Requirements | 19 19 19 19 20 20 |
| Report of the Commissioner Resolution for Keith Stepan Notable Achievements at USHE Institutions Security | 20 |
| Report of the Chair | 21 |
| Report of the Teacher Education Task Force | 21 |
| Adjournment | 23 |

MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS DIXIE STATE COLLEGE, ST. GEORGE, UTAH

STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION APRIL 19, 2007 <u>Minutes</u>

> Regents Excused James S. Jardine

Regents Present Jed H. Pitcher, Chair Bonnie Jean Beesley, Vice Chair Jerry C. Atkin Daryl C. Barrett Janet A. Cannon **Rosanita Cespedes** Katharine B. Garff David J. Grant Ali Hasnain Greg W. Haws Meghan Holbrook David J. Jordan Nolan E. Karras Josh M. Reid Sara V. Sinclair Marlon O. Snow

Office of the Commissioner

John R. Zenger

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner of Higher Education David L. Buhler, Associate Commissioner for Public Affairs Joyce Cottrell, Executive Secretary Amanda Covington, Director of Communications David S. Doty, Director of Policy Studies and Assistant Commissioner Carrie Flamm, Executive Director, Utah Student Association Kimberly Henrie, Director of USHE Budget and Planning Mark H. Spencer, Associate Commissioner for Finance and Facilities Lucille T. Stoddard, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs Lynne N. Ward, Director, Utah Educational Savings Plan Gary S. Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs

Institutional Representatives

University of Utah

David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Laura Snow, Special Assistant to the President and Secretary to the University

<u>Utah State University</u> Stan L. Albrecht, President Raymond T. Coward, Provost John DeVilbiss, Director of Public Relations Sydney M. Peterson, Chief of Staff

<u>Weber State University</u> F. Ann Millner, President Norm Tarbox, Vice President for Administrative Services Kathy Edwards, Executive Director, University Communication

Southern Utah University Michael T. Benson, President Abe Harraf, Provost Lee Montgomery, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies Dean O'Driscoll, Director of Marketing and Public Relations/Assistant to the President Gregory L. Stauffer, Vice President for Administrative and Financial Services

<u>Snow College</u> Richard W. Wheeler, Interim President Bradley A. Winn, Academic Vice President Greg Dart, Communications Director

<u>Dixie State College</u> Lee G. Caldwell, President Mark H. Gubler, Member, Board of Trustees Jeannine Holt, Vice Chair, Board of Trustees Steve Johnson, Director of Public Relations Joe Peterson, Dean, Arts, Letters & Sciences Christina Schultz, Vice President of Institutional Advancement Jennifer Shakespeare, Student Body President Vickie R. Wilson, Member, Board of Trustees Jennica Debenham, Student Ambassador Matt Denning, Student Ambassador Scott Klein, Student Ambassador Mitchel Squires, Student Ambassador

<u>College of Eastern Utah</u> Ryan L. Thomas, President Brad King, Vice President of Student Services

<u>Utah Valley State College</u> William A. Sederburg, President Val Peterson, Vice President for Administration and External Affairs

Chris Taylor, Director of Public Relations

<u>Salt Lake Community College</u> David Richardson, Academic Vice President Joy Tlou, Director of Public Relations

<u>Utah College of Applied Technology</u> Robert O. Brems, President Mark Middlebrook, Marketing Director, Mountainland Applied Technology College

<u>Representatives of the Media</u> Wendy Leonard, *Deseret Morning News* Rachel Tueller, *The Spectrum*

<u>Others</u> Al Church, Principal, Academy for Math, Engineering and Science Spencer Pratt, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Chair Pitcher called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone to Dixie State College. He excused Regent Jardine and welcomed Jack Zenger, who was appointed to the Board of Regents by Governor Huntsman and whose appointment was confirmed by the Senate the previous day.

Higher Education Messaging

Commissioner Kendell said the Regents' theme this past year has been "Building a Stronger State of Minds." Postsecondary education is one of the great assets of the future. He quoted Bill Gates, who said a high school diploma is obsolete. That does not mean it is not important; it simply means more is needed. The Regents' message to students is to stay in school, take a rigorous course of study, and graduate. A quality education is a great asset for individuals, families, communities, and our state. Higher education must be the leader in workforce development and in creating a better future for Utah. This message cannot be addressed solely through higher education; it must begin in junior high and high schools. In addition to preparing themselves academically to go to college, students must prepare themselves financially. Utah has the best 529 savings program in the country, and parents should be encouraged to save for their children's college education.

Participation is the second part of the Regents' message. Enrollments are generally flat. Utahns in the 35- to 65-year-old range are well educated, but the same cannot be said for the 18- to 34-year-olds. Completion is the third and final part of the message. We need to retain our students and help them succeed so they can graduate.

Associate Commissioner Dave Buhler said the Board had commissioned Dan Jones to conduct a poll last year to determine what perceptions exist within the state regarding higher education. In addition to

quantitative research, some qualitative research was done with focus groups comprised of parents of collegeaged children or younger. The results were enlightening. Utahns believe higher education is important in preparing themselves for employment, but they do not make the correlation between higher education and economic development. Most Utahns favor increased rigor in the public education curriculum. In addition, many parents are concerned that higher education is becoming increasingly inaccessible to many Utahns. Although parents believe a college education is important, most are not certain their children will go to college, nor are they saving for that education. Research and practical experience have proven we also need to do more to help the public and legislators understand the importance of higher education.

Amanda Covington reported a marketing plan has been developed, using the research as the baseline. A public relations firm helped to developed the new "brand" and tagline. The open book signifies lifelong learning. All entities within the Commissioner's Office (UHEAA, UESP, Utah Scholars) have incorporated the new USHE brand and tagline into their documents and presentations. It has also been incorporated on all of the web sites.

<u>Utah Scholars</u>. Amanda noted institutional public relations directors had been invited to attend this planning meeting to contribute to this discussion. She reported Dave Doty and Lauren Oviatt were taking the Utah Scholars message throughout the state. The Utah Jazz have indicated they would like to be a participant in this effort, which is very exciting. In addition, the Jack Kent Cook Foundation has joined with the Utah Scholars program to target minority and disadvantaged students in 14 Utah high schools with low college participation rates..

Other developments include the donation of advertising space in the *Deseret Morning News*, and support from the Salt Lake Chamber and the Ken Garff "Keys for Success" program. Legislative leaders have also been targeted and meetings have been scheduled with key legislators. Commissioner Kendell sends quarterly updates to a "List of 1000," detailing what is happening in higher education. Presentations have been made to the Salt Lake Chamber, the editorial boards of the Salt Lake metropolitan newspapers, LDS Church leaders, State Chambers of Commerce, the Coalition for Utah's Future, and the Legislature. Meetings have been scheduled with the Utah Taxpayers Association, Rev. France Davis, and the Centro Civico de Mexico. Hundreds of newspaper articles have been published since last fall regarding the higher education message, and television publicity has increased. In addition, public education spots are being run to follow up with major initiatives.

Dave commended Amanda for her many contributions and for the professionalism she has brought to this effort. He noted the promotional efforts being made by the individual institutions.

Commissioner Kendell stated if this effort is successful and has an impact on the larger community, it may help higher education achieve its goal of increasing enrollment by another 10,000 FTE students in the system. This is beneficial for the state, for the families, and for the individual students.

The group then divided into two discussion groups (universities and colleges) and reconvened at 11:20 a.m. to report the results of their discussions.

<u>University Group</u>. Dave reported his group had discussed the following issues:

- We need to sell the need for a college education before selling a particular institution. We are selling affordability and value. This message must be disseminated to high school counselors.
- We need more quality teachers in remedial education.
- Mentoring is vital.
- K-16 efforts are important and must be supported.
- Direct marketing to parents of high school students is needed. Because of privacy issues, this effort must be coordinated with public education. Such coordination is difficult.
- The PTA should be mobilized for help.
- More Spanish-language material is needed, and marketing is needed to the Hispanic community.
- Data tracking A unique student identifier will help.
- Use student success stories as a marketing tool.
- Better utilization of institutional internal research capabilities is needed.

<u>College Group</u>. Amanda reported the first theme of her group was that we need advocates to share our message. The business community needs to go into the schools to incentivize students. They must also take this message to their own employees. Another major factor is mentoring. UESP's marketing efforts have accelerated. Payroll deduction for UESP contributions should be made available to all employees. We must get into public education classrooms so the expectation of college education is ingrained in children at an early age. Reaching the under-served and diverse populations is also critical. Advocates could be a ball player or someone else whose face is known to young people – someone they identify as a success figure.

Vice Chair Beesley summarized the breakout reports. Questions from the Regents included: How can the Regents and higher education help public education keep divisiveness to a minimum? How is this being done in other states? What best practices are already being used elsewhere? How will this discussion shape our legislative agenda? What about online mentoring? Commissioner Kendell pointed out UtahMentor has been a wonderful tool for higher education, public education, and workforce services. The UtahMentor web site gets two million hits a month, although it has not received much visibility. Regent Cannon asked about the software to be utilized by high school counselors to analyze possible majors, the best institutions for those programs, scholarships, etc. She pointed out such software will not be inexpensive.

Vice Chair Beesley requested additional comments or ideas be given to members of the Strategic Planning Committee, who will study the issues and bring them back to the Board in June. Amanda recommended that the institutional public relations representatives meet monthly with her and Dave to coordinate their efforts. Regent Sinclair requested that members of the State Office of Education's public relations staff be included in some of those discussions. Vice Chair Beesley thanked everyone for their participation and suggestions. Chair Pitcher outlined the schedule for the remainder of the day.

Luncheon Speaker and Panel Discussion

The group broke for lunch, after which Chair Pitcher called them back to order. Commissioner Kendell thanked President Caldwell and his staff for their assistance in accommodating the meeting and for the delicious luncheon.

Commissioner Kendell introduced Dr. Shirley Malcom, Head of Education and Human Resources for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, who was the luncheon guest speaker. Dr. Malcom greeted the group with "I feel your pain, especially in these times of increasingly tight state budgets." She said she had begun her career by trying to increase the number of women and minorities into the sciences. A native of Birmingham, Alabama, she was the only Africa-American zoology major in a department of 800 people, and was often the only woman in her class.

She learned that women were not taking the necessary level of courses in science subjects to get into many of the applications for science and technology. In one state, the legislature expressed concern about the amount of money being spent on remediation, yet there was a definite disconnect between the science credit being taken in high school and the amount of science credit required for college entrance. Many high school students had not been taught the necessary courses. A year of college-level technology courses, taught by college faculty in the schools of technology, made up the difference and allowed students to get back on track.

Dr. Malcom addressed the question of alignment. She recommended a connection between the K-12 schools, community colleges and universities so students can transfer seamlessly. Make sure required courses allow as many students as possible to keep their options open. We need to communicate clearly to the parents that the world in which their child will be living is far different from the world in which they grew up. She asked, "Why do we let a 13- or 14-year-old make a decision that will affect him (and others) for the rest of his life?"

One reason students are not entering the field of science is lack of information. Students have preconceptions about the sciences, or they yield to peer or parental pressure. Dr. Malcom pointed out higher education owns the problem of teacher preparation and academic development. Are the requirements reflective of science as it used to be, or science as it is going to be? Very little information is being given to the students about the use of technology, or about how people learn, or about engineering. She asked, to what extent is there alignment across curriculum, teacher development, professional development? What are the after-school opportunities – early college, summer school, etc.? To what extent is technology being used to provide additional professional development or professional preparation for teachers? What is the role of the libraries? What is the role of a science museum?

Dr. Malcom noted Utah is big in geography but small in population. If this state were to build partnerships with everyone, it could become a model for other states. She challenged the group to think differently. Experiment. Use innovation in education as a strategy for moving forward.

Dr. Malcom responded to questions. She warned the group that the rest of the world is making great progress in the areas of science and technology while the United States lags behind She pointed out today's kids are not excited about what is in the books, but by what is in the world. Americans need to learn more languages; this is a global economy.

Commissioner Kendell thanked Dr. Malcom for her remarks and invited her to stay for the panel discussion. He then introduced Dr. David Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Utah, who chaired the panel. Other panelists included:

Dr. Al Church, Principal, Academy for Math, Engineering and Science (AMES)

Mr. Larry Madden, Science Teacher and Specialist, Salt Lake City School District Dr. Christine Hailey, Professor and Associate Dean, College of Engineering, Utah State University Dr. JoAnn Lighty, Chair, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Utah

Dr. Pershing suggested a few issues for consideration: The United States has neither the national leadership nor the political will to provide our children with a secondary education that is competitive in today's world, especially in the area of mathematics. As a state, our goal should be to have a secondary education system that is comparable with the top countries. To do this will require a coalition of public and higher education, legislative leaders, the Governor, and business and industry. A rigorous secondary curriculum is vital to this effort, and higher education must produce more and better teachers in the fields of science, engineering and technology. The panelists responded to these issues and to questions from the audience.

Chair Pitcher thanked Dr. Pershing and all of the panelists for their participation. Following a short break, the meeting reconvened in open session at 3:00 p.m.

Status and Future of Partnerships in the Utah System of Higher Education

President Albrecht remarked that the panel had made reference several times to partnerships. Progress has been made since the 2007 Legislative Session in developing institutional partnerships. The Legislature provided funding for USU to build partnerships with CEU and Snow College. A land gift in Vernal has provided an opportunity for shared physical space between USU and UCAT. President Albrecht said it was a unique opportunity to build some important partnerships in rural Utah. The Legislature appropriated \$4.8 million to build degree partnerships – \$1 million each to Snow College, the College of Eastern Utah, the Uintah Basin Campus of UCAT, and \$900,000 each to USU sites in Tooele and Brigham City. In addition, SB 53 provided \$710,000 ongoing funding and \$865,400 one-time money for a partnership between Weber State University and Utah State University for an engineering program at Hill Air Force Base.

The purpose of the March 28-29 education summit was to begin to identify the most critical needs in each area of the state. Business, Education, Pre-Engineering, and Liberal Arts were identified. In addition, Natural Resources is a critical need for the UBATC. President Wheeler expressed his appreciation for the way USU has worked with Snow and said he looked forward to working with CEU and UVSC as well. President Albrecht said USU had also benefitted greatly from this opportunity. The Utah Education Network (UEN) has been able to develop an infrastructure to make delivery more readily available throughout the state.

President Thomas echoed President Wheeler's and President Albrecht's comments. He said it is extremely important for smaller institutions to partner with the larger universities. USU has approached this relationship very professionally and has dealt with both CEU and Snow as peer institutions. President Thomas said he was very excited about the prospect of additional four-year programs or even graduate programs through Utah State University.

Another critical partnership now evolving is the one between USU and WSU for an engineering program at Hill Air Force Base. President Millner thanked President Albrecht for partnering with WSU.

<u>Next steps</u>: President Albrecht said mini-summits will be held, new faculty will be hired, and new or expanded course offerings will be added. This partnership now reaches into 14 of the state's counties with the lowest educational attainment.

Commissioner Kendell remarked he had attended some of the summit earlier this week. He noted a great willingness to reach consensus and come to agreement on supporting these partnerships throughout the state. He congratulated everyone involved and said the Governor would also be pleased.

Regent Reid said a big concern at Snow and CEU is the sharp decline in second-year students because of concurrent enrollment. President Thomas said at CEU an additional 500 students would remain in school for an additional two years with the additional programs available through USU. President Wheeler said residency is also an issue at Snow College. If students can transfer into an upper-division program, they are more likely to remain in school.

Regent Barrett urged the other presidents to follow this example and develop partnerships. President Benson said SUU is developing partnerships with Dixie State College in criminal justice and is working on a partnership in the field of secondary education. President Caldwell said Dixie is partnering with the University of Utah on special education, nursing, and an MBA program.

Associate Commissioner Stoddard said the partnerships with UCAT have been very successful. President Brems said two teams from the Council on Occupational Education just met with the Dixie ATC and Southwest ATC campuses for accreditation site visits. The sharing of facilities and programs between Dixie State College and Dixie Applied Technology College was particularly impressive to the accreditation team.

Chair Pitcher requested that partnership mentoring be included on the Programs Committee agenda every quarter.

Supporting the Comprehensive Community College

President Thomas said he had been at UVSC during its transition to a four-year institution. In eastern Utah, the community college is a much more viable structure for the needs of the population, particularly with opportunities through partnerships to provide four-year degrees. College personnel work very closely with high schools and school districts to develop curriculum for the junior and senior years of high school. The highest percentage of students graduating with a concurrent degree from college and a high school diploma is in Blanding, Utah.

The community college is preparing for a dramatic change in the blue collar segment – now referred to as a technology segment, where the average age in power production is 56. There is also an opportunity to work in specific and targeted ways to respond more rapidly to the kinds of certificates or problems for specific population areas. The merger of CEU and SEATC has provided a greater opportunity to act as a comprehensive community college by including short-term training programs.

President Wheeler said Snow College has been a liberal arts transfer institution. With the addition of the CTE programs at Richfield, the college is now truly a comprehensive community college. Commissioner Kendell asked if Snow's partnership with USU would make Snow a sustainable comprehensive community college, and to what extent tuition was a barrier at Snow. President Wheeler said students are very cost-sensitive. Students who choose community colleges are much more cost-sensitive than students at other institutions, which is why they choose to attend community colleges. A differential between the two types of institutions would be very beneficial.

Regent Karras asked if the state should be considering a property tax model to fund some of the highcost issues faced by higher education. President Thomas said that would work well on the Wasatch Front, but it would be a "tough sell" in Blanding or any of the rural communities.

Vice Chair Beesley suggested it might be worthwhile to look at the costs of production of CTE statewide and the amount of subsidy that comes from the state, depending on the institution and structure. She also recommended that the Regents take another look at the variances in tuition, which would differ according to the institution's mission and role.

Commissioner Kendell said these partnerships have enormous potential. Another suggestion might be a kind of tuition moderation. We now have a legislative task force to study higher education; perhaps we could suggest that they study this issue.

Regent Jordan said he had sat next to two of the Dixie Ambassadors at lunch and asked them if they could explain the decline in enrollment at Dixie State College. Both indicated it was because of increasing tuition. Regent Jordan stressed that If we want to preserve the community college mission, we have to fund community college access. Supporting programs through an increase in tuition is putting the expense on the backs of the students. Commissioner Kendell said regional universities who are also teaching colleges play a very important role. However, community colleges seem to be more vulnerable.

Regent Barrett asked if Weber State University and Utah Valley State College have differential tuition for their two-year and four-year programs. President Millner said Weber does not have differential tuition. In fact, theirs is the lowest of any state university. They need to be able to provide financial aid and scholarships to help first-generation students and others to obtain a college education. She suggested that thinking of this as a financial aid issue rather than a funding issue may be a better model.

Regent Karras expressed the Regents' commitment to the community college role. A funding model might inspire more commitment to the community college mission. Commissioner Kendell said this was on the table for discussion by the Legislative Task Force on Higher Education.

Strategic Directions

Commissioner Kendell briefly reviewed the Strategic Directions document and requested feedback. <u>Access and Participation</u>. The Commissioner noted UCOPE received good funding this year, and an allocation was made to the Utah Scholars program. We are still trying to get funding for the Regents Scholar Award.

Higher education is working with the Taylor Foundation and the Salt Lake Chamber and key legislators on the establishment of a fully-endowed Regents Scholar program. <u>Retention and Graduation</u>. All of the institutions are very concerned about retention. A very successful retention conference was held, with recognizable benefits for some of the things we are doing. <u>Needs of Disadvantaged and Minority Students</u>. The Regents are receiving reports from the institutions at each Board meeting. In addition, more need-based financial aid was allocated (\$2 million ongoing and \$2 million one-time funding). <u>Workforce Needs</u>. The Engineering Initiative and Nursing Initiative have been very successful. <u>Teacher Education</u>. A study was launched of the needs of teachers in the public school system. The task force produced an outstanding report. <u>Funding Institutional Missions and Roles</u>. Commissioner Kendell said we were unsuccessful in obtaining an allocation for institutional-based funding. Partnerships may be much more successful.

Regent Karras asked what the University of Phoenix was doing to attract the students we are not getting. What models are working for private institutions that we could incorporate? What lessons can we learn from them? He asked to have this as a discussion item on a future agenda.

Regent Sinclair said the discussion on comprehensive community colleges was beneficial for the Regents. She suggested the Regents need to know more about UCAT and asked that President Brems be allowed to tell the Regents about UCAT's role and mission in a future meeting.

A question was raised about the trimester system suggested as a possible solution by the Teacher Education Task Force. Commissioner Kendell said that option offered more earning potential for teachers and was a more efficient use of facilities. President Brems pointed out UCAT has year-round education. Many UCAT instructors have been able to transition from a nine-month contract to a year-round position with subsequent proportionate increases in salary.

Regent Reid moved the Board recess and reconvene at 5:00 p.m. in executive session to discuss personnel issues, pending litigation, and property issues. Regent Atkin seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting recessed at 4:45 p.m.

Following dinner, the Regents had a dinner meeting with the Dixie State College Board of Trustees, President Caldwell, and members of his staff. Dixie State College staff presented a draft of a strategic plan which will be discussed further at subsequent meetings of the Regents and Trustees.

REGULAR BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING APRIL 20, 2007 Minutes

Regents Present Jed H. Pitcher, Chair Bonnie Jean Beesley, Vice Chair Jerry C. Atkin Daryl C. Barrett Janet A. Cannon **Rosanita Cespedes** Katharine B. Garff David J. Grant Ali Hasnain Greg W. Haws Meghan Holbrook James S. Jardine David J. Jordan Nolan E. Karras Josh M. Reid Sara V. Sinclair Marlon O. Snow John R. Zenger

Office of the Commissioner

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner of Higher Education David L. Buhler, Associate Commissioner for Public Affairs Joyce Cottrell, Executive Secretary Amanda Covington, Director of Communications David S. Doty, Director of Policy Studies and Assistant Commissioner David Feitz, Executive Director, Utah Higher Education Assistance Authority Carrie Flamm, Executive Director, Utah Student Association Kimberly Henrie, Director of USHE Budget and Planning David J. Sperry, Scholar-in-Residence Mark H. Spencer, Associate Commissioner for Finance and Facilities Lucille T. Stoddard, Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs Lynne N. Ward, Director, Utah Educational Savings Plan Gary S. Wixom, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs

Institutional Representatives

University of Utah

A. Lorris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs John G. Francis, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

<u>Utah State University</u> Stan L. Albrecht, President W. Glenn Ford, Vice President for Business and Finance Kathy Edwards, Executive Director, University Communication Brad Mortensen, Interim Vice President for Student Services

<u>Weber State University</u> F. Ann Millner, President Norm Tarbox, Vice President for Administrative Services

Southern Utah University Michael T. Benson, President Abe Harraf, Provost Rodney D. Decker, Dean, Humanities and Social Sciences Lynne Brown, Director, Student Support Center Pat Keehley, Associate Professor of Political Science Spencer Pearson, Student Body President

<u>Snow College</u> Richard W. Wheeler, Interim President Greg Dart, Public Relations Director

Dixie State College Lee G. Caldwell, President Donna Dillingham-Evans, Academic Vice President Brent Hanson, Professor of Theater Arts Shandon Gubler, Member, Board of Trustees Jeannine Holt, Vice Chair, Board of Trustees Stanley J. Plewe, Vice President of College Services Joe Peterson, Dean, Arts, Letters and Sciences Christina Schultz, Vice President of Institutional Advancement Jennifer Shakespeare, Student Body President Danela Souberbielle, Student Services Advisor Matt Denning, Student Ambassador Scott Klein, Student Ambassador

<u>College of Eastern Utah</u> Ryan L. Thomas, President

<u>Utah Valley State College</u> William A. Sederburg, President Lowell M. Glenn, Chair, Department of Business Management Linda Makin, Director of Budgets Chris Taylor, Director of Public Relations J. Karl Worthington, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs

Salt Lake Community College David Richardson, Vice President of Academic Services Dennis Klaus, Vice President of Business Services Julie Curtis, Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Services

<u>Utah College of Applied Technology</u> Robert O. Brems, President Carol Sapp, Chair, Dixie ATC Board of Directors

<u>Representatives of the Media</u> Wendy Leonard, *Deseret Morning News* Rachel Tueller, *The Spectrum*

Others

Dirk Anderson, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget John W. Hickman, State Senator Keith Stepan, Executive Director, Division of Facilities Construction and Management Stephen H. Urguhart, State Representative

Following a breakfast meeting with the Dixie Applied Technology College Board of Directors, Chair Pitcher called to order the Committee of the Whole at 9:15 a.m. He briefly reviewed the contents of the Regents' folders. Chair Pitcher recognized Senator Hickman and welcomed him to the meeting.

Administration of Oath of Office to Regent John H. Zenger

Chair Pitcher administered the oath of office to John H. Zenger, who had been confirmed by the Utah State Senate the previous day as a member of the State Board of Regents. Regent Zenger said he had long been an advocate of education. He and his wife have 10 children. Many family members, including sons- and daughters-in-law and grandchildren, have attained advanced degrees. For 11 years, Regent Zenger was Vice President of Human Resources for a pharmaceutical company in California. Most of his career has been spent in training and development. He taught briefly at the University of Southern California and as an adjunct instructor at the Stanford Graduate School of Business. He previously served on the UVSC Board of Trustees and enjoyed that experience very much.
Summary of April 19 Planning Retreat

Commissioner Kendell said the previous day had been made up of three very successful sessions. The morning session was spent in discussing the higher education message. Those who invested in education will thrive in the new economy. Those who do not will probably not be as successful. The group discussed the importance of sending a unified message throughout the state. We do not have the resources to do a mass media campaign, so we will do a grass-roots campaign driven by the Presidents and Regents. Many good ideas were gathered during the discussion, which will be summarized and put into a report for future direction. Some institutions need to direct more effort at recruiting. All institutions need to improve their efforts to retain students.

The second session was spent discussing math, science and engineering, and how to get more young people involved in those areas. Our future is going to be determined by our ability, or lack of ability, to solve such problems as the global environment and a highly interdependent economy. The United States is simply not keeping pace with the rest of the world in involving young people in the areas of math, science, technology, and engineering. Our guest speaker, Dr. Shirley Malcom, was very direct in her remarks about what needs to be done. We need to build on our themes of greater rigor, and of more students attending and graduating from college. Those nations that have taken that agenda seriously are thriving in the world economy – Belgium, China, Ireland, and others. The demographics show that our 18- to 34-year-olds are not as well educated as the 35- to 65-year-olds. That is the polar opposite of what is happening in many other countries. A panel discussion followed the luncheon speaker, building on Dr. Malcom's remarks.

The third part of the day was spent discussing partnerships in the Utah System of Higher Education and efforts that are underway, with Utah State University taking the lead. Commissioner Kendell reported on the Strategic Directions document and what his staff has done in each of the six areas identified two years ago at Dixie State College. He said we may need to rethink need-based funding. On the whole, we are on track. The planning session was very positive and some good ideas were generated.

The Regents went to their various committees at 9:30 a.m. The Committee of the Whole reconvened at 10:55 p.m. New tams were distributed to the Regents, to be worn at commencement exercises and presidential inaugurations. Representative Urguhart was recognized and welcomed.

General Consent Calendar

On motion by Regent Atkin and second by Regent Snow, the following items were approved on the Regents' General Consent Calendar (Tab W):

- A. <u>Minutes</u> Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held March 9, 2007, at the Regents' Offices in Salt Lake City, Utah
- B. Grant Proposals on file in the Commissioner's Office
- C. Grant Awards

- University of Utah National Institutes of Health/National Institute of General; "Conus Peptides and Their Receptor Targets;" \$1,362.689. Baldomero M. Olivera, Principal Investigator.
- Utah State University NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, "Wide-Field Infra-red Survey Explorer (WISE);" \$1,566,388. John Elwell, Principal Investigator; Scott Schick, Co-Principal Investigator.
- D. <u>Proposed Revision to Policy R851</u>, *Guidelines for Retirement Programs* (Attached). The proposed revision conforms the policy to current statutory language and institutional best practices. It eliminates the requirement that employees who opt for early withdrawal from a retirement program must sign a waiver.

Funding Recommendations of the Technology Initiative Advisory Board

Commissioner Kendell said the Technology Initiative Advisory Board (TIAB) was chaired by John Sutherland, who has done an excellent job over the years. This year's report and recommendations were found behind Tab X of the agenda. Mr. Sutherland joined the meeting via conference call.

Mr. Sutherland said it had been an interesting year because the TIAB was asked to report to the Executive Appropriations Committee for the first time. They found universal support at the Legislature. There is a huge demand for positions in the engineering industry, which has experienced a 4.5 percent job growth rate. The TIAB talked with the deans or department chairs responsible for the use of these funds. Every institution gave a good report and indicated how the funding would be used in the coming year. The TIAB focused the funding on faculty positions and past performance of programs. A couple of board members were very interested in the growth in southern Utah, but Dixie State College did not have a large request for funding, so a substantial increase was given to Southern Utah University for its integrated engineering program. Mr. Sutherland suggested the Regents consider the type of programs that might be needed in southern Utah because of the rapid growth there. He noted SUU originally had 38 majors in integrated engineering; this year there were 112.

Regent Grant moved approval of the TIAB Board's funding recommendations for 2007-2008. Regent Snow seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

Reports of Board Committees

Programs Committee

<u>University of Utah – Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP), Joint Master's in Health Care Administration</u> and Doctor of Nursing Practice (MHA/DNP) and Master's in Public Health and Doctor of Nursing Practice (MPH/DNP) (Tab A). Chair Garff commended University officials for the excellent report on the state's need.

The well-prepared report indicated the University of Utah would be on the forefront of a trend in medicine that is necessary for nursing. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) has mandated that the current level of preparation necessary for advanced nursing practice roles be moved from the master's to the practice doctorate level by the year 2015. The Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) declared that only practice doctoral degrees with the Doctor of Nursing Practice title will be eligible for CCNE accreditation. The committee appreciated the detail included in the report. Chair Garff moved approval of the University's request for a DNP Degree, a joint MHA/DNP Degree, and a joint MPH/DNP Degree, effective Fall 2007. Regent Snow seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

<u>Southern Utah University – Master of Public Administration Degree</u> (Tab B). Regent Garff said this degree was supported by the other institutions, provided the proposed new faculty position is in place before the degree is offered, provided there continues to be sufficient student demand. Regent Garff moved approval of the program, with a follow-up report focusing on enrollment at the end of the first three years. Regent Snow seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously. Regent Jordan said the committee had extensive discussion about the place of master's degrees at SUU. The committee felt it is important to continue the university's emphasis on quality undergraduate education and very good full-time faculty-student ratios. The Regents indicated their desire that the university continue this commitment, and university officials made that commitment.

<u>Utah Valley State College – Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts Degrees in Economics, Minor</u> in Economics, and an Economics Emphasis in the Bachelor of Integrated Studies Degree (Tab C). Regent Garff noted this request had been in the pipeline for several years. This program will help prepare students for careers in business, government, and education, as well as provide an excellent background for further graduate work in economics, business, and law. The program complies with the accreditation requirements of the AACSB and will have little impact on lower-division teaching. Chair Garff moved approval of UVSC's request to offer the BS and BA Degrees and Minor in Economics and an Economics emphasis in the Bachelor of Integrated Studies Degree, effective Fall 2007. Regent Cespedes seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

Information Calendar, Programs Committee (Tab D). Chair Garff called attention to the committee's Information Calendar, which consisted of name changes and new emphases at Utah State University.

<u>Report of Academic Majors' Meetings</u> (Tab E). Regent Garff referred to the report found behind Tab E and commended Assistant Commissioner Teddi Safman for the excellent report and for coordinating the annual meetings of these faculty groups.

Finance and Facilities Committee

<u>Regent/Trustee Acknowledgment and Disclosure Form</u> (Tab F). Chair Atkin said the Commissioner's cover memo to Tab F explained the background of this form, which will require the signature of all Regents and Trustees no later than August 1, 2007. Institutions were allowed to replace the standard form with one specific to their schools if approved by the Regents no later than July 27. Chair Atkin noted there would be one small change to the form. The corrected disclosure form will be sent to the Regents with a request for prompt return.

Chair Atkin moved adoption of the Acknowledgment and Disclosure Form. The motion was seconded by Regent Grant and adopted unanimously.

<u>Utah State University – Approving Resolution, Refunding of 2004 Student Housing Revenue Bonds</u> (Tab G). Chair Atkin said the committee had reviewed and adopted this resolution, which will save the University approximately \$1.3 million. The transaction was approved by the University's Board of Trustees on April 13. Chair Atkin moved adoption of the approving resolution for refunding the 2004 Student Housing Revenue Bonds. Regent Grant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

<u>Utah State University – Proposed Lease with Granite School District</u> (Tab H). Chair Atkin reported USU is providing educational opportunities in the Salt Lake Valley and is expanding the size of its facility in the Granite School District. This comes from a mandate of the university's role as the state's land-grant institution. The space will be leased for \$224,808 annually, including the cost of utilities. The University will also pay 55 percent of the cost of remodeling and capital improvements for the designated space. USU's portion of the remodeling cost will be approximately \$900,000. Chair Atkin moved approval of Utah State University's lease with Granite School District. Regent Grant seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

<u>Weber State University – Campus Master Plan</u> (Tab I). Vice President Tarbox reported that Weber's Davis Campus is on 100 acres of land. The revised master plan includes a second building just east of the existing instructional facility. The University's main campus on Harrison Boulevard includes 120 acres of undeveloped land on the hillside to the east of the developed campus. University officials have worked with DFCM for several months to determine whether this land can be developed for university use. Geologic studies, mapping and survey work were all studied. DFCM has concluded that half of this area can indeed be developed. The University could fit ten buildings in that space with a traditional higher education footprint. Regent Grant pointed out the Ogden Campus is landlocked. The university cannot continue to grow without this land. Chair Atkin moved the committee's resolution, which was to approve the Weber State University's campus master plan, including future use of the hillside property as identified in the plan. Furthermore, WSU is directed to retain the hillside property for future institutional use and to continue seeking opportunities to acquire property adjacent to the Ogden and Davis Campuses. Regent Zenger seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

<u>Dixie State College – Campus Master Plan</u> (Tab J). Chair Atkin said Dixie's campus master plan was a bit more challenging than the traditional master plan because of the rapid growth in Washington County. The committee did not adopt a campus master plan and opted to wait for a subsequent presentation before giving its approval. Chair Atkin noted a land bank adjacent to the campus is not available. The campus is landlocked, so this presents a challenge for the college.

<u>Dixie State College – Delegation for Stadium Seating</u> (Tab K). Chair Atkin reported the existing seating is acceptable on only one side of the stadium. Most of the bleachers are inadequate and potentially unsafe. College officials are working with a donor to secure financing for new seating, which will cost approximately one million dollars (\$1 million). The committee approved the college's request, subject to approval of a financing plan by the Commissioner. No state funds are to be used for this project. College officials have secured pledges for \$400,000 and are hoping to get the entire project financed by private donations. President Caldwell said

he was committed to "solid financing" before moving forward with this project. Commissioner Kendell said this was a good project, but it is not a high priority for the college. Rather, it is a community project, to be paid by the community, county, etc. Vice Chair Beesley commented that the Regents have worked very hard to get funding for Dixie's academic programs. They do not want to delegate those funds for a community facility. The time, attention and administrative resources of college officials are already stretched. The community must put together a funding package without placing an additional burden on the college administration. Chair Atkin moved approval of the request for seating in Hansen Stadium, subject to the Commissioner's approval of the final financing plan, which does not include any college or state funds. Regent Grant seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

Landbanking Opportunities (New agenda item). Chair Atkin said the committee had asked that landbanking opportunities be pursued for the system in its entirety. They also suggested that land banks be viewed separately by the State Building Board, rather than including them with building projects. Commissioner Kendell agreed. Chair Atkin moved that (1) in conjunction with the State Building Board, the Regents pursue opportunities to bank land for all of the USHE institutions, and (2) the Regents suggest to the Building Board that land banks be viewed and ranked separately from building projects. Regent Karras seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously. Keith Stepan, DFCM Executive Director, said the State Building Board would cooperate with the Commissioner's office to look at land banks separately. He thought it was a good suggestion.

<u>Consent Calendar, Finance Committee</u> (Replacement Tab L). On motion by Chair Atkin and second by Regent Snow, the following items were approved on the Finance Committee's consent calendar:

- 1. UofU and USU Capital Facilities Delegation Reports
- 2. Weber State University Land Exchanges
- 3. Utah State University Real Property Conveyance (Vernal Campus Public Roads and Utilities Easements)

<u>USHE – Final Report on 2007-2008 Tuition and Fees</u> (Tab M). As reported in the Commissioner's cover memo, the Regents' Executive Committee met on April 2 and approved Utah State University's second-tier tuition increase at 3%. Tuition at all other institutions was approved by the Board in its March 9 meeting. As authorized by the Regents in March, Commissioner Kendell approved fee increases for Weber State University (5.5%), Utah Valley State College (6.45%) and Dixie State College (11.22%). Final amounts for tuition and fees were shown on Attachment 1 to Tab M.

<u>USHE – 2007-2008 Capital Improvement Funding</u> (Tab N). The attachment to Tab N showed the funded projects approved by the State Building Board on April 11.

<u>UHEAA – Information Update</u> (Tab O). David Feitz gave the committee a report on UHEAA activities since he was appointed Executive Director. The Commissioner's cover memo briefly explained actions taken by the UHEAA Board of Directors at its March 22 meeting.

<u>USHE – Information Technology Audits</u> (Tab P). As reported in the Commissioner's cover memo, fiveperson teams have been assigned to conduct security audits of systems and networks at each USHE

| Minutes of Meeting | |
|--------------------|--|
| April 2007 | |
| Page 19 | |

institution, under the direction of Dr. Steve Hess, Chief Information Officer for the Utah System of Higher Education. One institution is being audited each month. Chair Atkin said the committee recommended that IT audits be included on the agenda for a future executive session meeting of the State Board of Regents.

Strategic Planning and Communications Committee

Policy R212, *Board Self-Evaluation and Orientation* (Tab Q). Chair Jardine said the committee had discussed this document. Many felt a personal self-study and evaluation would be appropriate in addition to the Board evaluation. Assistant Commissioner Dave Doty advised the committee that one of the areas of criticism in the University of Utah's recent accreditation was that the governing board did not engage in a self-study. In addition, there is value in periodic evaluations of any organization. The proposed policy was a broad outline, directing the Executive Committee to select a self-evaluation instrument and recommend the procedures for conducting the evaluation. **Chair Jardine moved adoption of Policy R212. Vice Chair Holbrook seconded the motion, which carried unanimously**.

Institutional Reports on Campus Programs and Initiatives Relative to Minority and Disadvantaged Students (Tab R). Chair Jardine said these reports were a very useful and interesting part of the committee discussion, showing what is being done in this area on the various campuses. The committee and institutions are able to share good ideas and best practices. The committee felt that both Dixie and SUU presented positive, encouraging reports. SUU's program is more mature, but Dixie is going in the right direction, with a new director hired recently. Chair Jardine said Dixie officials reported that two years ago, the college passed an initiative to implement a diversity requirement in general education. They have been struggling with the format. During the committee discussion, Dr. Pershing said one of the challenges the University of Utah faced was training the teachers how to manage the discussions in class. Regent Barrett requested that the reports be presented in a way to measure success at each institution, qualitatively and quantitatively, if possible. Regent Cespedes expressed her appreciation for the efforts being made in this area. She, too, would appreciate future reports in a way so the Regents can assess performance.

<u>Measuring Utah Higher Education – Update</u> (Tab S). Regent Jardine recalled one of the charts in the report previously presented to the Board was identified as troublesome and subject to misinterpretation. That chart measured students entering college with no previous credit. The Supplement to Tab S showed those students in two ways – by those who have earned 20 or more credit hours by the end of their first year of college, and by those with no previous AP or concurrent credit.

<u>Utah Scholars Update</u> (Tab T). Chair Jardine reported the committee had commended the Commissioner's Office. The Commissioner's staff was able to secure \$500,000 in one-time funding for the Utah Scholars program, which was not even on the Legislature's agenda until the last minute. Associate Commissioner Doty pointed out that in addition to the overwhelming support from the Legislature, the Utah Scholars program has the total support of the Salt Lake Chamber. Chair Jardine said the Chamber resolved that this is one of its priorities for this funding year. President Sederburg asked about geographic distribution. Dr. Doty responded there was initial discussion with a school district in Utah County and another in Washington County; neither was ready to implement the program this year. The ultimate goal is to have this program in all of the 40 school districts in Utah.

<u>Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) Research Report</u> (Tab U). Chair Jardine said the report on Quality, attached to Tab U, was one of the most significant reports to emerge for some time. The Regents have discussed quality measures and quality issues regularly. The CAOs have decided to focus on some of these areas and to write reports with the intention that they become action items. The report on quality was written by Dr. Brad Winn, Academic Vice President at Snow College. Chair Jardine asked Dr. Winn to briefly discuss his paper. Dr. Winn thanked Associate Commissioner Stoddard for taking on the recurring issues and asking the CAOs to define those issues and determine actions to be taken. Part of the report discusses higher education's relationship with the Legislature. The final component is the priorities or next steps, found on pages 5-7 of the report. The CAOs have scheduled a retreat this summer to discuss these goals, identify time frames, and put fiscal notes to them. Chair Jardine commented that the legislators frequently ask how to measure quality. Those measurements were shown on page 5 of Dr. Winn's report. These approaches must all be studied in an aggregate way. The committee encouraged the CAOs to continue this type of effort in other areas.

<u>Report on Institutional Residency Requirements</u> (Tab V). The information contained in the Commissioner's cover memo summarized the current state statute on resident student tuition and Regents' policy R512. HB 118, enacted by the 2007 Legislature, changes the existing requirements significantly. Discretion was granted to the institutions to set their own residency requirements, within defined parameters.

Report of the Commissioner

Commissioner Kendell thanked President Caldwell and his staff for their hospitality in hosting this twoday meeting.

<u>Resolution for Keith Stepan</u>. Dr. Kendell acknowledged the work of Keith Stepan, Executive Director of DFCM for the past few years. He has been a friend and advocate of higher education and has an enormous capacity to solve problems and to help institutions when special needs have been identified. Keith will step down from his position on June 30. He will be missed. Commissioner Kendell read a formal resolution to recognize Mr. Stepan's contributions and achievements, then presented the resolution to him.

<u>Notable Achievements at USHE Institutions</u>. The Commissioner briefly reviewed each of the highlights outlined in his written report.

<u>Security</u>. Commissioner Kendell spoke of emergency preparedness procedures in the Commissioner's Office and throughout the System. He directed Associate Commissioner Spencer to review each institution's existing crisis response plan and, with the assistance of an independent consultant, to make recommendations for best practices for the Utah System of Higher Education. A report and recommendations will be presented to the Regents in July.

Report of the Chair

Chair Pitcher thanked Amanda Covington for the written report, which was in the Regents' folders. He said he was continually amazed and impressed by the success of our students, who are our most valued asset.

A moment of silence was observed in recognition of the tragedy on the Virginia Tech campus earlier in the week.

Report of the Teacher Education Task Force

During the luncheon meeting, Chair Pitcher announced that the July Board meeting date had been changed from July 27 to July 20, and it will be held on the Snow College campus in Ephraim.

Commissioner Kendell introduced Dr. David J. Sperry, USHE Scholar-in-Residence and former Dean of the College of Education at the University of Utah. Dr. Sperry has been invaluable to the Commissioner's Office, particularly as he has chaired the K-16 Alliance Task Force on the Teacher Shortage. Dr. Sperry introduced Lyle Cox, Human Resources Manager for the Washington School District and a member of the Task Force, who designed Appendix D of the report.

Dr. Sperry reported the Task Force examined the data and came away with a genuine belief that if public and higher education enrollment projections remain accurate, and if teacher employment patterns remain steady, the state will face an acute problem in supplying a sufficient number of teachers in the public school system. At present, 500 teachers will be needed this fall for one district alone; only 75 applications have been received. Washington County School District has been unable to fill its slots in special education.

The task force studied the factors determining whether or not an individual would go into the teaching profession. Compensation is the single most important factor.

The traditional source for getting teachers has been graduates of schools of education at the state's public universities. In addition, four other possible sources of public school teachers were identified on pages 8-9 of the Executive Summary: (1) out-of-state recruitment, (2) alternative licensing programs, (3) recruiting former teachers whose teaching credentials have expired, and (4) better utilizing the current pool of existing teachers. The task force believes the state should pursue all five sources. Some of these alternatives are not practical at present. For example, significantly increasing the number of teacher education graduates is problematic in light of existing flat enrollments. Enticing out-of-state teachers is also problematic because Utah salaries cannot compete with neighboring states. Alternative licensing is not promising because of the high turnover rates and because of the quality of some of its programs. A more promising option would be to recruit individuals who have held a teaching license but who do not hold one at this time.

The best option, in the task force's view, is to better utilize existing resources – teachers and facilities. The present organization of the K-12 school system fails to utilize the state's investment in a highly trained workforce. Dr. Sperry pointed out that most traditional jobs are based on a schedule of 260 workdays per year, while teachers work on an 180-day (990 instructional hours) contract, 70 percent of the traditional work year. Expanding the length of the instructional days and the number of operating days per year would enable school districts to use their facilities year-round and to offer extended contracts to the teachers, which would increase their salaries significantly.

One model to which many members of the task force were attracted was the trimester calendar system being done at BYU-Idaho. President Kim Clark met with the task force to explain how this plan was working on his campus.

Mr. Cox reviewed Appendix D and explained that the chart on page 5 was the actual salary schedule for the Washington County School District. He referred to page 7, which compared the salary schedule based on the present 5½-hour day with the proposed 7-hour day trimester model. Using the same hourly rate, a teacher's salary could be increased by 51 percent. He noted many elementary schools are using year-round school schedules, and parents already need to coordinate those schedules with junior high school and high school schedules.

Regent Grant noted the trimester/longer day schedule seemed to be quite practical. He asked what stops the school system from adopting this model. Mr. Cox said the WPU funding would need to be changed in order for the state to go to the trimester model. Administrators would need the flexibility to scale back without having an entitlement. Regent Grant asked about job sharing. Dr. Sperry pointed out the same flexibility provided for students (shown on page 14) would be available to the teachers as well. The model would allow for a variety of working conditions. It would allow a student to move into higher education and to move through the system and graduate more quickly. The more closely public education can coordinate with higher education, the better it will be for the entire state. Regent Jardine pointed out teachers may have a 5½-hour instructional day, but they also spend many more hours correcting papers, preparing tests, etc.

Commissioner Kendell said this appears to be a good solution that requires further study. What higher education needs now is the increments or steps to get us to this end result. Mr. Cox said the first step would be to get Utah families to accept this as a possibility. Dr. Sperry said this model is operating in the Alpine School District's middle schools. It has greatly helped alleviate the teacher shortage in that district because teachers can opt to teach for an extended day.

Regent Karras asked what the Regents could do to help promote this model. Commissioner Kendell said the most logical starting point for higher education is recommendation #4, increasing the capacity of our colleges of education to produce more teachers. He noted public education will own this model; higher education can be and should be supportive.

Regent Cannon said the report offered great possibilities. Some of her concerns were that this model utilizes the schools year-round. Many of the schools would have to be retrofitted to handle year-round classes. Additional transportation costs would be required. This would be convenient for many male teachers and would likely attract more of them into the profession. Conversely, many female teachers prefer the nine-month schedule and like being home when their children get home from school. High school is more difficult; there is no successful year-round model for a high school anywhere in the United States. There are other issues, such as the behavior of high school students and truancy, for example. She asked if teachers would still be attracted to the higher salaries when they realize they were at the expense of longer hours. Some K-12 teachers have remarked that the report did not address level of compensation. Why should public school teachers be working all year for only slightly higher salaries than teachers in other states can make for working only nine months?

Regent Cannon stated the State Board of Education had developed a program called ProExcel to address the needs and concerns of the teacher shortage. This program has been presented to the Legislature. Although it was not adopted this year, the SBE hopes legislators will give the program further consideration in the future.

Dr. Sperry said the report endorsed ProExcel, particularly differentiated salaries for hard-to-fill positions. Additionally, recommendation #2 addressed the need to increase teacher salaries. A special report was prepared by Workforce Services comparing various occupations requiring similar training and background in different comparative groups. The economists on the task force felt that Utah averages should be used, given the fact that most teachers will teach within an 80-mile radius of where they received their teacher preparation. WFS is willing to continue to monitor that issue on an annual basis.

Regent Haws pointed out the task force's recommended model allows for freedom of choice. Some teachers and students would prefer to begin the day earlier, while others feel more comfortable and alert when they can get a later start. The longer day would also assure the parents that their children would not be home alone so long while the parents are at work. Commissioner Kendell noted the school schedule system is driven by business schedules and clocks.

President Sederburg cautioned officials to be careful not to apply this model too quickly to higher education. Teachers receive additional compensation for a summer contract.

Commissioner Kendell thanked Dr. Sperry and Mr. Cox for the report and for their efforts with the task force. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Joyce Cottrell CPS, Executive Secretary

Date Approved

May 31, 2007

MEMORANDUM

To: State Board of Regents

From: Richard E. Kendell

Subject: <u>Report on Utah College of Applied Technology's Role and Mission</u>

At the conclusion of the Strategic Planning Meeting on April 19, Regent Sinclair requested that President Brems be allowed some time to educate the Regents on the role and mission of the Utah College of Applied Technology.

President Brems will make an oral presentation and respond to questions.

Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner

REK:jc