

OGDEN-WEBER APPLIED TECHNOLOGY COLLEGE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

February 24, 2011

Harold W Ritchey Board Room

4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ruth Brockman	Business/Industry
Barney Chapman	WSU Board of Trustees
Sharilyn Gerber	Weber County School Board
Jeff Harris	Ogden School Board
Douglas J. Holmes, Chair	Business/Industry
Steve Moore	Business/Industry
Brent Richardson	Business/Industry
Frank Ruiz	Business/Industry
Joyce Wilson	Ogden/Weber School Boards

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Lloyd McCaffrey, Vice Chair	Business/Industry
-----------------------------	-------------------

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Collette Mercier	Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College
------------------	--

GUESTS

Tyler Call	Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College
Jim Taggart	Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College
Randy Hodges	Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College
Tina Smith	Recording Secretary

The Board of Directors of the Ogden-Weber Applied Technology College met on Thursday, February 24, 2011, at 4:00 p.m. in the C. Brent Wallis Student Services Building, Harold W Ritchey Board Room. The meeting was conducted by Douglas Holmes, chair. The agenda proceeded as follows:

Mr. Holmes noted that Lloyd McCaffrey had asked to be excused from the meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD JANUARY 27, 2011

Mr. Holmes noted that the schedule of events for the college's 40th anniversary celebration and grand opening of the Barker Family Health Technology Building is included in the Information/Discussion section of the board booklet. He noted that the UCAT Board is scheduled to meet on the campus on June 16 and asked if any of the events will impact the college's board meeting. President Mercier stated that they would not.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held January 27, 2011, was made by Joyce Wilson, seconded by Sharilyn Gerber, and carried unanimously.

2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Referencing the Purchase Requisition Approval memo, Mr. Holmes asked if the items purchased are for the health building; they are. President Mercier explained that the items were purchased from the Agency Management Account which is being used for all health building-related items.

A motion to approve the Consent Calendar as presented was made by Brent Richardson, seconded by Sharilyn Gerber, and carried unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED BUDGET MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Call reviewed the budget modifications, noting that revenues are not being increased or decreased. The college is requesting shifts within the budget.

Operating Revenues

- Bookstore increased its sales projections by \$10,000.
- The Children's School decreased its sales projections by \$25,000.

Operating Expenses

- The Bookstore decreased Cost of Goods Sold by \$5,000.
- Salaries and Employee Benefits are being decreased by \$35,000, and Capital Expense is being increased by \$5,000. The General Expense account is being increased by \$121,000 as a result of increases in the Pell grant budget. Demand was higher than initially anticipated.
- Depreciation is being decreased by \$75,000 because original estimates were overstated. Mr. Call explained that the college used to have quite a few items with a value of less than \$5,000 on the depreciation schedule. When the Property Control policy was changed, items under the \$5,000 threshold were no

longer included on the depreciation schedule. The college is still in the process of removing some of these items from its books.

Non-operating Revenues

- Federal Grant projections are up by \$97,000 due to increased demand for Pell.
- Investment income projections decreased by \$6,000 because interest rates remain low.

A motion to approve the budget modifications as presented was made by Steve Moore, seconded by Frank Ruiz, and carried unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED POLICIES – FIRST READING

Family and Medical Leave: Mr. Call explained that this is a current policy that was revised to ensure it is in compliance with changes in the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

Changes include:

- Page 13 of the board booklet, number 2, Policy: Use bullets to format some of the information to make it easier to read. Added the last two bullets to address military leave entitlements as required by law.
- Page 14 of the board booklet, number 3, Definitions, section 3.5, Next of kin to the employee: Added a definition for next of kin (taken directly from the FMLA).
- Page 15 of the board booklet, section 3.6, Qualifying exigencies: Added a definition of qualifying exigencies (taken directly from the FMLA).
- Page 15 of the board booklet, number 4, References: Added the updated calendar year to the FMLA reference.
- Page 17 of the board booklet, section 1.1.5, Military Family Leave Entitlements: Added new section to address entitlements per FMLA.
- Page 21, Request for Leave of Absence Form: Added “Military FMLA Entitlements” to the “Type of Leave” section.

Mr. Holmes noted that the definition for “next of kin” does not include a reference to children. Mr. Call stated that the wording was taken directly from the FMLA; he will verify the language.

A motion to approve the policy—noting the absence of children from the definition of “next of kin”—on first reading was made by Brent Richardson, seconded by Joyce Wilson, and carried unanimously.

School District Fee Waivers: Mr. Call explained that this is a current policy that was updated to reflect current processes, practices, and terminology. Changes include:

Page 23 of the board booklet, number 2, Policy: Replaced “materials usage fee” with “annual high school fee” (current terminology).

Page 24 of the board booklet, number 1: Clarified the process for requesting a fee waiver. Mr. Moore raised the issue of why the word “must” is used instead of “shall” in the sentence which reads, “The letter must be printed on high school or district letterhead...” He noted for most legal documents, the word “shall” is used because it makes actions compulsory. Mr. Call will verify the language used in this section.

A motion to approve the School District Fee Waivers policy on first reading with the caveat that the usage of must/shall be verified was made by Ruth Brockman, seconded by Brent Richardson, and carried unanimously.

5. REPORT ON ANNUAL EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

Mr. Taggart explained that programs are evaluated annually during the fall. In September 2010, 110 employers evaluated each program area, and the 2009 vs. 2010 summary data was included in the board booklet. There were a couple of areas where the score decreased from 2009 to 2010:

1. Admission requirements, length, and cost: The college was marked down because some programs do not have reading level requirements.
2. Curriculum: As part of accreditation through the Council on Occupational Education, the college must integrate health, safety, and fire prevention into its curriculum. Employers were asked to note if this item was missing from any program curriculum so the college could incorporate it prior to the reaffirmation site visit.

Mr. Taggart explained that the college has a program of continuous improvement starting with the annual evaluation. Employers identify areas that need improvement and prioritize capital equipment needs. This information drives the three-year plans developed and approved by each employer team.

Mr. Taggart provided members with a copy of the questions from the program evaluation form. If an employer marks a question as being “neutral,” the college follows up to find out why.

In addition, as a component of the three-year plan, employers are given a progress report on recommendations they made the previous year. They are also asked for feedback on market influences.

As a matter of information, the board is provided with a synopsis of the employer team meetings each month.

Page 26 of the board booklet contains a list of employers who participated in the evaluation.

Mr. Holmes asked if all programs were evaluated; they were.

Mr. Ruiz approved of the questions the employers were asked, especially the one regarding the number of entry-level employees they planned to hire.

Ms. Brockman asked if the college saw a large variation in its 4 vs. 5 scores—a 5 is generally a loyalty marker. Mr. Taggart indicated that he would need to review the data at the program level to see any fluctuations; the board is provided with aggregate data. The college was looking at general trending. Ms. Brockman stated that it is beneficial to look at the “top box” as it is a gauge of how excited the responder is feeling. Mr. Taggart stated that the college could look at this data point in the future.

Mr. Taggart noted that 2010 is the last year that the college will include a question in the survey regarding health program facilities as the new health building will be completed in 2011.

Mr. Holmes asked if Mr. Taggart will separate the scores into 4s and 5s next year; Mr. Taggart said he would. Mr. Richardson noted there are some evaluative questions that can be used to determine how a person is likely to score a question. Mr. Taggart indicated that the college can look at providing more explanation on what each score means, e.g., a 5 means that no changes are needed. Mr. Holmes noted that having different individuals provide feedback each year will affect the scores since they will score differently.

6. TECH COLLEGE LOGO

President Mercier related that the logo has not been finalized at this time. The Marketing Department is working on a couple of designs, and a final logo will be presented in March.

7. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

Members did not have any questions about the Information/Discussion items.

8. UCAT BOARD OF TRUSTEES' REPORT

Mr. Homes related that the UCAT Board has not met since the Ogden-Weber board met in January.

9. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Mercier reported on the following items:

- The college's Career Fair is scheduled for March 1, 2011, from 2:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. Time has been reserved for college students to meet with employers (2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.) before the event is opened to the general public. The Student Success Center has been providing training on resume preparation, dressing for success, interviewing, etc.

Mr. Holmes asked about the number of employers participating, and President Mercier stated that approximately 60 employers have signed up and will be housed in both the Union and Multi-purpose Buildings.

- Legislative update: The state has \$263 million in new revenue but has a structural imbalance of \$313 million. As a result, there will still be some budget reductions but not as severe as first anticipated. The Executive Appropriations Committee is meeting tonight to develop budget recommendations and discuss how it might restore some of the funding to the budgets if the opportunity arises. It appears that UCAT would be first to receive any restored funds, followed by the Utah System of Higher Education and then the Utah Education Network.

Ms. Gerber had heard rumors that the legislature is looking at having the tech colleges take over the adult education function. President Mercier stated that she has heard nothing about this issue.

President Mercier indicated that there was quite a bit of discussion about return on investment (ROI) in education, especially in higher education, during the session. The legislature is interested in considering ROI when determining funding allocations. The issue is how ROI will be defined, calculated, etc.

Mr. Holmes noted that some individuals feel that the purpose of a college degree is to help an individual get a job. However, a college education has other benefits. Mr. Ruiz agreed that the difficulty lies in defining ROI, e.g., how can one compare a law school, medical school, or business school? He also asked how athletics would be factored in as they affect ROI as well.

Mr. Holmes raised the question of who is driving the “2020 Plan.” President Mercier stated that the plan started at the national level based on the question of what kind of education is needed in order to drive the economy and nation. Other nations have higher completion rates and credentials. Completion is an important component of the ROI discussion. The legislature is interested in completion rates and how long it takes to earn a degree. The question is how long the state should support a person in his or her educational quest. President Mercier indicated that the state funds educational institutions based on growth rather than completion. The legislature realizes it is part of the problem and may be ready to look at other factors.

Mr. Richardson stated that UCAT should be funded on outcomes. President Mercier explained that students are encouraged to complete quickly so that they can find employment; however, this impacts membership hours. This is a difficult balance to maintain. The college has changed its emphasis and is pushing employees to focus on completion, with the intent that placement and membership hours will follow.

Mr. Holmes said there isn’t enough interest in math and science, and Mr. Ruiz commented that the districts can influence curriculum. Mr. Richardson clarified that the districts have very little influence on curriculum—the state dictates what is to be taught. He noted that this is why the high schools are experiencing so many difficulties in providing students with enough free time to attend classes at the tech colleges. Ms. Gerber noted that the elementary schools were emphasizing math and science more.

10. NEXT MEETING

The Board of Directors is scheduled to meet on Thursday, March 24, 2011, at 4:00 p.m. in the C. Brent Wallis Student Services Building, Harold W Ritchey Board Room. Mr. Holmes noted that he will not be in attendance. Mr. Moore indicated he would also need to be excused.

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

H:BOARD:MIN:2011:FEB'24.11