

# Utah State Building Board



## MEETING

October 5, 2011

---

## **MINUTES**

### **Utah State Building Board Members in Attendance:**

N. George Daines, Chair  
Sheila Gelman  
Jeff Nielson  
David Fitzsimmons  
Ned Carnahan  
Gordon Snow  
Chip Nelson  
Ron Bigelow, Ex-Officio

### **DFCM and Guests in Attendance:**

Lynn Hinrichs	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Cee Cee Niederhauser	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kurt Baxter	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
John Nichols	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Tom Shaw	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Denise Austin	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
John Harrington	DFCM/Energy
Bianca Shama	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Chiarina Glead	Attorney General's Office/DFCM
Alan Bachman	Attorney General's Office/DFCM
Sal Petilos	Department of Administrative Services
Kimberlee Willette	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Rich Amon	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Mike Perez	University of Utah
Jason Perry	University of Utah
Cory Higgins	University of Utah
Chris Hill	University of Utah
Ralph Hardy	Utah Commission of Higher Education

William Sederburg	Utah Commission of Higher Education
Gregg Stauffer	Utah Commission of Higher Education
Ben Berrett	Utah State University
Sydney Peterson	Utah State University
David Cowley	Utah State University
Joe Peterson	Utah State University/CEU Campus
Stan Albrecht	Utah State University/CEU
Alyn Lunceford	Courts
Sherry Ruesch	Dixie State College
Stephen Nadauld	Dixie State College
Stan Plew	Dixie State College
Jon Gibb	Dixie State College
Clark Caras	Utah State Fair Park
Andrew Carlino	Utah State Fair Park
Dan Clark	Parks and Recreation
Emily Mellor	BNA Consulting
Anna Heywood	Reaveley Engineers & Associates
Libby Crapo	Stanley/Action Doors
Keri Hammond	EDA Architects
Thomas Brennon	EDA Architects
Tiffany Woods	BHB Consulting Engineers
Mike Buell	MHTN Architects
Robert Rolfs	UDOH
Kyle Stephens	UDAF
Leonard Blackham	UDAF
Stephen Ogilvie	UDAF
Gordon Jensen	Department of Technology Services
Tyler Brinkerhoff	Utah College of Applied Technology
Angela Oh	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Spencer Pratt	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Kevin Hansen	Weber State University
Norm Tarbox	Weber State University
Mark Halverson	Weber State University
Viron Lynch	Weber State University
Michael Benson	Southern Utah University
David F. Tanner	Southern Utah University
Dorian Page	Southern Utah University
Julie Attig	Henrikson/Butler
Burke Cartwright	EDA Architects
Russ Bachmeyer	FFKR Architects
Cynthia Cook	FFKR Architects
Scot Olson	Utah National Guard
Matt Price	Utah National Guard

Lance Davenport	Department of Public Safety
Alyn Lunceford	Utah Courts
Rob Brems	UCAT
Ron Larsen	UCAT
Gary Esplin	St. George City
Dana Miller	SWATC
Rich VanAusdal	DXATC
Clay Christensen	MATC
Richard Maughan	BATC
Michael Bouwhuis	DATC
Matthew Holland	Utah Valley University
Val Peterson	Utah Valley University
Scott Wyatt	Snow College
Ellen Parrish	VCBO Architects
David Patton	UDOH
Jay Henry	UDOH
Tom Patterson	Department of Corrections
Mike Haddon	Department of Corrections

On Wednesday, October 5, 2011 the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting in Room W30 of the East Building, Utah State Capitol Complex, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chair George Daines called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 3, AND AUGUST 17 & 18, 2011**

Chair Daines sought a motion for approval of the minutes.

**MOTION: Ned Carnahan Fitzsimmons moved to approve the meeting minutes of August 3 and August 17 & 18, 2011. The motion was seconded by Gordon Snow and passed unanimously.**

**UNIVERSITY OF UTAH DEE GLEN ATHLETIC EXPANSION (Revised Request)**

Mike Perez from the University of Utah gave the background for this project, indicating that the University previously brought this project before the Board in February, 2011 to request authorization for bonding. Bonding was approved and the University is pursuing the Athletic Expansion as a design-build project. However they have discovered that there are expectation and requirements from the Pac 12 which stipulate that the facility be larger than it is and should include elements which need to be placed in the facility. Dr. Chris Hill, Director of Athletics at the University of Utah said that the Dee Glen Athletic Expansion is one of the University's most important projects. With the new media contract there are some extensive media requirements that must be a part of this facility. In addition, an upgraded dining facility, sports medicine area and additional meetings rooms will be

required to meet their needs. The sports complex will be designed so as to be placed slightly further from the road which adds to the aesthetics of the building and value to the campus. The University is requesting to increase the project from \$20 Million to \$30 Million. This additional amount will be from a bond issued and retired from revenues from the University's Athletic Department. There will be no state funds to build or maintain this facility.

**MOTION: Sheila Gelman moved to approve the University of Utah Dee Glen Athletic Expansion (Revised Request). The motion was seconded by Ned Carnahan and passed unanimously.**

#### **RULES OF PROCEDURE**

Chair Daines reminded the Board that the Building Board's Rules of Procedure have been discussed in previous meetings. Assistant Attorney General, Alan Bachman has made a number of amendments to the Rules and they are now ready for approval. Once that takes place they will be filed for publication. The Board retains the right to reintroduce the Rules if changes need to be made in the future. Mr. Bachman said there are two authorizations needed from the Board in the motion 1) that they be allowed to file the rule for publication and 2) to file the effective notice after the comment period (30 days), assuming there are no objections from the Board or the public.

**MOTION: David Fitzsimmons moved to approve the Rules of Procedure with the two authorizations needed from the Board. The motion was seconded by Sheila Gelman and passed unanimously.**

#### **COURTS REALLOCATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS**

Alyn Lunceford from Utah Courts said they were requesting \$68,000 be reallocated from a current project (the concrete project at the Matheson Court House) to the Matheson Courts Boiler Burner Unit Replacement. This will allow them to replace both boilers in the facility. This reallocation would allow them to utilize the existing engineering and design work which has already been purchased. If they are not allowed this reallocation, then they will possibly return next year to receive funding for the additional boiler needed as an improvement project. Kurt Baxter asked if the project was officially closed out so that no future change orders would affect the balance of funds. Mr. Lunceford replied that the concrete project was not closed out at this time; however their engineer has assured them that the funds are there. These additional funds will be returned to the Contingency Fund when the concrete project is completed. Gordon Snow asked if this reallocation could wait until the concrete project was completed. Mr. Lunceford said that with all HVAC projects, heating is addressed in the summer and cooling is addressed in the winter so as to maintain a working environment in the building. If they are down to one functioning boiler in the winter it could create problems for the heating demands of the building. Mr. Snow

asked what the remaining balance would be on the project budget after the reallocation. Mr. Lunceford indicated that approximately \$28,000 will go back to the Contingency Fund. He does not anticipate any of this will be needed because there is a very well defined scope for the remainder of the project.

**MOTION: Ned Carnahan moved to approve the Courts Reallocation of Capital Improvement Funds Based upon the Expectation of Excess Funds in the Concrete Project and Adequate Reserves. The motion was seconded by Sheila Gelman and passed unanimously.**

At this point, DFCM Assistant Director, Lynn Hinrichs reminded those making presentations of the importance of staying on schedule. When the alarm is heard, it is important that the presenter wrap up his presentation and address any questions from the Board. Because the Board was ahead of schedule, presentations were delayed and other agenda items were addressed.

**❑ REQUEST TO REALLOCATE IMPROVEMENT FUNDS FOR DAS SECURITY UPGRADES**

Sal Petilos, Deputy Director for Department of Administrative Services indicated he was there to request a reallocation of \$20,000 which was originally budgeted for Security Updates in the State Office Building to be reallocated to a remodeling project currently being considered by DAS. Security upgrades were completed and already paid for with agency funds. Consequently, DAS is requesting that the \$20,000 for security upgrades be reallocated to a proposed remodeling project designed to address operational needs resulting from 1) internal program transfers, and 2) the creation of the Consolidated Budget and Accounting Group (CBA) which services the entire department. This consolidation brings together budget and accounting staff that were previously stationed on different floors to one central location. In addition it allows staff from other agencies like the Attorney General's Office assigned to DAS, be housed in the State Office Building. Funding is the critical issue for DAS -- specifically the portion of the remodeling cost that can be ascribed to the CBA. Created in May 2011, the CBA at this point has no budget of its own. Reallocating the security update funds to the remodel project will allow DAS to move forward with this remodeling project. Gordon Snow expressed concern as to why the other divisions haven't allotted part of their budgets for this shared service? Mr. Petilos said the divisions are funding their current personnel from the group. A building block has been requested for Fiscal Year 2013, however at this point the group has not sufficiently matured enough to implement the rates they will charge for their services. The issue now is creating the work space for this group. Ned Carnahan questioned the cost of the project. Mr. Petilos said the entire project would cost more than \$20,000 however; the reallocation of \$20,000 will help with the remodeling costs.

**MOTION: Chip Nelson moved to approve the Request to Reallocate Improvement**

**Funds for DAS Security Upgrades. The motion was seconded by Gordon Snow and passed unanimously.**

**☐ UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY REVOLVING LOAN FUND INCREASE**

DFCM Energy Director, John Harrington reported that on February, 2011 Utah State entered into a loan agreement with the State Facility Energy Efficiency Revolving Loan Fund to borrow money to install insulation jackets in mechanical rooms across campus. The loan amount was based on the low bid for work that had been identified by a survey. The work has been proceeding well and they anticipate lower steam consumption for the next heating season; however they have discovered that the survey did not pick up all the needs and in fact completely missed some buildings. The Board was supplied with a breakdown of the entire need indicating the original project amount based on the survey as \$362,841.60 and the estimated project total based on actual field conditions as \$557,250. The difference between the two amounts is \$194,409.00, so they would like to add another \$187,000 to the loan amount of \$398,000.00 bringing the total to \$585,000.00. There is good return on the investment and the payback period for all buildings is at 27 months.

**MOTION: Jeff Nielson moved to approve the Utah State University Revolving Loan Fund Increase. The motion was seconded by David Fitzsimmons and passed unanimously.**

Chair Daines reminded those making presentations that if further questions or additional material is requested, the Board will receive this information up until 5:00 p.m. Wednesday, October 12. Please submit your materials to CeeCee and she will circulate your information to members of the Board.

**☐ PRESENTATIONS FOR FY2013 CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT REQUESTS**

The following presentations were made during the meeting:

UDAF/UDH/DPS	Module #2 of the Unified State Lab
UDAF	William Spry Agriculture Building
Courts	Ogden Juvenile Courts
Courts	Utah County Land Banking
DNR	Parks Wasatch Mtn. SP Campground Renovation
UDC	CUCF West-1 192 Secured Housing
DFCM	Multi-Agency State Office Building II
UCAT	Overview of UCAT Priorities
SWATC	Health Science & Information Technology Building
DXATC	New Main Campus Building
MATC	Central Utah County Campus
BATC	Health Science & Technology Building

BATC	Land Banking Request
DATC	Medical Building Expansion
DATC	Land Banking Request, Morgan

At approximately 12:10 p.m. the Board members left the session in W30 of the West Building and reconvened for a lunch meeting at 12:15 p.m. in the Capitol Board Room. Casual conversation included the possible changes in boundaries for the voting districts, the weather, campground facilities, park entrance fees, vacations, and the some of the sites visited during the Building Board Tour last summer. During this meeting, Chair Daines introduced Ned Carnahan who received an assignment to research comparative statistical extracts from Applied Technology Colleges in the state concerning full time equivalent students. Mr. Carnahan reported that the more he researched the more he came to the conclusion that FTE's for Universities, Colleges and ATC do not equate very well and an accurate comparison analysis cannot be done. He visited with the presidents of DXATC, SWATC, and UCAT. The review of the two educational systems accountability data and the need to compare USHE's Headcount and FTE data with the UCAT Headcount and membership hours cannot be simply accomplished on an USHE vs. UCAT data basis. It became apparent that the basis for educational programs, credits and student enrollment varies beyond a comparison of published data similarities. The 2009 Performance Audit accomplished by the Office of the Legislative Auditor General became most useful in determining efforts to compare the two reporting systems. The audit would also be the most unbiased approach to compare systems however they reported that *"different measures colleges and ATC's use for student enrollment make comparing costs difficult."* Mr. Carnahan provided summary of each institutions mission and accountability to the Board (see attached report).

After the lunch presentation, the Board members relocated to W30 West Building to continue the FY2013 State Funded Capital Development presentations. Before this session began, Chair Daines reminded the agencies and institutions that they had until 5:00 p.m. October 19 to respond to any requests for additional information from the Board.

The following presentations were given.

Board of Regents	Overview of Higher Ed Priorities
U of U	Utility Distribution Infrastructure Replacement
WSU	New Science Lab Building
USU	Brigham City Regional Campus Academic Building
USU/CEU	Arts & Education Building-Price Campus
SUU	New Business Building
SUU	Land Banking Request
UVU	Classroom Building
Snow	Science Building Remodel

At this point in the meeting, Chair Daines excused himself to attend another meeting and appointed Gordon Snow as acting chair of the Board in his absence.

The presentations continued with:

Dixie	New General Classroom Building
Dixie	Land Acquisitions
UNG	Statewide Capital Development

After the presentations, Kurt Baxter explained the spreadsheet for the scoring process of the Capital Development rankings. Board members were informed on the expectations for the next meeting on October 26 and instructed on how the rankings could be adjusted at the meeting should they see a need.

**ADJOURNMENT** .....

**MOTION: Chair Snow moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:33 p.m. The motion was seconded by David Fitzsimmons and passed unanimously**

**For the Members of the Utah State Building Board  
A Summary of Available Information and Comparison of  
State Education Institutions Enrollment Data.**

5 October, 2011

During a meeting of the State Building Board held on August 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> the question of how to interpret and/or compare enrollment data presented by the State College's/Universities and the State Applied Technology College's was discussed.

This paper involves a review of Utah State Higher Education (USHE) enrollment Information, specifically Head count and full time equivalencies (FTE's) and the Applied Technology College (ATC) enrollment information, specifically the Membership Hours and Student Headcount.

A meeting was held with President Rich VanAusdal, Dixie Applied Technology College (DXATC, St. George, Ut.) and President Dana L. Miller, South West Applied Technology College (SWATC, Cedar City, Ut.) President VanAusdal provided resources included in this paper. President Rob Brems, Utah College of Applied Technology (UCAT, Salt Lake City, Ut.) was also instrumental in the fact finding discussion via teleconference. President Brems suggested that he be involved in the explanation of differences between two systems in a joint information meeting or teleconference with all or select Board Members, however, it was determined that any meetings should follow public meeting rules and was postponed. In discussion with Greg Buxton, it was determined that initially an informative paper should be presented to the Board.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The review of the two educational systems accountability data and the need to compare USHE's Headcount and FTE data and the UCAT Headcount and Membership hours cannot be simply accomplished on an USHE vs. UCAT data basis. It became apparent that the basis for educational programs, credits and student enrollment varies beyond a comparison of published data similarities.

Representatives from USHE were not interviewed for their perspective of the accountability issues. It was thought that the ATC representatives would logically be the first to discuss the differences. For this reason the Summary of Key

Differences provided by DXATC may have a slight bias towards the ATC's perspective. For this review purpose the Summary Key Differences between USHE and UCAT appeared to be accurate and informative.

The 2009 Performance Audit accomplished by the Office of the Legislative Auditor General became most useful in determining efforts to compare the two reporting systems. The audit would also be the most unbiased approach to compare systems.

Apparently the attempts by the Legislative Auditor General's office to provide a comparison model for a requested cost audit in 2009 proved difficult and somewhat inadequate.

*“Different measures colleges and ATCs use for student enrollment make comparing costs difficult.” (Audit 2009)*

The audit did attempt to correlate the two reporting systems by initiating a “Clock Hour” comparison. Difficulty in the comparison attempt proved problematic.

To further support the Board Members understanding of the reporting information differences provided by UCAT and USHE a summary of each institutions mission and accountability is presented.

**NOTE:**

- UCAT space utilization information was not included in this review.
- The Interrelationship between Secondary (High School) and Post-Secondary training programs was not included in this review
- USHE annual data reports for Headcount and FTE were not included in this review.

## **Provided Summary of Key Differences between Higher Education and Accountability Measures and UCAT's Mission and Accountability Measures:**

### **USHE INSTITUTIONS**

**Mission:** To focus most of their efforts on providing Associate, Bachelors, and Advanced Degrees. Some institutions do provide certificate training that requires less than a degree, but these certificate programs would not be considered to be their major focus. As the one remaining community college in the state, Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) is the primary provider of certificate training in the USHE system.

**Credit and Non-credit:** USHE programs are allowed to offer credit for all training. They (especially SLCC) do some non-credit Career Technical Education (CTE) training, but most is offered for credit.

### **Accountability Measures:**

- **Headcount:** The total number of students enrolled for training of any type and any length.
- **Full-time Equivalent (FTE):** The total number of student credit hours divided by 30 to provide an annual FTE count. Thirty is used because an average full load for a student is 15 credits per semester. The fiscal year is comprised of two semesters with summer semester being funded separately.
- **Numbers of students enrolled in degree programs:** Total number enrolled in degree programs at the time of the 3<sup>rd</sup> week report for in Fall Semester.
- **Numbers of Certificates and Degrees Offered:** Total students receiving degrees or certificates at the end of the school year.
- **Placement:** Some USHE institutions do some follow-up of students being placed on jobs. Some do not.
- **How credit for a class is determined (example for most institutions):**
  - **Lecture classes:** One (1) 50-Minute class = 1 credit (outside study expected)
  - **Lab classes:** Two (2) 50-minute lab classes = 1 credit
  - **On Job Training (OJT) and/or internship or many clinical cases:** Three (3) 50-minute periods = 1 credit.

**Summary:** USHE Institutions focus on longer training which often requires quite rigid program requirements (sequences, pre-requisites, outside study, general education requirements, etc.) Students enroll for a total “College Life” experience including activities, sports, social activities, etc. Most spend several years in pursuit of the chosen degree. (VanAusdal 2011)

## **UCAT INSTITUTIONS**

**Mission:** The Utah College of Applied Technology provides CTE training. The focus on short term, 2-year or less, certificate training. Training is designed to meet current employment needs in each of the eight UCAT regions. (These include Bridgerland, Davis, Dixie, Mountainland, Ogden-Weber, Southwest, Toole and Uintah Basin.) The majority of the training is done by programs that require 1,500 hours or less instruction. A high emphasis is placed on short-term training that is specifically designed to meet needs of local employers. Every program has an employer advisory committee which helps to design the program and provide on-going review of instruction to keep the training relevant and current with business and industry needs.

**Credit & non-credit:** UCAT does not offer credit. With the Board of Regents new policy (R409), students achieving a certificate of 900 hours or greater have the option to receive 30 college credits at a regional partner USHE institution to count toward an Associate of Applied Science Degree at that institution.

### **Accountability Measures:**

- **Headcount:** The number of students enrolled in CTE training of any type and any length.
- **Student Membership Hours:** The total number of 60 minute periods that student enrolls and receives training at a UCAT institution.
- **Number of students enrolled in certificate programs:** Total number of students in certificate training at any one point in time. Most programs run on a year-round basis. Most are open-entry and open-exit. Students work at his/her own pace. The UCAT enrollment and tracking system allows for data on numbers of students enrolled in certificates to be tracked at any given point in time. Reports are published quarterly.
- **Number of certificates completed:** Total number of students completing a certificate.

- Placement: Number (percentage for each program) of students being placed on jobs or continuing their training in a related program at another institution.
- How hours are counted for a class: Advisory Committees work with instructors and administrators to create the training program. The number of hours for each area or module is determined. Total hour requirement for each certificate is then determined. All training is specific to the needs identified by business and industry to prepare the student for certification, licensure, and for employment.

**Summary:** UCAT institutions focus on shorter training. The training is very flexible and is determined by employer needs. Students only register for specific CTE training rather than the longer programs offered by USHE institutions. Sports, student activities, general education, and “college-life” experience are not emphasized. Preparation for a job and a career drives all decisions regarding student training and student support services provided by UCAT. (VanAusdal 2011)

**UCAT PUBLISHED ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS:**

The **October 2010 UCAT Annual Report** was obtained. It provides reported information for each regional ATC.

The publication listed annual UCAT totals;

FY 2010 Program Enrollment	Membership Hrs.	Student Headcount
Secondary Students	1,667,843	9,717
Postsecondary students	4,742,795	32,807
Total	6,420,638	42,542
FY 2010 Custom Fit Enrollment	Training Hrs.	Headcount (Trainees)
Custom Fit Trainees	271,020	16,968

The history tables attached as Membership (Exhibit “A”), Headcount (Exhibit “B”) and Training Programs (Exhibit “C”) provide data from all UCAT Institutions from 2006 to 2010. (Annual Report 2009)

These tables give the published accounting for each regional institution and a picture of their adjustable role in providing regional programs. It will be recognized that the training offered is intended to be adjustable and adaptable to regional job needs which is far different from traditional degree colleges and universities.

The regional ATC's apparently provide only the programs determined to be needed in the region and adjust the offerings to the demand. This adaptability adds to the economy of UCAT Training and the type/utilization of facilities.

A comparison can be made of student classwork (Membership Hours) activity and the number and type of programs offered by regional ATC is individually reported by year in the exhibits. It could be assumed that the activity relates directly to the regional training needs. The most prevalent training programs could reflect the ATC's facility needs.

#### **ACCOUNTABILITY COMPARISON DIFFICULTY**

The **November 2009 Performance Audit of Career and Technical Education Costs** by the Legislative Auditor General's office provided a study requested by the Legislature comparing the cost of career and technical education at Utah's ATC's and Two year colleges.

A review of the November 2009 Performance Audit report by the Office of the Legislative Auditor General revealed that their task to compare the two educational institutions was difficult because of the two distinctly different missions.

In this report a section is entitled ATCs and College Use Different Measures of Student instruction. The paragraph differentiates the measure of instructional activity. It reads:

*"As mentioned, the ATCs and colleges use different measures of student instructional activity. At ATCs, courses are self-paced and are taught on an open-entry/open exit basis. As a result, ATCs measure student activity in terms of time students are scheduled to receive instruction, or membership hours. In contrast, most college instruction is scheduled for set time periods throughout the academic calendar. As degree-granting institutions, colleges measure student activity in terms of credit hours for courses taken." (Audit 2009)*

As stated in a 2009 letter included in the audit from the Chairman of the board of Trustees to the Legislative Auditor General

*“The general conclusion is that colleges and ATCs are different – use different measures of student instruction, have different direct costs, have different overhead costs, etc. ... both systems are vital to the states workforce and economy. In short the systems are different because they serve different missions.” (UCAT Letter 2009)*

Also stated in an additional 2009 letter included in the audit from the State Board of Regents to the Legislative Auditor

*“We appreciate the difficulty of the task in preparing a report that attempts to walk between the traditional USHE system (hours/credit) and the ATC job training model (non-credit, open entry/exit). It is a very difficult task to achieve since the two systems are rather inherently incompatible...” (USHE Letter 2009)*

The audit did attempt to correlate the two reporting systems by initiating a “Clock Hour” comparison. Difficulty in the comparison attempt proved problematic.

*“During the 1995 Audit of applied technology education, we found too many problems presented by the use of a single conversion factor.” (Audit 2009, Pg. 3)*

*“The direct cost per clock hour is found by the number of hours in which students are scheduled to be in class.” (Audit 2009, Pg. 7)*

*“Different measures colleges and ATCs use for student enrollment make comparing costs difficult.” (Audit 2009, Pg. 20)*

Apparently attempts to find a satisfactory conversion factor by the Legislative Auditor proved inadequate. The study did utilize the “Clock Hour” conversion which required adjustments for most individual programs for their audit report needs. This individual conversion must have been time consuming.

The primary reason for the Legislature’s creation the UCAT system of education was to create a system that was different from the rigid USHE credit based programs. It was to establish a learning institution that would be flexible and adaptable for the community’s needs. From what was gathered from discussions, the ATC’s were intended to be different. They were charged with the responsibility to produce regional trailing programs in a short period of time and get students into the workplace.

## REFERENCES:

1. VanAusdal, Rich. Summary of Key Differences between Higher Education and Accountability Measures and UCAT's Mission and Accountability Measures. President, DXATC, 2011.
2. Informal discussion including President Brems, President VanAusdal, President Miller and Board Member Ned Carnahan. 4 September, 2011.
3. Utah College of Applied Technology, Annual Report, October 2010
4. A Performance Audit of Career and Technical Education Costs, Office of the Auditor General, November 2009.
5. UCAT Letter, Letter attached to the Audit to: John Schaff, Legislative Auditor General, Dated November 5, 2009 from Thomas E. Bingham, Chair, Utah College of Applied Technology, Board of Trustees.
6. USHE Letter, Response letter attached to the Audit to: John Schaff, Legislative Auditor General, Dated November 4, 2009 from Utah System of Higher Education.

**For the Members of the Utah State Building Board  
A Summary of Available Information and Comparison of  
State Education Institutions Enrollment Data.**

5 October, 2011

During a meeting of the State Building Board held on August 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> the question of how to interpret and/or compare enrollment data presented by the State College's/Universities and the State Applied Technology College's was discussed.

This paper involves a review of Utah State Higher Education (USHE) enrollment Information, specifically Head count and full time equivalencies (FTE's) and the Applied Technology College (ATC) enrollment information, specifically the Membership Hours and Student Headcount.

A meeting was held with President Rich VanAusdal, Dixie Applied Technology College (DXATC, St. George, Ut.) and President Dana L. Miller, South West Applied Technology College (SWATC, Cedar City, Ut.) President VanAusdal provided resources included in this paper. President Rob Brems, Utah College of Applied Technology (UCAT, Salt Lake City, Ut.) was also instrumental in the fact finding discussion via teleconference. President Brems suggested that he be involved in the explanation of differences between two systems in a joint information meeting or teleconference with all or select Board Members, however, it was determined that any meetings should follow public meeting rules and was postponed. In discussion with Greg Buxton, it was determined that initially an informative paper should be presented to the Board.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The review of the two educational systems accountability data and the need to compare USHE's Headcount and FTE data and the UCAT Headcount and Membership hours cannot be simply accomplished on an USHE vs. UCAT data basis. It became apparent that the basis for educational programs, credits and student enrollment varies beyond a comparison of published data similarities.

Representatives from USHE were not interviewed for their perspective of the accountability issues. It was thought that the ATC representatives would logically be the first to discuss the differences. For this reason the Summary of Key

Differences provided by DXATC may have a slight bias towards the ATC's perspective. For this review purpose the Summary Key Differences between USHE and UCAT appeared to be accurate and informative.

The 2009 Performance Audit accomplished by the Office of the Legislative Auditor General became most useful in determining efforts to compare the two reporting systems. The audit would also be the most unbiased approach to compare systems.

Apparently the attempts by the Legislative Auditor General's office to provide a comparison model for a requested cost audit in 2009 proved difficult and somewhat inadequate.

*“Different measures colleges and ATCs use for student enrollment make comparing costs difficult.” (Audit 2009)*

The audit did attempt to correlate the two reporting systems by initiating a “Clock Hour” comparison. Difficulty in the comparison attempt proved problematic.

To further support the Board Members understanding of the reporting information differences provided by UCAT and USHE a summary of each institutions mission and accountability is presented.

**NOTE:**

- UCAT space utilization information was not included in this review.
- The Interrelationship between Secondary (High School) and Post-Secondary training programs was not included in this review
- USHE annual data reports for Headcount and FTE were not included in this review.

## **Provided Summary of Key Differences between Higher Education and Accountability Measures and UCAT's Mission and Accountability Measures:**

### **USHE INSTITUTIONS**

**Mission:** To focus most of their efforts on providing Associate, Bachelors, and Advanced Degrees. Some institutions do provide certificate training that requires less than a degree, but these certificate programs would not be considered to be their major focus. As the one remaining community college in the state, Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) is the primary provider of certificate training in the USHE system.

**Credit and Non-credit:** USHE programs are allowed to offer credit for all training. They (especially SLCC) do some non-credit Career Technical Education (CTE) training, but most is offered for credit.

#### **Accountability Measures:**

- **Headcount:** The total number of students enrolled for training of any type and any length.
- **Full-time Equivalent (FTE):** The total number of student credit hours divided by 30 to provide an annual FTE count. Thirty is used because an average full load for a student is 15 credits per semester. The fiscal year is comprised of two semesters with summer semester being funded separately.
- **Numbers of students enrolled in degree programs:** Total number enrolled in degree programs at the time of the 3<sup>rd</sup> week report for in Fall Semester.
- **Numbers of Certificates and Degrees Offered:** Total students receiving degrees or certificates at the end of the school year.
- **Placement:** Some USHE institutions do some follow-up of students being placed on jobs. Some do not.
- **How credit for a class is determined (example for most institutions):**
  - **Lecture classes:** One (1) 50-Minute class = 1 credit (outside study expected)
  - **Lab classes:** Two (2) 50-minute lab classes = 1 credit
  - **On Job Training (OJT) and/or internship or many clinical cases:** Three (3) 50-minute periods = 1 credit.

**Summary:** USHE Institutions focus on longer training which often requires quite rigid program requirements (sequences, pre-requisites, outside study, general education requirements, etc.) Students enroll for a total “College Life” experience including activities, sports, social activities, etc. Most spend several years in pursuit of the chosen degree. (VanAusdal 2011)

## **UCAT INSTITUTIONS**

**Mission:** The Utah College of Applied Technology provides CTE training. The focus on short term, 2-year or less, certificate training. Training is designed to meet current employment needs in each of the eight UCAT regions. (These include Bridgerland, Davis, Dixie, Mountainland, Ogden-Weber, Southwest, Toole and Uintah Basin.) The majority of the training is done by programs that require 1,500 hours or less instruction. A high emphasis is placed on short-term training that is specifically designed to meet needs of local employers. Every program has an employer advisory committee which helps to design the program and provide on-going review of instruction to keep the training relevant and current with business and industry needs.

**Credit & non-credit:** UCAT does not offer credit. With the Board of Regents new policy (R409), students achieving a certificate of 900 hours or greater have the option to receive 30 college credits at a regional partner USHE institution to count toward an Associate of Applied Science Degree at that institution.

### **Accountability Measures:**

- **Headcount:** The number of students enrolled in CTE training of any type and any length.
- **Student Membership Hours:** The total number of 60 minute periods that student enrolls and receives training at a UCAT institution.
- **Number of students enrolled in certificate programs:** Total number of students in certificate training at any one point in time. Most programs run on a year-round basis. Most are open-entry and open-exit. Students work at his/her own pace. The UCAT enrollment and tracking system allows for data on numbers of students enrolled in certificates to be tracked at any given point in time. Reports are published quarterly.
- **Number of certificates completed:** Total number of students completing a certificate.

- Placement: Number (percentage for each program) of students being placed on jobs or continuing their training in a related program at another institution.
- How hours are counted for a class: Advisory Committees work with instructors and administrators to create the training program. The number of hours for each area or module is determined. Total hour requirement for each certificate is then determined. All training is specific to the needs identified by business and industry to prepare the student for certification, licensure, and for employment.

**Summary:** UCAT institutions focus on shorter training. The training is very flexible and is determined by employer needs. Students only register for specific CTE training rather than the longer programs offered by USHE institutions. Sports, student activities, general education, and “college-life” experience are not emphasized. Preparation for a job and a career drives all decisions regarding student training and student support services provided by UCAT. (VanAusdal 2011)

**UCAT PUBLISHED ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS:**

The **October 2010 UCAT Annual Report** was obtained. It provides reported information for each regional ATC.

The publication listed annual UCAT totals;

FY 2010 Program Enrollment	Membership Hrs.	Student Headcount
Secondary Students	1,667,843	9,717
Postsecondary students	4,742,795	32,807
Total	6,420,638	42,542
FY 2010 Custom Fit Enrollment	Training Hrs.	Headcount (Trainees)
Custom Fit Trainees	271,020	16,968

The history tables attached as Membership (Exhibit “A”), Headcount (Exhibit “B”) and Training Programs (Exhibit “C”) provide data from all UCAT Institutions from 2006 to 2010. (Annual Report 2009)

These tables give the published accounting for each regional institution and a picture of their adjustable role in providing regional programs. It will be recognized that the training offered is intended to be adjustable and adaptable to regional job needs which is far different from traditional degree colleges and universities.

The regional ATC's apparently provide only the programs determined to be needed in the region and adjust the offerings to the demand. This adaptability adds to the economy of UCAT Training and the type/utilization of facilities.

A comparison can be made of student classwork (Membership Hours) activity and the number and type of programs offered by regional ATC is individually reported by year in the exhibits. It could be assumed that the activity relates directly to the regional training needs. The most prevalent training programs could reflect the ATC's facility needs.

#### **ACCOUNTABILITY COMPARISON DIFFICULTY**

The **November 2009 Performance Audit of Career and Technical Education Costs** by the Legislative Auditor General's office provided a study requested by the Legislature comparing the cost of career and technical education at Utah's ATC's and Two year colleges.

A review of the November 2009 Performance Audit report by the Office of the Legislative Auditor General revealed that their task to compare the two educational institutions was difficult because of the two distinctly different missions.

In this report a section is entitled ATCs and College Use Different Measures of Student instruction. The paragraph differentiates the measure of instructional activity. It reads:

*"As mentioned, the ATCs and colleges use different measures of student instructional activity. At ATCs, courses are self-paced and are taught on an open-entry/open exit basis. As a result, ATCs measure student activity in terms of time students are scheduled to receive instruction, or membership hours. In contrast, most college instruction is scheduled for set time periods throughout the academic calendar. As degree-granting institutions, colleges measure student activity in terms of credit hours for courses taken." (Audit 2009)*

As stated in a 2009 letter included in the audit from the Chairman of the board of Trustees to the Legislative Auditor General

*“The general conclusion is that colleges and ATCs are different – use different measures of student instruction, have different direct costs, have different overhead costs, etc. ... both systems are vital to the states workforce and economy. In short the systems are different because they serve different missions.” (UCAT Letter 2009)*

Also stated in an additional 2009 letter included in the audit from the State Board of Regents to the Legislative Auditor

*“We appreciate the difficulty of the task in preparing a report that attempts to walk between the traditional USHE system (hours/credit) and the ATC job training model (non-credit, open entry/exit). It is a very difficult task to achieve since the two systems are rather inherently incompatible...” (USHE Letter 2009)*

The audit did attempt to correlate the two reporting systems by initiating a “Clock Hour” comparison. Difficulty in the comparison attempt proved problematic.

*“During the 1995 Audit of applied technology education, we found too many problems presented by the use of a single conversion factor.” (Audit 2009, Pg. 3)*

*“The direct cost per clock hour is found by the number of hours in which students are scheduled to be in class.” (Audit 2009, Pg. 7)*

*“Different measures colleges and ATCs use for student enrollment make comparing costs difficult.” (Audit 2009, Pg. 20)*

Apparently attempts to find a satisfactory conversion factor by the Legislative Auditor proved inadequate. The study did utilize the “Clock Hour” conversion which required adjustments for most individual programs for their audit report needs. This individual conversion must have been time consuming.

The primary reason for the Legislature’s creation the UCAT system of education was to create a system that was different from the rigid USHE credit based programs. It was to establish a learning institution that would be flexible and adaptable for the community’s needs. From what was gathered from discussions, the ATC’s were intended to be different. They were charged with the responsibility to produce regional trailing programs in a short period of time and get students into the workplace.

## REFERENCES:

1. VanAusdal, Rich. Summary of Key Differences between Higher Education and Accountability Measures and UCAT's Mission and Accountability Measures. President, DXATC, 2011.
2. Informal discussion including President Brems, President VanAusdal, President Miller and Board Member Ned Carnahan. 4 September, 2011.
3. Utah College of Applied Technology, Annual Report, October 2010
4. A Performance Audit of Career and Technical Education Costs, Office of the Auditor General, November 2009.
5. UCAT Letter, Letter attached to the Audit to: John Schaff, Legislative Auditor General, Dated November 5, 2009 from Thomas E. Bingham, Chair, Utah College of Applied Technology, Board of Trustees.
6. USHE Letter, Response letter attached to the Audit to: John Schaff, Legislative Auditor General, Dated November 4, 2009 from Utah System of Higher Education.