

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA  
HELD AT  
270 Washington St., S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia  
January 11 and 12, 2005**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, January 11 and Wednesday, January 12, 2005, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Joel O. Wooten, Jr., called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 11, 2005. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Wooten, were Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Allan Vigil.

On behalf of the Board of Regents, Chair Wooten welcomed the Chancellor back from an extended recovery after he and his wife, Susan, were in a car accident.

Chancellor Meredith thanked the Regents for their cards, letters, and telephone calls of concern and said that he was very glad to be back.

Chair Wooten announced that the Board meeting was being Webcast and asked that all attendees turn off their cell phones, PDAs, etc.

**INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

Chair Wooten called upon the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, to introduce some special guests at this meeting.

Mr. Daniel greeted the Regents and noted that earlier that day, the key legislative leaders had been announced. He introduced Senator Seth Harp, Chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee. Senator Harp of Midland, Georgia, has previously served as Vice Chair of that committee. He has a pharmacy degree from Auburn University and a law degree from Mercer University. He served as a marine in the Vietnam War and later served as a lawyer for the marines. He and his wife, Linda, have two grown children, and he is very active in his community and church. Next, Mr. Daniel introduced Representative Bill Hembree, Chair of the Higher Education Committee of the Georgia House of Representatives. Representative Hembree is an insurance agent from Douglasville who has previously served on the Higher Education Committee as the ranking Republican member. He was

educated in the Douglas County public schools. He received his marketing degrees from Johnson & Wales University in Providence, Rhode Island, and the University of Oslo in conjunction with the University of Pittsburgh and his master's degree from the University of Glasgow in Scotland. Representative Hembree and his wife, Beth, have three children ages four to nine. Mr. Daniel welcomed Senator Harp and Representative Hembree and asked them to make some remarks to the Board.

Senator Harp greeted the Regents. He said that although his alma mater is Auburn University, he pledges to the University System of Georgia his undying support and that he will do his best to see the System weathers well the funding battle. He said that he was glad to see the Chancellor is back at work because the legislature needs his guidance and help. He commended the Board on its vital role in making higher education a level playing field in the State of Georgia and ensuring there is quality higher education available to any child in Georgia who wants to pursue it. The Senate Higher Education Committee stands ready to help the Board of Regents in all such efforts, he said in closing.

Representative Hembree thanked the Regents for allowing him to visit and speak at this meeting. He said that it is an honor to chair the Higher Education Committee of the Georgia House of Representatives. He has served in the General Assembly for 12 years and has worked on this committee for many years. He said that he is eager to work closely with the Board and to be a liaison between the Regents and the legislature. He also hopes to ensure the preservation of the HOPE Scholarship Program for his own children and generations to come.

Mr. Daniel next introduced Senator Brian P. Kemp of Athens, who has previously served as Secretary of the Senate Higher Education Committee and is now the Vice Chair of the committee. Senator Kemp will also chair the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Higher Education. He has a degree from the University of Georgia and is in the development and construction business. He and his wife, Marty, have three children. Mr. Daniel also introduced Representative Bob Smith of Watkinsville. He is a real estate and business developer. He and his wife, Laura, have three children.

She is a first grade school teacher. Their oldest son, Robert, is a junior at the Georgia Institute of Technology with a 4.0 grade point average. Their son, Matthew, is a freshman at the University of Georgia and has made the dean's list. Their daughter, Shearron, is a sophomore at Oconee County High School. Representative Smith will serve as Chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Higher Education. Mr. Daniel said that the Regents have worked with these legislators before in other capacities and they will continue to work to fulfill the Board's goal of a more educated Georgia. Mr. Daniel welcomed Senator Kemp and Representative Smith and asked them to speak.

Senators Kemp greeted the Regents and said that he has learned a great deal about higher education in his two years in the Senate. He said that higher education is one of the state's top priorities in terms of economic development and having an educated workforce. He stated that he is looking forward to working with the Regents.

Representative Smith greeted the Regents and said that he was happy that Chancellor and Mrs. Meredith are on the road to recovery. He stated it was an honor to be at the meeting and to be part of a new majority in the General Assembly. He said that he looks forward to working with the Regents and appreciates the good work of the Regents.

Chair Wooten thanked the legislators for their past and future support. He then called upon the Chancellor to introduce some special guests from Mississippi.

Chancellor Meredith said that the Board of Regents was honored at this meeting to have three representatives of the Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (the "Mississippi Board"), who are examining the way that other boards work before beginning the search for a new commissioner. So, they would be visiting the Board of Regents for a few days to see how this Board operates. The Chancellor said that he was honored to work for the Mississippi Board for about ten years and has a great affection for that system. He then introduced Virginia Shanteau Newton and Ed Blakeslee from Gulfport as well as Aubrey Patterson from Tupelo.

#### **ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, January 11, 2005, by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent Glenn S. White had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on November 16 and 17, 2004, were unanimously approved as distributed.

#### **PRESENTATION ON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM ADMISSIONS DATA AND TWO-YEAR COLLEGE ADMISSIONS CRITERIA**

Chair Wooten called upon the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, to make a presentation to the Board about University System of Georgia admissions data and two-year college admissions criteria.

Dr. Papp said that the Board has requested that every year the University System Office staff provide an update on and analysis of admissions criteria in the System. This presentation would have three parts. First, he provided a comparison of admissions data from fall 1995 to fall 2004. In fall 1995, the average SAT score of all entering freshmen was 994. Of traditional freshmen, 27% required learning support and 76% had taken the complete college-preparatory curriculum ("CPC"). That is the required four math courses, four English courses, and modern languages, natural sciences,

and social sciences courses. In fall 2004, the average SAT score of entering freshmen was 1042. Of traditional freshmen, approximately 16% required learning support and 89% had taken the CPC. In fall 1995, there were 27,570 entering traditional freshmen, and in fall 2004, there were 35,026. So, in addition to greater enrollments in the last decade, the University System of Georgia has also seen significant increases in the average entering SAT score and the number of students completing the CPC, as well as a significant decrease in the percentage of students requiring learning support.

There are a number of reasons why this has happened, explained Dr. Papp. One of the reasons is that the Board of Regents decided to increase the admissions standards at System institutions. This was a process that began in 1996 and was phased-in over a number of years. For most institutions, the increase in the admissions standards was fully phased-in by fall 2001. So, that was a critical factor in the admissions improvements. Also, there was the HOPE Scholarship Program (“HOPE”). HOPE has been a wonderful success story for the students of the State of Georgia. However, HOPE has a rather curious effect. Obviously, it keeps better students in Georgia, which also helps attract better faculty members to the state. Better faculty also attract better students, so there is a nice upward spiral effect to HOPE that improves System institutions across the board. The Board of Regents has consciously balanced access with improvements in quality in the University System of Georgia.

Dr. Papp next discussed the overall effects of the heightened admissions standards. The System has deliberately channeled students into institutions by sector. The sectors now have meaning, and all sectors of the System have improved. Also because the historically black colleges and universities (“HBCUs”) historically had higher percentages of students who required learning support, the HBCUs were provided an extended period of time to reduce those percentages and they are still in the process of meeting those goals. Pilot admissions programs were also implemented in a number of locations around the state where there were no two-year institutions. For example, in and around the Statesboro area, there is no two-year institution, so East Georgia College now offers learning support courses in the Statesboro area. In the Carrollton area, there is no two-year college, so Floyd College provides learning support there. Similarly, the South Georgia Regional Educational Consortium, consisting of Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Bainbridge College, and South Georgia College, offers learning support to the Valdosta area. University colleges were created in three other locations where there were no two-year institutions to offer access opportunities to students who might not otherwise meet the admissions standards of the local institutions: at Augusta State University, Columbus State University, and Savannah State University. The students of the state have generally met the increased standards of the heightened admissions standards. SAT scores have improved in all sectors of the System; the percentage of CPC completers has increased; and the percentage of students needing learning support has decreased. Significantly, the System has had neither a reduction in the numbers of freshmen nor a reduction in the numbers of minority students. So, all in all, the increased admissions standards have been a success, and those admissions efforts are continuing to move forward.

Dr. Papp next provided an analysis of admissions criteria concentrating primarily on the two-year colleges and state colleges. He reiterated that admissions criteria vary by sector. They are driven by the freshman index, which is a combination of the high school grade point average (“HSGPA”) and either the SAT or American College Testing (“ACT”) score. Students are consciously channeled into particular sectors based on the probability of success in each sector. This is done not only to maximize the chances of students to succeed, but also to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of System resources. The freshman index has been the best predictor of student success across all sectors. A student entering one of the 13 two-year colleges or either of the System’s 2 state colleges as a traditional freshman pursuing an associate’s degree is required to take either the SAT or ACT. However, a nontraditional freshman entering one of these institutions is not required to take either test. Similarly, a transfer student into one of these institutions is not required to take either test. A career associate degree student (i.e., a student pursuing an associate’s degree without the intention of transferring into a bachelor degree program) who takes more than 12 credit hours in the core curriculum is required to take the SAT or ACT. All in all, approximately 50% of students entering two-year or state colleges are required to take one of these tests.

For admission to any System institution, a student is required to have a high school diploma or General Equivalency Diploma (“GED”). The SAT requirement for traditional freshman admissions at the two-year institutions is a verbal score of at least 330 and a math score of at least 310 (or the ACT equivalents). A student must also have a combined freshman index of 1830. The student must also have completed the CPC. However, there are exceptions. One-third of the freshman class at each of the two-year institutions can be admitted under the limited admissions or presidential exception category, which means they do not necessarily have to meet these requirements.

Of the over 1,000 two-year and community colleges in the United States, there are really only two systems (the University System of Georgia and the University of Wisconsin System) that have extensive or required use of admissions tests as a requirement for admission. In the University System of Georgia, the SAT and ACT are also no longer considered consistent predictors of the freshman grade point average at the two-year and state colleges. Indeed, over the course of the last year, the HSGPA alone is a better predictor of whether a student will succeed at a two-year or state college. Dr. Papp said there are a number of reasons this is happening. First is the changing nature of the type of students entering these institutions. Students requiring learning support often take more courses during their first two years outside the general education courses. Many learning support students also take only one or two courses for credit their freshman year, and grade point averages based on fewer courses are therefore not very accurate predictors of success or progress. So, there are some questions about the use of test scores as admissions criteria at two-year colleges.

Dr. Papp next made some recommendations to the Board. The first recommendation was that the System continue its current admissions policies for state, regional, and research universities, where those policies seem to be working very well. The second recommendation was that the Board form a task force to review the use of SAT and ACT test scores and other admissions requirements for

traditional freshmen at two-year and state colleges and charge that task force to make a presentation of its findings and some recommendations to the Regents at the April 2005 Board meeting. In closing, Dr. Papp asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent McMillan asked Dr. Papp what he predicts will happen as a result of upcoming changes in the SAT test.

Dr. Papp replied that what is happening with regard to the SAT is that there will be a third part added to the test that will be a writing sample. The reason that third part is being added to the test is because many people in the academic and business worlds have become increasingly concerned about the quality of writing among college students. The research institutions, Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, Valdosta State University, and a few other System institutions have already made the decision to require the third section of the SAT as part of their admissions standards. Dr. Papp said that the quality of students at those institutions will therefore probably get even better. Many other state universities have not yet made a decision on whether or not to require the third section of the SAT in their admissions criteria. Dr. Papp predicted that over time, those institutions will move in the direction of requiring this section of the SAT as well, though it may take a few years for that to occur. He said that he expects to see an overall improvement in the quality of students at those institutions as well, but perhaps not as rapidly. He said that the proposed task force would likely have some recommendations in this regard for the two-year and state colleges.

Regent NeSmith asked why it is that fewer students now require learning support.

Dr. Papp said that there are two likely reasons for this. First, students who want to get into System institutions are working harder, particularly during their high school junior and senior years. Secondly, in the last decade, there has been a significant expansion of the number of students enrolling in Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”) institutions. DTAE has roughly doubled its enrollments in the last decade.

Chancellor Meredith added that when students take the CPC, they do not need remediation. The CPC provides the foundation for college preparedness.

Regent Cleveland said that any discussion of admissions data and criteria should also include information on retention and graduation rates and how they reflect the changes in the admissions standards. He asked Dr. Papp to comment on these.

Dr. Papp said that since the full implementation of the heightened admissions standards, there has been a growth in first-year retention. He called upon the Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, to elaborate on this issue.

Dr. Hudson stated that Systemwide first-year retention rates are now over 80% and six-year graduation rates are approximately 50%. She noted that both rates are the highest in the System's history.

Dr. Papp added that just in the last year, the six-year graduation rate has increased.

Dr. Hudson said that it had indeed gone up about two percentage points just last year.

Dr. Papp said that the raised admissions standards are having an effect across the System in these critical areas.

Chancellor Meredith added that he is trying to build upon this success with the establishment of the graduation rate task force, which is being led by the Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs, Frank A. Butler.

Regent NeSmith asked whether the state is seeing increased numbers of high school graduates entering higher education.

Dr. Papp responded that the State of Georgia is still lagging behind the rest of the nation in this regard. He said that the percentage of high school graduates in Georgia who pursue higher education, including DTAE institutions, is about the average for the percentage of high school graduates nationally. However, the total number of students enrolling in higher education in Georgia lags behind the rest of the nation because of the large percentage of Georgia high school students who do not graduate.

Chancellor Meredith noted that next month's kick-off of the Education GO Get It initiative will help address this problem.

Seeing that there were no further questions, Chair Wooten thanked Dr. Papp for this presentation and said that he was impressed by the increasing quality and growth of the student body in the University System. The admissions policies that this Board established and adopted eight years ago are clearly working. Students in the System have met the challenge of completing the CPC, and the percentage of students in the System requiring learning support has decreased dramatically. Importantly, those students who do need the extra help are now mostly enrolled at the two-year institutions, where they can receive the level of learning support in the most cost-effective way possible. Given the budget constraints in recent years, he said, that is a very important consideration, considering the number of students in the University System of Georgia. While the admissions policies do appear to successfully balance access and excellence, it is still a good idea for the Board of Regents to review its policies in light of the most recent data. Since there are questions at the two-year and state colleges about the extent to which a student's SAT or ACT score help predict that student's success in college, Chair Wooten said that it makes sense for the Board to review the

admissions criteria in those sectors and to refine those criteria. He remarked that this is the kind of fact-based analysis in which the Board should be continually engaged. He agreed with Dr. Papp that the establishment of a task force to examine these issues further is a good idea, and on behalf of the Board, he asked the Chancellor to appoint a task force to study admissions criteria at the two-year and state colleges in the System and to have the task force make its report and recommendations at the April 2004 meeting.

### **PRESENTATION ON 2005 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

Chair Wooten next called upon the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, to make a presentation to the Board about the 2005 legislative session.

Mr. Daniel said that on Monday, January 10, 2005, 65 new legislators were sworn in and took their seats as members of the Georgia General Assembly. The freshman class is composed of 21 new senators and 44 new representatives. Five of the new senators moved from the House of Representatives to the Senate. Two senators have previously served as legislators. Six representatives had also previously served as legislators. He noted that 65 new members comprise a large freshman class, but not as big as the 67 new members in the class of 2003. Of all legislators, 56% have two years or less legislative experience. This fact certainly validates the Chancellor's commitment to actively communicate with all legislators at all times. Once again this session, the University System Office will publish "Mission Possible" on a weekly basis and distribute this important news from the Board of Regents and the University System of Georgia to all legislators.

Another highlight of the previous day was the election of Representative Glenn Richardson of Paulding County as Speaker of the House of Representatives. Mr. Daniel noted that Speaker Richardson has two degrees from Georgia State University: his undergraduate degree from 1981 and his juris doctorate from 1984. Speaker Richardson was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1996 and has previously served as floor leader for Governor Sonny Perdue and as minority leader. Speaker Richardson will be assisted by Representative Mark Burkhalter of Alpharetta as Speaker Pro Tempore and Representative Jerry Keen of St. Simons Island as Majority Leader. Representative DuBose Porter of Dublin is Minority Leader.

In the Senate, Lieutenant Governor Mark Taylor of Albany will serve as President, while Senator Eric Johnson of Savannah will continue to serve as President Pro Tempore. Senator Bill Stephens of Canton will serve as Majority Leader, while Senator Robert Brown of Macon serves as Minority Leader. Mr. Daniel had already introduced the leadership of the Higher Education Committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

In closing, Mr. Daniel noted that the Governor would deliver his "State of the State" and budget address at 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 12, 2005.



Chair Wooten thanked Mr. Daniel for his excellent work representing the Board of Regents and the University System of Georgia at the Capitol. At approximately 1:50 p.m., he adjourned the Regents into their regular Committee meetings.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, January 12, 2005, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Joel O. Wooten, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Wooten, were Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Allan Vigil.

### **INVOCATION**

The invocation was given on Wednesday, January 12, 2005, by Regent Joe Frank Harris.

### **ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, January 12, 2005, by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Julie Hunt, Patrick S. Pittard, and Glenn S. White had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

### **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

Chair Wooten called upon the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, to introduce some special guests to the Regents.

Mr. Daniel said that Senator Chip Pearson of Dawsonville and Representative Stacey Reece of Gainesville had come to the meeting for the introduction of new President David L. Potter of North Georgia College & State University (“NGCSU”), but unfortunately, President Potter was detained in rush-hour traffic and the legislators could not stay.

Chair Wooten welcomed the legislators and thanked them for coming to the meeting.

Mr. Daniel noted that Representative Amos Amerson of Dahlonega had just entered the Board Room, and he welcomed him to the meeting.

Senator Pearson greeted the Regents and congratulated President Potter on his new presidency.

Representative Reece stated that he had earned his associate's degree at Gainesville College and his bachelor's degree from NGCSU. He said that the University System of Georgia is very near and dear to his heart, particularly those institutions.

Representative Amerson said that NGCSU is not only in his district, but also it is very important to him personally. He met his wife at the college in 1953, and they married after graduating in 1956. He then spent 23 years in the Army. After three years in retirement, he taught in the Department of Business Administration, where he put his doctorate in Economics Statistics to good use. He has been in the General Assembly since 2000, and he has been named Chair of the new Science & Technology Committee. He said that he looks forward to serving the Board of Regents and NGCSU in this capacity. Representative Amerson said that he had met and talked extensively with President Potter on the day he was sworn in as President of NGCSU. He remarked that President Potter looks and sounds a bit like Mark Twain. He said that NGCSU lost a great president when Nathaniel Hansford retired, but it has another great president in Dr. Potter.

Chair Wooten thanked the legislators for coming to the meeting and said that he would tell President Potter that they were there. He then welcomed the Chief Operating Officer for the State of Georgia, James R. "Jim" Lientz, Jr., who was also in attendance at this meeting.

At approximately 9:10 a.m., Chair Wooten adjourned the Regents for the meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs.

### **INTRODUCTION OF NEW PRESIDENT AT NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY**

At approximately 10:00 a.m., Chair Wooten reconvened the full Board meeting for the introduction of the new president of North Georgia College & State University ("NGCSU"). He called upon the Chancellor to make this introduction to the Board.

Chancellor Meredith first introduced Dr. Mark C. Spraker, Associate Professor of Physics at NGCSU, who chaired the institutional presidential search committee. He remarked that Dr. Spraker had done an extraordinary job in this capacity and that Dr. Spraker is also the NGCSU alumni association's distinguished professor for 2005. The Chancellor thanked Dr. Spraker and the campus committee for their hard work in helping select the new president of NGCSU. The Chancellor also thanked the Special Regents Committee for the North Georgia College & State University Presidential Search. The Committee was chaired by Regent Pittard and also included Regents Jolly and White.

President David L. Potter began his tenure at NGCSU on January 1, 2005. Chancellor Meredith noted that President Potter previously served as the Chief Executive Officer and Commissioner for the Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (the "Mississippi

Board”). Prior to that, President Potter was the President of Delta State University in Cleveland, Mississippi. From 1987 to 1999, he served in many administrative and teaching positions at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, including Provost, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Vice President for Executive Affairs. He also worked at Syracuse University in New York, Denison University in Ohio and Sylvan University in the Philippines, and he currently serves as a member of the Commission on Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness for the American Council on Education. President Potter earned his Bachelor of Arts in History from Amherst College and his Master of Arts and Doctorate in Social Science from Syracuse University. He and his late wife, Pam, have two children, Elizabeth and Holly. Chancellor Meredith welcomed President Potter to the University System of Georgia and invited him to speak.

President Potter greeted the Regents and apologized for being late due to traffic. He thanked Dr. Spraker, the campus search committee, and the Special Regents Committee for their support. He also thanked the representatives of the Mississippi Board for their encouragement and support. He thanked former President Nathaniel Hansford for leaving NGCSU in such wonderful shape and remarked that he was very fortunate to inherit a wonderful institution. However, there are still things to be done, and President Potter said that he looks forward to doing those things. He said that the NGCSU faculty are very proud of the student body and very committed to teaching and serving those students. He hopes to give faculty an opportunity to engage in professional development to further strengthen the teaching and learning process. NGCSU also has an obligation to think about how it is going to grow and to do so in ways consistent with the heritage of NGCSU as well as the future. So, enrollment management will continue to be important going forward, he said.

NGCSU has a great opportunity to be a lead institution in the growth and development of the North Georgia region, said President Potter. It can be a catalyst for economic and community development and a force for cultural enrichment in the region. He noted that NGCSU is designated as the state’s leadership institution as well as a senior military institution, and both of these identities are crucial to the future of the university. The leadership identity gives NGCSU an opportunity to advance both in teaching and learning and in service and outreach. In closing, President Potter said that he is honored to be part of the University System of Georgia. He thanked the Regents for their support and said that he looks forward to working with them.

Chair Wooten welcomed President Potter to the System.

### **EDUCATION SEMINAR: FORMULA FUNDING IN GEORGIA: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE**

Chair Wooten next called upon the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, to provide an in-depth review of the current funding formula for the University System of Georgia.

Mr. Bowes said that the State of Georgia is one of several states that use funding formulas to generate state appropriations requests for its public colleges and universities. The funding formula has a long tradition in this state and has served the University System of Georgia well in providing funds to meet educational goals. First, Mr. Bowes would discuss some basic formula concepts and common characteristics of formulas as used here and in other states. Next, he would provide a brief history of the formula in Georgia; that is how the current version came into being and how it has been modified over time. Third, he would examine the specific elements of the formula, the variables and fixed factors it uses, and how it converts basic information about each institution into a funding request. He would then talk briefly about formula use in other states and some of the new features that they incorporate into their models. Finally, he would discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of the current funding model, leaving time for questions, discussion, and consideration of next steps.

Formula funding is a method for appropriating funds that links input and output variables to specific dollar amounts, explained Mr. Bowes. It is a mathematical formulation usually tied to current costs. Having said that, he reminded the Regents that formulas are also negotiated agreements among funding partners that as a necessity must take into consideration limits on state resources. For the most part, formulas are workload models reflecting costs associated with the instruction of students. Changes in student enrollment, whether measured by credit hours or full-time equivalent (“FTE”) student enrollment, will result in a change in funding. The enrollment variable will drive a student-faculty ratio or, as is the case in Georgia, a productivity factor representing the number of total credit hours a faculty member may be expected to produce based upon assumptions about the number of courses each faculty member is expected to teach during a semester, average class size, and the credit hours awarded for each course. Using student-faculty ratios or productivity factors both address the fundamental question of how many faculty are needed based upon student enrollments.

Most formulas also include factors for ongoing maintenance and operations of facilities using square footage, said Mr. Bowes. Many state formulas, like Georgia’s, include factors for facilities renewal and replacement. Formulas are usually average cost models so that each change in the enrollment variable generates an increase or decrease in dollars. This can be a significant benefit during times of enrollment growth, but it can be a disadvantage when enrollments decline because many costs cannot be readily reduced. For example, an enrollment reduction may lead to reduction in class size but not the elimination of courses and associated faculty resource requirements.

Many formulas will differentiate by institutional category (i.e., research universities versus two-year colleges) either through entirely separate funding models or by incorporating factors to account for mission differences. Mr. Bowes explained that these factors often represent different demands on faculty for research, service, and other activities. Georgia’s formula does not differentiate by institutional category or mission. He would address this issue later in the presentation. Although many formulas may differentiate by institutional category, they tend to be highly aggregated. Not only will many institutions with differing cost structures be included under a single formula model,

but different categories of cost may be aggregated as well. For example, there is usually a single factor to represent all academic support functions or institutional support functions. Formulas usually reflect the traditional cost categories used in higher education that were established by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (“NACUBO”). These categories include instruction, research, public service, academic support, etc.

Mr. Bowes noted that the Georgia formula is an “asking” formula. It was not designed as a means to appropriate funds directly to institutions. The process of developing the formula request begins with the Board of Regents and the University System of Georgia in the collection of enrollment data, square footage data, and information about fringe benefits. He also noted that the request considers only the change in these variables. One of the reasons for this has to do with the number of adjustments to base funding level for the University System that are not reflected in the formula, for example, the budget reductions of recent years. If the Board were to develop the request “starting from scratch” each year, the amount of new funding generated by the formula would far exceed the current budget base.

The request for formula funds becomes part of the Board’s total budget request to the Governor and General Assembly. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (“OPB”) will review and verify the dollars generated in the model and make any necessary revisions in consultation with the Board of Regents’ budget office. From that point, the Governor will develop his recommendations and submit them to the General Assembly. Normally, the General Assembly will not make changes to the funding recommendation under the formula. The formula funds are appropriated to the University System of Georgia as a lump sum, and then, the Board allocates these funds to each individual institution. This process usually occurs in April at the same time that tuition and fee changes are approved. The Board’s allocation strategy returns a minimum of 80% of the enrollment formula to each institution in accordance with the way each institution generates new funding; 100% of funds generated for new space are returned to the institution.

Mr. Bowes stated that the formula is the primary source of funding for the University System of Georgia, representing \$1.42 billion in fiscal year 2005. Formula funds are also the System’s most flexible funds – its “bread and butter” money – to be used for educational and general operations. Finally, the formula uses credit hours based upon the most recently completed fiscal year. This produces a two-year lag between the year in which credit hours are generated and the year in which funds are provided. So, for example, the budget request for fiscal year 2006 is based on credit hours generated in fiscal year 2004.

Formulas have been in existence in Georgia going back to 1963, said Mr. Bowes. The last major revision occurred in the early 1980s when then Governor George Busbee issued an executive order creating a study committee to develop a new formula model. A blue ribbon commission was created in coordination with OPB, the General Assembly, and the Board of Regents. Mr. Bowes said that he believes this commission also included representation from the business community. The

commission's efforts resulted in the "formula for excellence" in 1982, which was implemented beginning in fiscal year 1984 and was fully implemented in fiscal year 1987. He noted that it was during this implementation period that tuition rates underwent significant increases to generate revenue in support of formula costs. He would come back to this point later in discussing the formula components. During the course of the last ten years, there have been several adjustments to the formula. Generally, these have been to reduce funding in periods of state budget constraint. In 2000, the formula was revised to reflect semester conversion and to include a technology factor.

Mr. Bowes next discussed the elements of the current funding formula. He showed the Regents a graphic representation of the formula components. There are six major components in the formula that, when combined, generate the total funding for the University System. The first and most significant component of the formula is the one based upon credit hour enrollment, and it contains four subcomponents: instruction, research, academic support, and student services and institutional support. The variable used in this component is student credit hours based upon the most recently completed fiscal year.

There are also five major fixed factors that are used to convert credit hours into dollars, explained Mr. Bowes. The productivity ratio, a measure of how many total credit hours each faculty member is expected to produce, reflects assumptions about class size, the total number of courses each faculty member is expected to teach annually, and the number of credit hours awarded for the course. In order to help the Regents better understand these productivity ratios, Mr. Bowes discussed discipline categories and levels. There are five groupings of disciplines. He said that he was not working for the Board of Regents in 1982 when the current formula model was created and that his review of the various documents and publications associated with the formula did not reveal a specific rationale for the designation of these particular groupings. However, his experience with formula development in another state leads him to believe that the decision to group one set of disciplines with others reflects an assumption that the disciplines in each group share certain class size characteristics. If the productivity ratio assumes a standard teaching workload for faculty and a fairly standard credit hour award (e.g., most courses will carry a three-credit hour award), then the only variable left in the productivity ratio is class size.

In addition, there are three discipline levels: lower division, upper division, and graduate and professional. Mr. Bowes again speculated that the assumption and the basis for the productivity ratios here is class size differences. Combining discipline group with level results in a matrix in which the ratios generally decline. In other words, faculty are expected to produce fewer student credit hours in courses where class size would be expected to be lower. There are four other fixed factors used in the formula process for instruction and fixed factors associated with the other components of the enrollment formula.

The first step of the formula is the determination of the number of academic (faculty) positions, explained Mr. Bowes. This is done by dividing credit hours by discipline group and level by

productivity ratio by discipline group and level. The second step is the determination of total academic salary expenditures. This is done by multiplying the total number of academic positions by average salaries. The average salaries are a fixed factor that is adjusted each year by salary increases approved by the General Assembly. They differ only by discipline group but are constant across each discipline level. The third step is the determination of the number of instructional support positions. These are clerical and technical positions that provide direct support to faculty. This is accomplished by dividing the number of academic positions in each discipline group by a position ratio that varies by discipline group. The fourth step involves multiplying the total number of support positions from the third step by a fixed salary component. In the fifth step, instructional operating expense is generated as a fixed value of \$12.66 multiplied by total credit hours. The total instructional piece of the formula then is the sum of academic salary expenditures from the second step, instructional support position expenditures from the fourth step, and instructional operating expense expenditures from the fifth step.

Mr. Bowes showed the Regents a chart depicting the instruction cost or value of each credit hour in the formula based upon all of the fixed factors he had just discussed. He noted that, with the exception of the area of learning support, cost increases as one moves up each level and as one moves from lower division to graduate. Total research expenditures in the formula are equated to the amount generated for academic salary expenditures at the graduate level. So, the total amount for academic salaries at the graduate level is how one determines the research funding. The combination of the instruction and research components constitutes what is referred to as the total funding base. The calculation of academic support, student service, and institutional support funding is a relatively simple matter, he said. Academic support equals 18.9% of the funding base, and student services and institutional support equal 26.9% of the funding base.

The maintenance and operations component of the formula also has three separate parts: one for regular operations, one for utility costs, and one for major repairs and renovation (“MRR”). For regular operations, the variable is total square footage and the fixed factor is \$4.62 per square foot. For utilities, the variable is also total square footage multiplied by a fixed factor of \$1.45 per square foot. Until a few years ago, MRR had been funded using general state appropriations, but MRR is now included as part of the state bond package and is generated based upon total replacement cost (which is a function of square footage multiplied by a fixed replacement value of \$95 per square foot) multiplied by a factor of 1%. Mr. Bowes noted that the replacement value of \$95 per square foot has been unchanged over many years, at least in the nine years that he has been working with the formula. He remarked that it is certainly unrealistic as a measure of current costs to replace facilities. Additionally, although it has increased slightly from the values used in the mid-1990s, the 1% value remains far below industry standards. In prior budget cycles, the Board has requested that this figure be increased to 2% to 3%. Mr. Bowes stated that fringe benefits are for the most part calculated based upon rates provided by the stated or actual cost. Retiree fringe benefits are adjusted annually based upon the actual number of new retirees in the System.

The University System of Georgia serves over one million students in continuing education, reported Mr. Bowes. Until fiscal year 2003, when funding for continuing education was capped in the formula, the System received funding for the number of continuing education units generated. In the last year that increases were funded, that factor was about \$47 per continuing education unit (“CEU”). Under current Board budget principles, there is the expectation that institutions will move toward self-sufficiency. There are also several public service institutes that are funded under the formula with funding levels fixed, except for increases in salaries. Twelve public service institutes at the University of Georgia (“UGA”), Georgia State University (“GSU”), and Kennesaw State University receive funding. Some examples of institutes funded in this manner include UGA’s Carl Vinson Institute of Government and the University Press and GSU’s Fiscal Research Center and Georgia Health Policy Center.

The last major component of the formula is the technology factor, said Mr. Bowes. This is calculated at 1.7% of the funding base. When the technology component was established in fiscal year 2002, the amount of funding provided allowed only for the transfer of a number of the special funding initiatives associated with technology to the formula. It is a fairly modest addition to the formula and does not represent the full amount expended by institutions for technology purposes. Mr. Bowes stressed that all of the calculations he had presented when summed together across the various components generate the total formula for the System.

Mr. Bowes explained that within the formula, there is the assumption that students, through tuition revenues, will support 25% of the total formula cost while the state pays for 75%. This cost-sharing arrangement has enabled the System to limit growth in tuition rates, which have averaged around 6% annually for the last ten years. He noted that with recent budget reductions, however, the share of formula supported by tuition revenue has crept up to approximately 31%. He emphasized that this change was not a function of tuition rate increases, but rather the fact that state appropriations have been reduced.

Several states use formulas to generate state appropriations for their higher education institutes. However, Mr. Bowes noted that the extent to which formulas are used and the extent to which they cover full costs can vary significantly. In the states in the Southern Regional Education Board (“SREB”), only two states use formulas exclusively to generate state appropriations: Georgia and Tennessee. About half of the SREB states use an incremental budget process. There are six states that use some combination of formula and incremental funding to support public higher education. Fairly recently, the number of states that have incorporated performance funding in a formulaic manner has grown. To date, 19 states across the country have included formulas related to performance funding to generate state appropriations requests. Performance funding, as defined in this context, means there is a direct relationship between outcome measures and the funds received by the institution. Tennessee, which has one of the oldest performance funding formulas and probably one of the best, uses ten performance standards; 5.45% of total budget appropriations are based upon these performance standards.



“What are the strengths of the formula?” asked Mr. Bowes. First and foremost, he said, the formula ensures funding of enrollment growth and funding to ensure upkeep of new facilities and the protection of the state’s investment in those facilities. As he had already noted, the formula has also helped the State of Georgia maintain low tuition rates, among the lowest in the country, and avoid the double-digit tuition rate increases that other states have implemented in recent years. The formula also provides a measure of predictability to institutions in the amount of funding they can anticipate. The use of the formula in the Board’s allocation strategy strengthens that predictability. It certainly provides for uniformity and ease in the budget preparation process internally, and because it simplifies the budget process, communication with funding partners is enhanced. Finally, because it makes direct links between enrollment, square footage, and other institutional data, the decision process appears to be more objective.

However, the formula has many drawbacks, stated Mr. Bowes. First, it focuses exclusively on quantitative factors and does not have any components that address quality or outcomes. The Board of Regents has attempted to address that issue to a degree in setting aside 5% of formula appropriations to fund performance in graduation, retention, and obtaining of sponsored funds. The formula also does not recognize institutional missions, programs, or markets. For example, it assumes a common teaching workload across all System institutions, which does not reflect reality here in Georgia or in any other higher education system. Mr. Bowes reiterated that the formula uses a single average faculty salary across each discipline group but does not differentiate between institutions which face very different markets for faculty. One only has to look at the actual average salary differences between and among System institutions to verify that its research institutions have much higher salaries than its two-year colleges. That should come as no surprise, he said. The formula also ties research funding to graduate credit hours rather than to the level of sponsored research activity. “Why is this a problem?” he asked. Well, for example, the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) has fairly stable enrollments that do not change significantly from year to year. The research component of the formula therefore does not grow in accordance with increases in sponsored funding, which requires that existing funds be redirected to non-externally funded costs associated with research. The same can be said for the other research institutions, though they may experience more growth at the graduate level. This is also a problem for institutions with graduate programs but no significant research mission. A small change in enrollment at the graduate level can result in wide swings in funding because graduate enrollment is essentially valued at twice the level and much higher cost than lower- and upper-division instruction. In addition, because the formula is enrollment-driven, it can disadvantage institutions with limited capacity for enrollment growth, like MCG or any institutions with limited growth capacity. These institutions will see funding increases only to the extent that enrollments shift from lower- to higher-cost disciplines or from lower- to upper-division and graduate enrollment. Further, the formula does not adequately address the impact of technology or high-cost programs, nor does it provide means to fund new or innovative programs. Finally, as he had mentioned earlier, many fixed factors in the formula are woefully outdated. The factors used to fund the MRR program are a prime example.

In closing, Mr. Bowes said that while the University System of Georgia's operations have changed significantly over the past 20 years, its budget formula has not. That is why formula revision would be very desirable. He then asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent Jolly asked Mr. Bowes whether he could provide information about the percentage of each System budget request that has been funded for the past three years.

Mr. Bowes said that he would have to calculate that and return with those answers. The System has experienced approximately \$300 million in reductions in the past three years. He asked the Budget Director and Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Usha Ramachandran, to elaborate.

Ms. Ramachandran responded that the System has received all of the funds it has requested in light of the Governor's budget reductions directives. In total, the budget has been reduced by approximately \$290 million.

Chair Wooten asked Mr. Bowes to come back to the Board with more information on this, and Mr. Bowes said that he would.

Regent NeSmith said that he did not understand Ms. Ramachandran's response.

Ms. Ramachandran explained that every year, the Board asks for formula funds in accordance with the Governor's reduction instructions, and each year, the System has received its requested amount. However, there are also budget reductions, so the net amount the System receives is not the full formula amount.

Regent Leebern commended Mr. Bowes on his excellent presentation. He asked how much of the budget is allocated to the institutions.

Mr. Bowes responded that at least 80% of formula funds go to the institutions. However, last year, 99% of the formula was allocated to the institutions.

Regent Leebern observed that perhaps a percentage of the allocations should be awarded based upon guidelines established by the Board of Regents to eliminate pass-through items, enhancements, special programs, etc., because no one knows better how to budget than the individual institutions.

Mr. Bowes said that the 80% is a direct allocation, and there is another 5% for recognition of quality and performance, as demonstrated by graduation and retention rates, etc. The other 15% is allocated based upon cost differences among the institutions. For many years, the budget staff has tried to make the allocation per FTE student more equitable across the System. He said that there are some obvious issues that need to be addressed and adjusted on an annual basis. There are also strategic

initiatives at the System level that need to be funded. So, it is important for the Board to retain a certain percentage of the formula to distribute as it sees fit on an annual basis as priorities arise.

Chair Wooten said that this percentage affords the Board of Regents some flexibility to reward institutions for excellence, to provide for special Systemwide initiatives, and to provide funding for specific critical needs.

Mr. Bowes concurred.

Chancellor Meredith added that in recent years, he has directed the staff to allocate formula funding directly to institutions at the level of 85% because of the budget cuts. Another 5% is for performance-based incentives. The other 10% is used for a variety of things, such as helping an institution in financial need. He stressed that all formula funding goes to the institutions.

Regent Leebern said that in February, he would like to see a list of the distribution of those funds. He stated that the Board should not reward institutions for mismanaging funds.

Chancellor Meredith replied that the staff would provide that information.

Chair Wooten said that the Board of Regents does not reward institutions for mismanagement. However, sometimes an institution needs a carrot as incentive to help itself. He said this was just the first step of an exhaustive review of the formula. This is a complex issue, and the Board will not be able to revise the formula alone. This process will require the help of the Governor's Office, the General Assembly, OPB, and other funding partners, who all have an interest in seeing that the formula is revised correctly and with foresight. The formula has provided a certain stability and predictability for base funding that has enabled the Board to plan accordingly.

Regent Carter asked what particular elements of the formula need to be updated and how the Board of Regents would go about doing that.

Mr. Bowes replied that the key thing missing in the formula is recognition of mission differences among the institutions. This is a major issue. He said that the Board may want to consider a multi-tiered model or incorporate other factors within the current formula to address mission differences. The salary and research issues are also very important to consider as the Regents look at the formula revision.

Seeing that there were no further questions or comments, Chair Wooten thanked Mr. Bowes and said that the Regents look forward to hearing more on this matter at future meetings. At approximately 10:50 a.m., he called for a brief break.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

At approximately 11:05 a.m., Chair Wooten reconvened the Board meeting and asked Committee Chair Leebern to convene the Strategic Planning Committee. Committee members in attendance were Chair Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Vice Chair Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Regents Michael J. Coles, Elridge W. McMillan, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Allan Vigil. Board Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Martin W. NeSmith, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and J. Timothy Shelnut were also in attendance.

Chair Leebern called upon the Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, Jan Kettlewell, to make the first presentation to the Committee, which was a follow-up to her November 2004 presentation to the Committee regarding increasing the numbers, quality, and diversity of K-12 teachers in the State of Georgia. At this meeting, she would present an implementation plan for meeting this goal by 2010.

Dr. Kettlewell stated that her presentation in November documented the need for more teachers, more diverse teachers, and more high-quality teachers for Georgia's public schools. She also described why the University System of Georgia needed to step up to meet these needs. At this meeting, she would describe how the University System will meet these needs through a new initiative to double the number and double the diversity of teachers prepared in the University System of Georgia and retained in the state's public schools. Copies of the implementation plan for this initiative were included in the Regents' folders. She reminded the Regents that this initiative is the third phase of the teacher preparation initiative that was begun in fiscal year 1999. At that time, the Board of Regents strengthened quality through the adoption and implementation of the Regents' Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools (the "Principles"). In the second phase, the Board of Regents piloted multiple pathways to become a teacher and continued to strengthen quality. In this third phase, the Board of Regents will bring together what it accomplished and learned during the first two phases and will implement a bold new plan to double the number and diversity of high-quality teachers. In essence, the Board is going to focus on doubling the number of teachers prepared in the University and the subset of those teachers that are persons of color. Simultaneously, in partnership with the Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching, the Board is going to work to reduce teacher attrition by one-third. So, the focus of this initiative is the combination of increasing production and reducing attrition to meet the need for more teachers.

The first problem the Board of Regents is trying to solve is teacher quantity, said Dr. Kettlewell. If there is no major reduction in teacher attrition, Georgia will need an addition 14,500 teachers in 2010. At this time, the state is relying primarily on other states to prepare its teachers. This is not sound policy when teacher shortages are projected in most states.

The second problem the Board is trying to solve is the need for more teachers who are persons of color. There is a significant difference in the ethnic makeup of the student body and the teaching force in Georgia's public schools. As Dr. Kettlewell had mentioned in November, the strong presence of minority teachers serves an important function in advancing the educational success of minority students.

The third problem the Board is trying to solve is teacher attrition. Data from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (the "PSC") show that 69% of the new teachers hired in 2003, for example, were needed because of teacher attrition. If teacher attrition is reduced, that will offset the magnitude of the need from the pipeline of teacher preparation.

The fourth problem the Board is trying to solve is one of teacher quality. Regardless of the quality of teachers prepared in the University System, if the System does not prepare a sufficient number of them to meet need, less than fully certified teachers will be hired to fill vacancies. Reliance on filling teacher vacancies with less than qualified teachers is not sound state policy because, as Dr. Kettlewell had emphasized in November, more than any other variable, the quality of the teacher makes the most difference in student achievement.

Having given a recapitulation of what she presented in November, Dr. Kettlewell next turned to the proposed implementation plan for meeting these needs. She said that the plan includes ten strategies to meet the three goals of the teacher preparation initiative. First, she would discuss each strategy, and then, she would identify the actions requested of the Board at this meeting.

The first strategy of the plan is a sustained emphasis on quality. The Board will continue the quality improvements made in the first two phases of the teacher preparation initiative. At this meeting, Dr. Kettlewell was proposing the adoption of a new continuous improvement and accountability system. In brief, the expectation is that System institutions will meet national and state standards, as well as standards outlined in the Principles. There is an emphasis on continuous improvement so that regardless of where an institution currently stands, the expectation is that the institution will continue to get better. There is a strong support component among institutions to help one another succeed. There is also a provision to deactivate programs, if necessary, if agreed-upon improvement goals are not met for two consecutive years. Dr. Kettlewell showed the Regents a diagram of the continuous improvement and accountability system. She explained that in any kind of program change, an institution starts with program redesign. When ready, the program is implemented. So, the first level of accountability is that the program must be reviewed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education ("NCATE") and be approved to prepare teachers by the PSC. Assuming positive outcomes of both reviews, the institution must have at least an 80% pass rate on PRAXIS II. Again assuming a positive outcome, the institution must fully meet the Principles. Finally, the institution must be able to show that its program completers have a positive impact on children's learning in the schools two years after graduation. Each institution now uses what is called a teacher work sample methodology to show impact. Dr. Kettlewell's staff are currently exploring

with the Office of Student Achievement and Georgia Department of Education (the “DOE”) the possibility of a teacher value-added assessment system that would provide preliminary evidence of teacher effectiveness. She noted that if at any of these levels, an institution receives a negative outcome, it will go back to program redesign. Any time this happens, a program improvement team will be constituted to include the president or provost of the institution, the deans, and a representative of the University System Office. If progress plateaus for two consecutive years, the program in question will be triggered for an outside review. The possible outcomes of this system are that the institution will resolve the issues or choose to deactivate the program or that the Board of Regents will deactivate the program until such time as the institution shows significant improvement.

The second strategy of the initiative is a proposed production target for the System of 7,000 teachers by 2010. Dr. Kettlewell noted that this target is up from 3,157 in fiscal year 2004. The production target for minority teacher candidates is 1,555, which is up from 601 in fiscal year 2004. She noted that both production targets exceed the number required to double the number. She explained that because of the great need, the staff have built in a “stretch factor” to come as close as they can to meeting the need within the five-year timeframe for this initiative. Beyond 2010, these targets will continue to be adjusted upward as need to meet the demand for teachers in the public schools. The combination of meeting this overall target and meeting the third goal of this initiative, the reduction of teacher attrition by one-third, will still meet only about 60% of the need for new teachers in 2010. She noted that in fiscal year 2003, the System met less than 19% of the need.

Additional funding will be needed to reach the targets. The Board of Regents included \$10 million for this initiative in its fiscal year 2006 budget request to the Governor and General Assembly. Dr. Kettlewell showed the Regents a map of the 15 System institutions that currently prepare teachers. Some of the funding is needed to increase the capacity of these 15 existing institutions that prepare teachers. The System production targets are the sum of production goals set by each institution. (Dalton State College [“DSC”] was approved in November 2004 to offer teacher preparation, and Macon State College [“MSC”] was approved to offer teacher preparation at this meeting. See the report of the Committee on Academic Affairs, Item 5.) Each institution has set annual production goals for each year in between 2004 and 2010. So, over the course of the five-year period of this initiative, the state will see increases annually in the number of teachers prepared by the University System. The third through ninth strategies of the initiative address how the System will meet these targets.

The third strategy expands the role of two-year colleges in teacher preparation in seven ways. The first way is to help more students pass PRAXIS I, a test that must be passed to be admitted into teacher preparation. The second is teacher preparation recruitment; that is, reaching out into the community and in high schools to increase student interest in becoming teachers. The third is increasing the number of “4-4-2” programs, in which four-year institutions offer four-year programs on the campuses of two-year colleges to make the programs more convenient to students. The fourth

is increasing the number of “2+2” programs, in which students take their first two years of a teacher preparation program at a two-year college and then transfer to a four-year institution to complete their education degrees. The fifth way is flexible scheduling; that is, offering courses at times of the day and on days of the week when students can come. The sixth way is partnering with four-year institutions to offer postbaccalaureate programs for second-career candidates on the two-year college campuses, again with the goal of making the programs more accessible to where the students live. The final way to expand the role of two-year colleges in teacher preparation is to expand the number of hours they offer. For example, a two-year college may offer 69 hours within the associate of arts degree in secondary education so that candidates have the opportunity to complete both the prerequisite content courses and courses in teacher education, the latter as a recruitment strategy.

The fourth strategy is to extend the pilot Teacher Career Center to all teacher preparation institutions and two-year colleges in order to market teacher preparation programs, to provide a one-stop shop for connecting candidates with institutions, and to keep the public informed about the progress the System is making in its teacher preparation initiative. The fifth strategy is to offer baccalaureate programs for pre-kindergarten teachers. The Board of Regents may establish an articulation agreement with the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”) for 2+2 programs in this area. The sixth strategy is part of the Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics (“PRISM”) initiative, funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation. The Board will place added emphasis on the recruitment of teacher candidates in science and mathematics, two areas of extreme shortage. The PRISM grant works with four regions of the state, including four universities and two of the two-year colleges. As part of the cost-share obligation, the University System of Georgia will create ten PRISM satellites to extend PRISM’s benefits to all System teacher preparation institutions.

The seventh strategy is to expand teacher preparation pathways. System institutions will offer multiple pathways to become a teacher, focusing primarily on paraprofessionals, career changers, and individuals to teach students for whom English is a second language. Dr. Kettlewell noted that the staff have piloted much of this work during the second phase of the teacher preparation initiative. Lessons learned will be brought to scale throughout all teacher preparation institutions and the two-year colleges (as described in the third strategy). The eighth strategy is to become more flexible by offering online programs, by creating consortia, and through flexible scheduling. The bottom line is that the System will offer programs when teachers need them and in the most conducive format while preserving quality. The ninth strategy is to approve more institutions to prepare teachers, as needed. Dr. Kettlewell reiterated that DSC was approved to offer teacher preparation at the November 2004 meeting, and that MSC was also being recommended for approval at this meeting. As the Board moves forward, it will consider approval of additional institutions to prepare teachers that will be recommended in the future as needed to meet state need. With the addition of MSC and DSC, there will be 17 institutions offering degree programs to prepare teachers. In addition, 13 two-year colleges will provide access to teacher preparation programs. So through this initiative, access to teacher preparation programs will now be expanded to 30 out of 34 System institutions.

The tenth and final strategy of the initiative is to partner with the Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching to reduce teacher attrition by one-third. The University System of Georgia will accomplish this through the Georgia BellSouth Learning and Teaching Initiative, where it will learn from teachers what conditions contribute to their remaining or leaving the teaching profession and then developing policy recommendations to improve the working conditions in schools. Dr. Kettlewell noted that research shows that one of the reasons teachers leave the profession is that they have few opportunities for leadership roles in the schools unless they want to leave the classroom. Through the State Action for Education Leadership grant, the Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching will work to turn this situation around. She emphasized that this strategy is critical. As she noted in her November 2004 presentation to the Strategic Planning Committee, 69% of new teachers hired in Georgia in fiscal year 2003 were needed because of teacher attrition. The problem is attributable both to the pipeline (i.e., the number of teachers prepared) and to attrition (i.e., the number of teachers that leave the profession during their first five years of teaching). The University System cannot solve the attrition problem alone. It takes a partnership, which the System is doing through the Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching.

Next, Dr. Kettlewell made her recommendations to the Regents for their consideration and action. The first recommendation was that the Board adopt the implementation plan to double the number and double the diversity of teachers prepared by the University System of Georgia. The second recommendation was that the Board approve the new continuous improvement and accountability system as described in the implementation plan. The third recommendation was that the Board approve System-level teacher production targets for 2010 (as funds become available) with incremental annual increases between 2005 and 2010. The overall teacher production target is 7,000, and the minority teacher production target is 1,555. The fourth recommendation was that the Board approve the development of an articulation agreement with DTAE for 2+2 programs for pre-kindergarten teachers. There will also be related items in the implementation plan to be considered by the Committee on Academic Affairs for recommendation to the full Board in coming months, including the approval for two-year colleges to offer 69 hours within associate of arts degrees for pre-majors in secondary education and the approval of MSC to prepare teachers at this meeting. In closing, Dr. Kettlewell asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent Jennings asked Dr. Kettlewell to clarify what she meant by the term diversity.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that she was referring to ethnic diversity, particularly African-American and Hispanic populations.

Regent McMillan asked which institutions participate in the PRISM consortium.

Dr. Kettlewell replied that the PRISM four-year participants are Armstrong Atlantic State University, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, and the University of Georgia.



The two-year college participants are Coastal Georgia Community College and Georgia Perimeter College. There are also 15 K-12 public school systems participating in the initiatives.

Regent Vigil asked for clarification about the numbers of teachers leaving the profession.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that 35% of teachers leave the profession in the first three years.

Regent Cater asked why teachers are leaving the field.

Dr. Kettlewell replied that the lack of leadership opportunities is one reason. Another reason for teacher attrition is the historical top-down organizational structure in which teachers have little part in decision making. Some of it has to do with salary, but that is not as big a part in the problem as many believe it to be.

Regent Cater asked what is being done to improve teacher retention.

Dr. Kettlewell reiterated that this is not a problem that the Board of Regents can solve. However, the Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching, in which the Board is a partner, can systematically identify the reasons for teacher attrition in the State of Georgia. The Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching has set a goal to reduce teacher attrition by at least one-third.

Regent NeSmith stated that given the need for an increased number of teachers in the state, he hoped the legislature would fully fund this initiative and he encouraged the Regents to make this a top priority in the budget process.

Chancellor Meredith complimented Dr. Kettlewell for her presentation and for the extraordinary success of the leadership initiative, which is focused on educational leadership. He said that he was a high school teacher for six years and that performance-based rewards may help improve teacher satisfaction and retention. There is nothing more important the System does than preparing teachers, he said. The System's education graduates are entrusted with our children and the future of this country.

Chair Leebern asked Dr. Kettlewell whether there are particular school systems in the state that have worse attrition rates than others and that perhaps should get more attention through these efforts.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that there are some school systems that have a harder time retaining teachers.

Chair Leebern suggested that the school boards need to examine this matter at the local level.

Regent Cater said that regardless of how many teachers the System graduates, the school systems have to improve or they will continue to have attrition problems.

Dr. Kettlewell stated that the DOE is working to reduce attrition statewide. The Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching was created to address this issue and to put a qualified teacher in every classroom. The teacher working conditions survey will give the committee a systematic view of exactly why teachers leave, and then the various constituents must develop some policy recommendations to improve the situation. That is the point of this initiative and partnership.

Seeing that there were no further questions or comments, Chair Leebern called for a motion to approve the recommendations that Dr. Kettlewell had outlined. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Committee approved the following:

- Adoption of the implementation plan to double the number, double the diversity of teachers prepared by the University System of Georgia
- Approval of new continuous improvement and accountability system as described in the implementation plan
- Approval of System-level teacher production targets in 2010 (as funds become available), with incremental annual increases between 2005 and 2010
  - Overall teacher production target: 7,000
  - Minority teacher production target: 1,555
- Approval to develop an articulation agreement with DTAE for 2+2 programs for pre-kindergarten teachers

(Additional items in the implementation plan will be considered by the Committee on Academic Affairs, including approval for two-year colleges to offer 69 hours within associate of arts degree for pre-majors in secondary education and approval of MSC to prepare teachers.)

Chair Leebern next called upon President Jacquelyn M. Belcher of Georgia Perimeter College (“GPC”) to make a presentation to the Board on a potential new campus in Covington, Newton County.

President Belcher greeted the Regents and thanked them for the opportunity to speak with them concerning GPC. GPC is a multi-campus two-year college with more than 21,000 students, which makes it the largest two-year college in the state and the third-largest institution in the University System. The majority of GPC graduates transfer to four-year institutions, making it the largest feeder school within the System. The core mission of GPC is to provide accessible and affordable high-quality undergraduate education and to meet the academic needs of traditional and nontraditional students in its communities.

The System’s statewide assessment acknowledged the challenges facing the University System and recommended how the System should respond to meet Georgia’s educational needs. Critical to this study and our discussion today are three key elements: 1) educational attainment and academic need, 2) population growth and related demographics, and 3) the nature and composition of Georgia’s

economy. At this meeting, President Belcher presented the Board of Regents with an opportunity to meet an academic need in an underserved area, an area that is expected to grow at a rate that outpaces the state and whose economy requires a more educated workforce. She stated that GPC's mission leads it to focus on Newton County and the surrounding communities. GPC has served students in this area at the Rockdale Center for more than ten years. As the demand for higher education has increased, GPC has tripled its enrollment in the last six years, outgrown its Rockdale Center facility, and needs to expand its academic role in the community. President Belcher stressed that GPC is currently located in this area at the Rockdale Center, which serves 1,700 students. This center is as large as or larger than a third of the two-year institutions within the University System.

In order to continue meeting the academic needs of this service area, a new and larger facility is needed. President Belcher stated that GPC wishes to build a permanent, state-of-the-art instructional site to be known as the Newton Campus of GPC. The campus will serve not only Newton County, but also the fast-growing service area that includes Rockdale, Morgan, Jasper, Butts, Henry, Putnam, and Walton Counties. This need for a new and expanded facility is driven by the need for expansion in academic programs and is further substantiated by population increases and rapid economic growth.

Not only is the demand for higher education opportunities increasing in this region, said President Belcher, but evidence also suggests that the Newton Campus will stimulate additional demand for collegiate education. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 56% of the adult population in the region had no college attendance, compared with 50% for the State of Georgia and 48% for the nation. In some of the more rural counties like Butts, Jasper, and Putnam Counties, the proportion of adults with no college experience ranges from 65% to 70%. This large proportion of individuals with no higher education is a significant barrier to regional and personal economic success in the current and future economy. An increased demand for higher education in the region will have a meaningful economic impact. Potential students whose family backgrounds include little experience with postsecondary education are more likely to attend classes close to home in a familiar, convenient environment. These first-generation college students generally need more academic support and personal attention to develop the self-confidence needed for continued educational success.

GPC's Newton Campus would be the only public institution available to these students in this service area, explained President Belcher. The campus would provide a learner-centered environment that will contribute to academic success and student retention. As the educational and career aspirations of the local population grow, increasing numbers of high school students will pursue the college preparatory curriculum and higher education. The long-term benefits are a better educated citizenry, higher per capita income, and economic development throughout the region.

Additionally, opportunities for collaboration exist within the area, she said. Larger facilities will make it possible to implement activities with other institutions. Georgia State University has committed business administration and teacher education coursework at the new site leading to baccalaureate

and master's degrees in these two high-demand areas. GPC is also working to further develop partnerships with DeKalb Technical College and the Newton County School System.

Georgia's population is growing rapidly. President Belcher reported that by 2015, Georgia's population will have grown to over 10 million. Nearly 50% of the expected growth in the state will occur in the Atlanta region, leading to an increase in enrollment, and will continue to expand outward. The Newton County service area has captured a significant portion of this outward expansion and is expected to grow significantly during the next 10 to 20 years. The following facts underscore this pattern. From 1990 to 2002, the area grew by more than 73%. By 2010, the area's population is expected to increase by 40%. Seven of the eight counties in this area will experience double digit growth rates over the next ten years. In addition to the population growth factor, national trends consistently show that service and knowledge workers provide an increasing share of Georgia's economic productivity. As a result, the fastest growing occupations in Georgia require a college degree. It is also known that academically underprepared students continue to lag behind in the development of academic skills essential to success in Georgia's changing economy.

President Belcher said that when these facts are combined with the population growth factor, it leads to the following conclusions: 1) Cost-effective quality education must be delivered to key population growth areas, especially those currently underserved by the University System; 2) Since two-year colleges are a critical point of access for much of Georgia's population, their strategic deployment in the high-growth Atlanta region enhances the System's ability to facilitate a more educated Georgia; 3) As the largest feeder school in the System, GPC will provide access to underprepared students, graduate them, and transfer them to four-year institutions; and 4) In order to service the growing population, System capacity in needed areas should be increased.

Based upon the Board's assessment and GPC's own analysis, Georgia's economy has expanded and diversified, with a growing share of the economic production generated by the service industry. The service sector of this area's economy is clearly dominant, but there is also great economic variety in other sectors. The strong and balanced economic base of the service area is highlighted by the facts that the total number of new businesses within the area across all sectors has increased by 50%, the area continues to produce new jobs at a high rate, and in the past ten years, there have been strong community investments by business and industry. Regional policies in this area promote sustainable and consistent economic growth, with one example being the Stanton Springs initiative, which will be located only two miles from the campus. Newton, Walton, and Morgan Counties have formed a joint venture managing development of the Stanton Springs employment and residential center. Over the next three decades, Stanton Springs is expected to be a major economic engine, providing over 20,000 high-quality jobs. The center will be comparable to other Technology Park/Atlanta developments and has the potential to be one of the premier locations for technology-oriented companies in the Southeast. Stanton Springs has chosen to locate in this area for the same reasons GPC needs to be located in this area, said President Belcher.

Employment patterns and higher education levels confirm the need for expanded offerings in the service area. Major employers have expressed a need for undergraduate and graduate degree-granting institutions to which they may send employees to develop and supplement their skills. More access is needed to ensure this growing population can capitalize on the economic opportunities that are increasingly available in the region. GPC's Newton Campus will service these educational needs, she said.

Newton County is the optimal location for a permanent campus, stated President Belcher. The Newton County Board of Commissioners has dedicated itself to managing the growth that is coming. The new site is part of a 470-acre development at the intersection of Interstate 20 and Georgia Highway 11. The adjacent development, currently known as Mount Pleasant, is envisioned as a new community in which residents live, work, and socialize. Acknowledging the growing educational needs in the area, community leaders have stepped forward and stated their desire to partner with GPC. At the Newton Campus, GPC is projecting 3,800 students of its own with 500 upper-division and graduate students for a total student population of 4,300. Over the next several years, GPC expects the facility to grow to 5,000 to 6,000 students. With the Board's approval, GPC will be holding classes in this facility January 2007. As proposed, the community will donate approximately 100 acres to the Georgia Perimeter College Foundation, Inc. (the "Foundation"), which in turn will pursue private financing to fund the construction of this facility. The building will be approximately 85,000 square feet at an estimated project cost of \$24 million dollars. Under the authority of the Board of Regents, GPC would lease the facility from the Foundation for instructional use with options to renew for a total of 25 years, at which time the facility would be gifted to the Board of Regents and the State of Georgia. The dollar value of the proposed property is estimated at \$2 million dollars. In addition to the 100 acres, Newton County has pledged a one-time gift of \$2 million dollars cash to help fund the initial equipment acquisition, plus \$500,000 toward infrastructure costs. The Foundation, working with the eight counties within the service area, is committed to raising an additional \$1,500,000 toward overall project needs. President Belcher stated that GPC is not asking for additional funds for this facility. It is the college's plan to internally subsidize the facility for two years until GPC's state allocation catches up from enrollment increases.

President Belcher said that information submitted to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs in July 2004 outlined in detail how GPC meets the stated requirements for a permanent site. This report clearly shows a critical need for expanded access into the University System. This need is demonstrated through academic, demographic, and economic statistics, as well as in the community's willingness to donate land, cash, and infrastructure to this project. This proposal is in line with the goals of the University System and within the strategic plan of GPC. GPC officials have met with the Chancellor and his staff and will continue to meet with them as this project moves forward.

GPC has positioned itself to help meet the educational needs of the state, said President Belcher.

Expanding its presence to a permanent Newton campus is another step to address this academic need. She said that GPC shares the Board's vision that quality education is an investment in Georgia's future. This project is an innovative solution to meet an academic need. GPC will return to the Board of Regents in February 2005 to ask for approval of this project and again in August 2005 to ask the Board to authorize the execution of a rental agreement between the Foundation and the Board of Regents. In closing, she asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Seeing that there were no questions or comments, Chair Leebern noted that this item was for informational purposes only at this time and that the Board would be asked to approve the proposed site in Covington, Newton County at its February 2005 meeting. There being no further business to come before the Strategic Planning Committee, Chair Leebern adjourned the Committee meeting.

Chair Wooten next called for the Committee reports.

### **EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE**

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, January 11, 2005, at approximately 10:30 a.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut, and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, and Patrick S. Pittard. Chancellor Meredith was also present. Chair Wooten reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which did not require action. That item was as follows:

#### **1. Information Item: Future Issues**

The Committee discussed several different topics, including tuition issues and possibly appointing a task force on updating the funding formula. Regent Leebern stressed that when the Board of Regents uses consultants, he prefers to use Georgia-based ones.

With regard to the teacher preparation initiative, Regent McMillan stated that he would like the Regents to take a harder look at all institutions' teacher education programs to see that they are quality programs the Board wants.

At approximately 11:00 a.m., Chair Wooten called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues within the University System of Georgia. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as listed above. Chancellor Meredith; the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services, Corlis Cummings, were also in attendance. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 11:40 a.m., Chair Wooten reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

## **COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

The Committee on Information and Instructional Technology met on Tuesday, January 11, 2005, at approximately 11:25 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Michael J. Coles, Vice Chair W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., and Martin W. NeSmith. Vice Chair Jennings reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed three items, none of which required action. Those items were as follows:

### **1. Information Item: Student System Consolidation Update**

At its March 2004 meeting, approved Phase I of the implementation plan to consolidate hosting services for the Banner student information system. This initial phase was to begin with a limited number of institutions that have voluntarily requested SCT Banner hosting services and then, at a later date, examine adding more institutions. In March, Committee Chair Michael J. Coles urged the staff to consider expanding the consolidation effort beyond the recommended ten institutions and the five-year time period used in development of the cost-benefit analysis presented.

With the encouragement and support of Chancellor Meredith, the Office of Information and Instructional Technology developed a more extensive approach to Banner hosting. At this meeting, the Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology and Chief Information Officer, Randall A. Thursby, described the status of this more expanded approach, now called the Student System Consolidation project, which over a three-year period, will result in centralized hosting of 25 System institutions instead of the 10 institutions initially recommended. Furthermore, this expanded approach will yield additional funds for redirection by the institutions involved. Mr. Thursby reported that Student System Consolidation project is moving forward with the first five institutions scheduled to be hosted by fall 2005.

### **2. Information Item: University System Information Security Update**

At its March 2004 meeting, the Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology and Chief Information Officer, Randall A. Thursby, provided to the Committee an outline of the process underway to update the campus information technology (“IT”) security plans, the guidelines to be employed, and progress on institutional information technology audits to review current conditions. He indicated that all institutions were compliant in submitting their updated IT security plans to the University System Office by the deadline of December 31, 2004. Mr. Thursby reported that the next steps are to review each plan, identify their strengths and weaknesses, report these to institutions in February, and include suggestions to improve the plans. At the System level, the Office of Information and Instructional Technology staff will develop a collective view of campus plans,

highlighting commonalities both in best practices and in areas needing improvement. They will devise best System strategies for addressing areas of common need and come back to Committee on Information and Instructional Technology and the Administrative Committee on Information Technology with a report during the spring of this year.

Also at this meeting, the Executive Director for Enterprise Infrastructure Services, John T. Scoville, updated the Committee on the status of the project for PeachNet to provide intrusion defenses for System institutions. He reported that the intrusion detection system would be implemented at 30 institutions by June 30, 2005.

The Information Technology Audit Manager, Scott C. Woodison, then described the resources added to enhance the IT audit process. He reported that five IT audits and seven combined audits have been completed and that the University System Office is actively recruiting for a second IT auditor.

### **3. Information Item: University System Web Policies**

The University System of Georgia makes extensive use of the World Wide Web for communications both internal to the System and to external audiences. The Special Assistant to the Chief Information Officer, Jim D. Flowers, outlined System policies for use of the Web by the University System Office and System institutions. He reported that 13 of 35 System sites have Web policies but few of the policies are comprehensive and policies are inconsistent across the System. This issue is currently on the agenda of the Administrative Committee on Information Technology (“ACIT”); however, it exceeds ACIT authority. The staff may return to the Committee with a recommendation to amend or add Board policy to separate personal, student organization, and other third-party affiliates from official University System and institutional Web sites, which would be ideal in preventing security problems.

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, January 11, 2005, at approximately 1:50 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Patrick S. Pittard, Vice Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr., and Regents William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and J. Timothy Shelnut. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith, Board Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Allan Vigil were also in attendance. Vice Chair Carter reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Acceptance of Gifts for the Georgia Institute of Technology**



Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) gifts-in-kind from the following corporation:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Department</u>
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	\$120,213	Spectroanalyzer, autosampler, and miscellaneous supplies	School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences

Background: Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents. GIT has advised that there are no material costs associated with the acceptance of these gifts.

### **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, January 11, 2005, at approximately 1:55 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Martin W. NeSmith, Vice Chair Allan Vigil, and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith, Board Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris, James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and J. Timothy Shelnut were also in attendance. Chair NeSmith reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed eight items, seven of which required action. Chair NeSmith also reported that under the authority granted to him by the Board at the November 2004 meeting, Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith had administratively approved a request from Georgia State University to revise an item approved at the November 2004 meeting concerning the exchange of real property at 17 Piedmont Avenue and 170 Edgewood Avenue. This was necessary due to the fact that the legal entity involved in the transaction changed its name. This item was ratified by the Board under Unfinished Business (page 78). With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

#### **1. Authorization of Project, “Library Transformation Project,” Georgia State University**

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-50-0503, “Library Transformation Project,” Georgia State University (“GSU”), with a total project budget of approximately \$20,000,000 to be funded from student fees, library general operating funds, and private donations.

Understandings: This project is a comprehensive interior renovation of GSU’s two existing library facilities: Library North, approximately 150,000 square feet constructed in 1966, and Library South, approximately 125,000 square feet constructed in 1984. This renovation project will allow reorganization of departments, centralization of services, and strengthening of the relationship

between Library North and Library South.

A student fee of \$35 per semester was approved for this project by the Board at the June 2004 meeting.

The renovations will be phased in a manner that will allow the library facilities to remain in operation throughout the renovation.

The total construction cost for the project is estimated to be \$15,900,000 (\$57.82 per square foot).

The University System Office staff and GSU will proceed with the selection of appropriate professional consultants.

## **2. Rental Agreement, 425 and 455 North Lumpkin Street, Athens, University of Georgia**

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between the Trustees of the Methodist Church at Athens, in Clarke County, a Body Corporate, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 7,656.93 square feet of office space at 425 and 455 North Lumpkin Street, Athens, Georgia, for the period January 1, 2005, through June 30, 2005, at a monthly rent of \$8,295 (\$99,540 per year annualized/\$13 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for five consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing 3% per year for the use of the University of Georgia (“UGA”).

Authorization to execute this rental agreement was delegated to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities.

The terms of this rental agreement are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Understandings This space will be occupied by the Contracts and Grants Division, which is a UGA administrative function that needs to be located close to UGA’s Business Services. The space vacated in the basement of the Business Services Building will be used for storage.

All operating expenses are included in the rent rate.

## **3. Ground Lease and Rental Agreement, Recreation and Activities Center, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board declared approximately 52.33 acres of real property located on the campus of Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”), Statesboro, Georgia, no longer advantageously useful to GSOU or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this real property to be leased to Georgia Southern University Housing Foundation

Three, LLC (the “LLC”) for the purpose of constructing and owning a Recreation and Activities Center (“RAC”).

The Board authorized the execution of a ground lease, including necessary access, use, and construction easements and encroachments, between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and the LLC, Lessee, for the above-referenced approximately 52.33 acres of real property on the campus of GSOU for a period not to exceed 25 years with an additional construction period of not more than 2 years with the option to renew for up to an additional 5 years, should there be debt outstanding at the end of the original ground lease term, for the purpose of constructing, renovating, and owning the RAC consisting of approximately 135,000 square feet, and six athletic fields and parking.

The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between the LLC, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for the RAC for the period commencing on the first day of the first month after the LLC obtains a certificate of occupancy for the improvements but no earlier than March 1, 2006, and ending the following June 30, at a rent not to exceed \$281,400 per month (\$3,376,795 per year annualized) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for up to 25 consecutive one-year periods (the total not to exceed 25 years from the commencement date) with rent increasing no more than 3.0% for each option period exercised.

Authorization to execute the rental agreement was delegated to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities.

The terms of these agreements are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Authorization of the ground lease and rental agreement is subject to the approval of Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (“GSFIC”) of any and all remedial steps to be taken as a part of the transaction in connection with any private business use, as defined by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and the regulations issued thereunder.

Understandings: In August 2004, President Bruce F. Grube presented to the Board of Regents, as an information item, the RAC project, which illustrated the need to obtain the renovations and addition through a privatization process.

The facility will include a natatorium, locker rooms, basketball and volleyball courts, a climbing wall, weight rooms, and new outdoor playing fields for soccer, softball, and baseball.

At the May 2004 meeting, the Board approved a \$75 per semester student fee for this facility.

Funding for the acquisition of the real property by the Board of Regents included 1991C State bonds. Funding for construction of the existing recreation facility included 1992D State bond funds.

At the end of the term of the ground lease, the real property, all improvements, and any accumulated capital reserves will become the property of the Board of Regents.

**4. Amendment to Ground Lease and Rental Agreement for Phase I Housing, State University of West Georgia**

Approved: The Board amended the ground lease approved in October 2002 for 3.274 acres of real property for the purpose of constructing 612 student housing beds at the State University of West Georgia (“UWG”) to include the option to renew for up to an additional five years should there be debt outstanding at the end of the original ground lease term.

The Board also amended the rental agreement approved in February 2003 for 612 student housing beds at UWG to revise the rent to not exceed \$90,239 per month (\$1,082,866 per year annualized) with rent increasing no more than 3% for each option period exercised.

Understandings: Financing for this phase of housing utilized variable rate bonds backed by a bank letter of credit.

UWG desired to refinance in order to eliminate current interest rate exposure and to obtain bond insurance through fixed-rate financing. The interest rate exposure was due to a timing gap between when student rent rates are set and the fluctuation in interest rates. Also, interest rates are projected to rise which also increases the interest rate exposure. The UWG bond rating would be adversely impacted by this interest rate exposure, and a refinancing will allow renegotiation of the bond rating with the rating agencies.

All remaining terms of the ground lease approved by the Board in October 2002 and the rental agreement approved by the Board in February 2003 remain in effect.

**5. Naming of Jack Stallings Field, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the baseball field at J. I. Clements Stadium at Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) the Jack Stallings Field to honor former Coach Jack Stallings.

Understandings: Mr. Stallings was Head Baseball Coach at GSOU from 1975 until his retirement in 1999. He held the same positions at Wake Forest University (1958-1965) and Florida State University (1969-1975). At GSOU, he was also an Associate Professor in the Department of Health and Kinesiology.

Mr. Stallings led the GSOU Eagles to one College World Series, five National Collegiate Athletic Association (“NCAA”) post-season appearances, four Trans America Athletic Conference

championships, and three Southern Conference titles. In addition, he coached 22 All-American athletes. On October 30, 2004, he was inducted into the GSOU Athletics Hall of Fame.

During his long career, Mr. Stallings coached the USA National Baseball Team in the Pan American Games, the International Baseball Association (“IBA”) World Tournament, the IBA Intercontinental Cup, and the Olympic Games. In addition, he participated as a player in the Pan American Games in 1951 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He has also served as administrator for the IBA in the Pan American Games, the IBA World Tournament, the IBA Intercontinental Cup, and the Olympic Games (1984, 1988, 1992).

Mr. Stallings and his wife, Norma, live near Statesboro, where she raises and shows Arabian horses. They have been married for 49 years and have three sons. He retired from coaching baseball in May 1999 as the most winning active NCAA baseball coach in America with 1,258 wins.

## **6. Naming of the Carolyn and James Goldin House, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the naming of Building “B” of the Fourth Street Houses at Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) the Carolyn and James Goldin House to honor Carolyn and W. James Goldin.

Understandings: Building “B” of the Fourth Street Houses on the GIT campus provides sleeping rooms for 24 students. The accommodations are available to house special programs, groups, or organizations through coordination with the GIT Department of Housing. The facility also provides space for a living area, large kitchen, bathroom/restroom facilities, dining/activity space and outdoor patio space. The facility also provides one Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) accessible sleeping unit at each upper-level floor.

An Atlanta native, W. James Goldin matriculated to GIT from Brown High School in the fall of 1950. Mr. Goldin graduated in 1954 with a degree in Industrial Management. He then joined the United States Air Force and met his wife, Carolyn Middlebrooks. After leaving the Air Force, he became a prominent Atlanta businessman working for the Atlanta Gas Light Company for 34 years.

In the fall of 2004, Mr. and Mrs. Goldin donated 14.6 acres of commercial real estate in Gwinnett County, to the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. in celebration of his fiftieth reunion. The appraised value of the property is \$925,000.

Mr. Goldin desired to live on campus as a student, but his finances never allowed this to happen. Although he never realized this dream while in college, this opportunity is allowing him to fulfill that dream. Mr. Goldin has enjoyed serving and giving to the Atlanta community as President of the Atlanta Jaycees, President of the Peachtree Atlanta Kiwanis Club, President of Campfire Girls, and Vice President of the Metropolitan United Way. He also continues to be very active in his church.

**7. Appointment of Construction Management Firm, Project J-43, Professional Sciences Center, Macon State College**

Approved: The Board appointed the first-named construction management firm listed below for the identified major capital outlay project and authorized the execution of a contract with the identified firm. Should it not be possible to execute a contract with the top-ranked firm, staff will then attempt to execute a contract with the other listed firms in rank order.

Following public advertisement, a qualifications-based selection process for a construction management firm was held in accordance with Board of Regents procedures. The following recommendation was made:

**Project No. J-43, “Professional Sciences Center,” Macon State College**

Project Description: Construction of a new building of approximately 98,960 total square feet to provide classrooms, labs, and administrative and support spaces. The Divisions of Information Technology and Business and Economics will have space in the facility. The project is in the Board of Regents fiscal year 2006 capital budget, which is requesting \$22,655,380 in state bond funds.

Total Project Cost	\$22,655,380
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$17,000,000

Number of construction management firms that applied for this commission: 8

Recommended firms in rank order:

- 1) Chris R. Sheridan & Company, Macon, Georgia
- 2) Turner Construction Company, Atlanta, Georgia
- 3) Alcon Construction Company, Albany, Georgia

**8. Information Item: Update on Public-Private Ventures Program**

The Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, presented a progress report on public-private partnership activity in the University System of Georgia. She provided to the Regents a timeline of activity and milestones through August 2005 for the Public-Private Ventures program, which included filling the director’s position, composition of and proposed meetings for the Privatization Advisory Committee, workshops with interested parties, Board briefings, development and refinement of procedures, implementation of additional services, benchmarking

database, annual financial review, annual facility condition review, annual operation review, feasibility analysis, life cycle cost analysis, identification of opportunities savings process improvements, identification of potential Board policy changes, and updates to presidents, chief business officers, and foundations.

In addition, Ms. Daniels updated the Committee on related action from the Governor's New Georgia Commission that may affect this program. She noted that the Task Force on Financing references the System's privatization program as a model and that the director of the finance division of the Georgia State Finance and Investment Commission and the State Department of Audits had requested to share information on the program.

Finally, Ms. Daniels informed the Regents of proposed public-private partnership-enabling legislation targeted to education and other state facilities. She announced that the staff are reviewing this proposed legislation, are formally seeking comments from the System's public-private partners, and are looking forward to working with the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, and the System's legislative partners to provide input on this legislation.

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, January 11, 2005, at approximately 2:15 p.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair James R. Jolly, Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris, and Regents Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, and Doreen Stiles Poitevint. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith and Regents Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Patrick S. Pittard, and J. Timothy Shelnut were also in attendance. Chair Jolly reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed four items, two of which required action. Items 3 and 4 were walk-on items. Item 1 included six applications for review; five of these were denied, and one was continued. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), affidavits regarding the three Executive Sessions are on file with the Chancellor's Office. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Applications for Review**

- a. In the matter of Lumella Spencer Logan at the University of Georgia, concerning termination of her position as Information Analyst II for the School of Music, the application for review was denied.
- b. In the matter of file No. 1733 at Gainesville College, concerning a request for a grade change, the application for review was denied.

- c. In the matter of Dr. Modibo Kadalie, a current employee of Savannah State University, concerning denial of an approved leave of absence to attend a fellowship program in South Africa, the application for review was continued for further consideration.
- d. In the matter of Dr. Chunyan Li of the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, concerning termination of employment, the application for review was denied.
- e. In the matter of Kimberly A. Taylor at Fort Valley State University, concerning termination of her employment as Testing Coordinator for the university, the application for review was denied.
- f. In the matter of file No. 1724 at Clayton College & State University, concerning alleged refusal of course registration and accommodation of disability needs, the application for review was denied.

## **2. Ratification of Medical College of Georgia Settlement Agreement**

Approved: The Board ratified Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith's approval of a settlement agreement for the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG"). At its November 2004 meeting, the Board of Regents authorized Chancellor Meredith to take any actions necessary on behalf of the Board between the November meeting and the January 2005 meeting with such actions to be ratified by the Board at the January meeting. This ratification supports action taken by the Chancellor during that period.

Representatives from the Georgia Department of Law and MCG were present to discuss a settlement agreement between MCG, the Georgia Department of Corrections, and the Medical Center of Central Georgia. This matter was discussed in Executive Session.

## **3. Potential Litigation, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board authorized the Attorney General to enter into a consent order on behalf of the Board of Regents with regard to a court case involving a student at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Walk-on: This item was added by unanimous consent as a walk-on item to the Committee's agenda.

This item was discussed in Executive Session.

## **4. Information Item: Intellectual Property Guidelines**

Walk-on: This item was added by unanimous consent as a walk-on item to the Committee's agenda.



The Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services, Corlis Cummings, provided to the Committee a brief report on intellectual property guidelines in the University System of Georgia.

### **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Academic Affairs met on Wednesday, January 12, 2005, at approximately 9:10 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair William H. Cleveland, Vice Chair Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Joe Frank Harris, Martin W. Nesmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, and Allan Vigil. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith, Board Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, and Doreen Stiles Poitevint were also in attendance. Chair Cleveland reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 20 items, 17 of which required action. Additionally, 118 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

**1. Clarification of Mission Statement Without Changing Institutional Mission or Sector, Waycross College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Barbara P. Losty that Waycross College (“WC”) be authorized to clarify its institutional mission statement without changing institutional mission, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: As a result of the Chancellor’s statewide assessment process, the Board’s 1996 moratorium on changes in mission and mission statements was lifted at the November 2004 Board meeting.

As part of this process, institutions that wish to make alterations in the wording of their existing mission statements that do not change their current missions in any substantive way have been encouraged to submit them for University System Office review and subsequent action by the Board.

The following revision has been reviewed by the University System Office staff, and it neither alters the sector nor the fundamental program level of the institution.

#### **Previous Mission Statement**

As a unit of the University System of Georgia, Waycross College, founded in 1976 in Southeast Georgia, shares with the other institutions of the System the following core characteristics:

- A supportive campus climate, necessary services, and leadership and development opportunities, all to educate the whole person and meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff;

- Cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender diversity in the faculty, staff, and student body, supported by practices and programs that embody the ideals of an open, democratic, and global society;
- Technology to advance educational purposes, including instructional technology, student support services, and distance education;
- Collaborative relationships with other System institutions, state agencies, local schools and technical institutes, and business and industry, sharing physical, human, information, and other resources to expand and enhance programs and services available to the citizens of Georgia.

Waycross College shares with the other two-year colleges of the University System of Georgia the following core characteristics:

- A commitment to excellence and responsiveness within a scope of influence defined by the needs of the local area and by particularly outstanding programs or distinctive characteristics that have a magnet effect throughout the region or state;
- A commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains instructional excellence, functions to provide University System access for a diverse student body, and promotes high levels of student learning;
- A high-quality general education program that supports a variety of well-chosen associate programs and prepares students for transfer to baccalaureate programs, learning support programs designed to ensure access and opportunity for a diverse student body, and a limited number of certificate or other career programs to complement neighboring technical institute programs;
- A commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that address the needs, improve the quality of life, and raise the educational level within the college's scope of influence;
- A commitment to scholarship and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and meet local needs.

To meet the challenges of the 21st century, Waycross College distinctively serves the vital needs of the student body and the community in the following ways:

- By maintaining a primary commitment to Southeast Georgians within commuting distance of the college and by serving citizens of greater South Georgia through off-campus programs, continuing education, distance learning, and collaborative projects with other educational institutions;

- By offering “point of access” educational opportunities distinguished by flexible class scheduling, a strong learning support program, and an Academic Support Center, all of which assist a diverse, nontraditional population, comprised of many first-generation, older, and part-time enrollees;
- By pursuing the richness of diversity through not only equal opportunity for students, staff, and faculty, but also outreach programs/activities to recruit minority students, staff, and faculty; older citizens; and public school-age youth;
- By emphasizing a basic objective of instruction through a variety of pedagogical approaches to a core of general education courses;
- By emphasizing student learning outcomes through critical thinking, communication, computation, and a common core of the arts and sciences to prepare students for attaining further education;
- By offering programs of study for the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees that prepare students for further study in a variety of baccalaureate programs; and also select programs in cooperation with technical institutes that lead to the Associate of Applied Science degrees in business, service, health, and technical fields;
- By maintaining a commitment to instructional excellence and faculty and staff professional development in order to sustain creative and effective performance in the teaching/learning environment;
- By responding to the needs of students, business/industry, community groups, public schools, and System institutions through establishing partnerships and other collaborative programs to expand educational opportunities, to foster progress, and thereby to enhance the promise of Southeast Georgia;
- By emphasizing a comprehensive educational experience to assist Southeast Georgians in accepting the challenges of preparing to enter the workforce of the 21st century as leaders and contributing members of society;
- By nurturing a sense of personal enrichment and social responsibility and creating an awareness of the increasingly global nature of our natural, economic, and social orders.

### **Revised Mission Statement**

As a unit of the University System of Georgia, Waycross College is a student-centered institution of higher education committed to instructional excellence. The college provides accessible, affordable, high-quality educational opportunities for all Southeast Georgians in a diverse and dynamic campus

environment through a comprehensive range of programs and services:

- Associate degrees that prepare students for careers and transfer
- Partnerships and collaborative programs with other institutions
- Certificate and career preparation programs
- Educational support services
- Lifelong learning educational programs
- Public service

2. **Clarification of Mission Statement Without Changing Institutional Mission or Sector, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to revise its mission statement, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GIT is preparing for its 2005 reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (“SACS”). In preparing the SACS self-study, GIT found that its current vision and mission statements were not representative of the institution. Thus, GIT requested approval by the Board to revise its mission statement to more accurately define the institution as a technological research university.

**Previous Mission Statement**

***A Shared Vision***

Georgia Tech will be a leader among the few technological universities whose faculty, students, staff, and alumni create, expand, and communicate the frontiers of innovation. Georgia Tech seeks to create an enriched, more prosperous, and sustainable society for the citizens of Georgia, the nation, and the world.

***A Common Mission***

Georgia Tech will meet its unique statewide obligation for education in engineering and architecture, and its special responsibilities in computing, management, the sciences, and the technologically oriented aspects of humanities and social sciences. We seek and nurture undergraduate, masters, and Ph.D. students of extraordinary motivation and ability and prepare them for life-long learning and leadership in a world that is increasingly dependent on technology. We maintain a faculty of exceptional talent, a relevant and rigorous curriculum, facilities that sustain outstanding achievement, and a commitment to excellence supported by a tradition of practicality, integrity, loyalty, and fair-play.

Georgia Tech is a leading center for research and technological development. We continually seek

opportunities to advance society and the global economic competitiveness of Georgia and the nation. Our founding spirit of entrepreneurship sustains a focus on the application of science and technology to the creation of meaningful new ideas, methods, and the opportunities. We maintain beneficial partnerships with public and private sectors in education, research, and technology to retain our relevance and to assure that the benefits of discovery are widely disseminated and utilized.

Georgia Tech pursues its vision with the highest respect for the personal and intellectual rights of every member of its diverse community. In turn, we expect the fullest measure of effort from each to assure excellence; an ethical, well-managed institution; and the most effective use of our entrusted resources.

## **Revised Mission Statement**

### ***A Shared Vision***

Our vision is bold: Georgia Tech will define the technological research university of the 21st century and educate the leaders of a technologically driven world.”

### ***A Common Mission***

As a unit of the University System of Georgia, our mission is clear: to provide the state of Georgia with the scientific and technological base, innovation, and workforce it needs to shape a prosperous and sustainable future and quality of life for its citizens. It is achieved through educational excellence, innovative research, and outreach in selected areas of endeavor.

Georgia Tech’s mission in education and research will provide a setting for students to engage in multiple intellectual pursuits in an interdisciplinary fashion. Because of our distinction for providing a broad but rigorous education in the multiple aspects of technology, Georgia Tech seeks students with extraordinary motivation and ability and prepares them for lifelong learning, leadership, and service. As an institution with an exceptional faculty, an outstanding student body, a rigorous curriculum, and facilities that enable achievement, we are an intellectual community for all those seeking to become leaders in society.

Georgia Tech values its position as a leading public research university in the United States and understands full well its responsibility to advance society toward a proper, fair, and sustainable future. By seeking to develop beneficial partnerships with public and private sectors in education, research, and technology, Georgia Tech ensures relevance in all that it does and to assure that the benefits of its discoveries are widely disseminated and used in society.

Georgia Tech pursues its mission by giving the highest respect to the personal and intellectual rights of everyone in our diverse community. In return, we expect that all members of our community will conduct themselves with the highest ethical principles.

### **3. Clarification of Mission Statement Without Changing Institutional Mission or Sector, Macon State College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David A. Bell that Macon State College (“MSC”) be authorized to revise its mission statement, effective January 12, 2005

Abstract: As a result of the Chancellor’s statewide assessment process, the Board’s 1996 moratorium on changes in mission and mission statements was lifted at the November 2004 Board meeting.

As part of this process, institutions that wish to make alterations in the wording of their existing mission statements that do not change their current missions in any substantive way have been encouraged to submit them for University System Office review and subsequent action by the Board.

The revision has been reviewed by the University System Office staff, and it neither alters the sector nor the fundamental program level of the institution.

#### **Previous Mission Statement**

The purpose of Macon State College is to advance the intellectual, cultural, social, economic, recreational, and physical development of those within commuting distance. The College’s primary objective is to provide students the knowledge and skills needed for full, constructive lives in a rapidly changing and increasingly global environment. Macon State College is strongly committed to quality education through excellence and innovation in teaching.

Macon State College is unique in the manner that it provides access to excellence in education. Flexible and accommodating, the College has since its beginning served district constituencies including military personnel, early enrollment students, traditional and non-traditional, day and evening students, both on the main campus and at convenient off-campus sites. As well as serving the needs of underprepared students through developmental studies courses, the College offers challenging courses and programs which have very successfully prepared students for the baccalaureate degree and professional competence. The College has consistently sought and obtained the best qualified personnel available including faculty, staff and administrators, who are committed to the best possible teaching and learning environment and who care about the progress and success of people.

Macon State College offers the following specific programs and services:

- I. BACCALAUREATE programs are focused on selected areas of study. They offer students the opportunity to complete a bachelor of science degree with special emphasis on fields that support state and regional economic development.

- II. COLLEGE TRANSFER programs prepare students for further academic study at senior institutions, and assure transfer of credit to other units of the University System of Georgia. To achieve this purpose, numerous two-year degree programs with richly diverse electives, interdisciplinary courses, distance learning, and honors courses are offered.
- III. CAREER programs prepare students for further academic study while providing graduates with specific knowledge and skills for employment in such fields as business, health sciences, civil service and science technologies.
- IV. DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES courses extend access to higher education by providing under-prepared students the skills necessary for academic success.
- V. CONTINUING EDUCATION services provide the public with personal enrichment short courses and workshops for which continuing education credits may be awarded. Through this department the College also provides facilities and administrative services which enable statewide organizations and other units of the University System of Georgia to bring seminars, meetings and upper level and graduate courses to the region.
- VI. STUDENT AFFAIRS services enrich the growth and development of students and facilitate their pursuit of educational goals by providing financial, personal, and academic assistance. Services include counseling, testing, and job placement; coordination of student and alumni organizations; and a wide variety of cultural, social and athletic events for the benefit of students and the community at large.

In addition to these programs Macon State College opens many of its events to the public and offers its services and expertise to promote the cultural and economic development of the region.

### **Revised Mission Statement**

As a unit of the University System of Georgia, Macon State College is building a new model in higher education – a focused baccalaureate institution whose resources are dedicated to the advancement of a defined region. The college prepares students to succeed in a technology-rich, information-driven global economy while developing important life and citizenship skills through a solid foundation in the liberal arts.

Affordable and accessible, its professionally oriented degree programs are concentrated in selected disciplines that lead to rewarding careers and enhance the economic and cultural vitality of Central Georgia.

With a main campus in Macon, a site in Warner Robins, and a center on Robins Air Force Base, the college offers baccalaureate degrees in areas linked directly to important regional needs in business, communications, information technology, nursing, teacher preparation, public service, health services administration, and health information management.

In addition to its baccalaureate offerings, the college serves as a gateway to the University System

of Georgia through associate degree programs representing the first two years of college, work, and learning support coursework that allows underprepared students to develop their academic potential.

Macon State College is strongly committed to quality education and student success through excellence and innovation in teaching. A highly flexible and dynamic institution, it actively recruits faculty, staff, and administrators with the experience and talent to sustain a supportive and productive learning environment for a diverse student population. Scholarly pursuits are encouraged with emphasis on applied research related to regional issues, the college's core disciplines, and institutional effectiveness.

Student life is enriched through cultural, social, and recreational programs, as well as opportunities for leadership in student government and participation in extracurricular organizations. The special needs of a commuting population are recognized in the design and delivery of counseling, testing, career planning, and placement services.

Economic outreach and community engagement are accomplished through an extensive program of continuing and professional education. The college's Institute for Business and Information Management serves as its primary economic development resource for Central Georgia. The institute responds to the unique and complex educational needs of Robins Air Force Base and its associated aerospace firms.

#### **4. Revision of Name Without Changing Institutional Mission or Sector, State University of West Georgia**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Beheruz N. Sethna that the State University of West Georgia ("UWG") be authorized to revise its institutional name, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: UWG requested that the Board of Regents consider a name change of the institution from the State University of West Georgia to the University of West Georgia. All relevant constituencies of the institution were consulted concerning their preferences for the institutional name change, and all supported this request.

The previous name was somewhat awkward and did not conform well to common nomenclature practice in higher education.

No mission or sector change is implied by this action.

Print material costs of the name change are to be absorbed by the institution as it develops new published materials as part of its regular cycles. Other costs will be covered by external, nonstate funds.



**5. Establishment of a New Degree Program, Bachelor of Science in Education With a Major in Early Childhood Education, Macon State College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David A. Bell that Macon State College (“MSC”) be authorized to establish a new Bachelor of Science in Education with a major in Early Childhood Education, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: The Bachelor of Science in Education degree program, with a major in Early Childhood Education, will be the first teacher preparation program offered by MSC. The major in Early Childhood Education will be unique in that its design originates from the field of special education, which emphasizes diagnosis of learning needs and tailors instruction toward those needs. MSC’s program applies this design to the preparation of early childhood teachers, which will position the new teachers well to reach the diverse learners in Georgia’s elementary schools. Because the program design is based in special education, program completers will earn dual teacher certification in early childhood education and in special education.

The first students will enter the program in fall 2005. The program will build upon the associate degree program in education already offered. Concurrently, MSC will complete the development of this program, hire faculty, begin the accreditation process with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (required by Board policy), initiate a request to the Professional Standards Commission for approval to prepare teachers in Georgia, and meet the Regents’ Principles for the Preparation of Teachers for the Schools. The University System Office will assist MSC through the design and initial phase of this program.

Need: Teacher preparation at MSC will meet both a regional and state need for new teachers. President Bell is working with the Central Georgia school systems in the design of this new program. Data from MSC indicate that most of its graduates remain in the Central Georgia region, which will help local systems find the teachers they need.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 50, 70, 95, and 130 during the first four years of the program beginning in year 2007.

Funding: This new program will be funded through a combination of reallocated internal funds (representing 60%), outside sources that have been committed by the Macon State College Foundation, Inc. (the “Foundation”) and a new allocation. It will take two years for the formula funding generated from enrollment in this program to be realized. At that time, it is anticipated that use of Foundation funding will not be necessary. The remaining \$300,000 needed to initiate this program will be requested as part of the normal fiscal year 2006 budgeting process.

Approval of this program is a first important step to position MSC to prepare high-quality teachers for the Central Georgia region.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

Discussion: *Committee Chair Cleveland allowed Dr. Lawrence E. Marable, President of the National Alumni Association, Inc. of Fort Valley State University ("FVSU"), to respond to this proposed new degree program at MSC. Dr. Marable objected to the establishment of the new program because a similar program already exists at FVSU, because FVSU had not been consulted about the establishment of this new program in its service area, and because he felt it would be more prudent in these budget times to augment the existing program at FVSU rather than creating a new program in the same service area.*

*The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, responded that the funding for the new program already exists at MSC, so there will be no new state funds required to establish the program. He also noted that FVSU is one of the better funded institutions in the University System of Georgia; indeed, it is the fifth best funded institution in terms of allocations per full-time equivalent students, following the four research universities.*

*The Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, Jan Kettlewell, stated that in light of the state's tremendous demand for qualified teachers, which she had discussed at the November 2004 meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee, the System needs teacher education programs at both FVSU and MSC.*

*Dr. Papp concurred that as discussed at the November 2004 meeting, in order to increase the number and quality of teachers in the State of Georgia, the staff will be proposing other new teacher education programs throughout the System and will also be proposing that all two-year institutions embark on a larger transfer role in teacher education so that the System can increase its production of qualified K-12 teachers.*

*Regent Cater expressed concern about the low PRAXIS test scores of FVSU education graduates. He asked what the Board of Regents is doing to help the institution in this regard, and he said that the Board should demand better of the institution in this regard just as it does in the case of poor audit findings.*

*Dr. Kettlewell responded that the staff regularly meet with all of the institutions that offer teacher preparation programs so that institutions may share best practices. She had visited FVSU and made suggestions to improve its teacher education programs. She noted that FVSU had recently made some departmental staff and leadership changes and that President Kofi Lomotey had recommitted to the Chancellor the priority of teacher preparation at the institution. She said that her staff continues to*

*support the institution in its efforts but that the staff cannot redesign the program or teach the courses for the institution. She explained that a few years ago, she helped FVSU design a pilot program, which was approved by the Board of Regents, to improve the graduates' PRAXIS scores. The institution was making strides, but it chose to abandon the pilot program.*

*Regent McMillan interjected that he had been very interested in FVSU's innovative pilot program in teacher education, which had been approved by the Board. However, for whatever reason, the administration at FVSU chose to cancel that program. Since the Board had approved the pilot program, he felt the Board should have had a vote on whether to discontinue the program. He stated that there should be more hands-on involvement from the University System Office in the teacher education programs around the System. He was appalled at the dearth of teachers that are projected to graduate from historically black colleges and universities. He said that even with this new program, there would not be an appreciable increase in the production of minority teachers in the region. He agreed that the Board needs to be aware of how institutions encroach on each other, but on the other hand, if an institution is not producing enough quality graduates, then that is a catch-22.*

*Chancellor Meredith said that the staff have been deeply distressed by the low PRAXIS test passage rates at FVSU. He said that any time an institution admits students into a program and then graduates them from the program, the students should be prepared to pass the certification test. If not, the institution has failed those students. The University System Office staff can only do so much to improve the program at FVSU. There must be an institutional commitment to improve the PRAXIS pass rates. The Chancellor said that the System only produces 21% of the state's teachers. It must produce more teachers for the K-12 schools in the State of Georgia, and it must establish more teacher education programs to accomplish this goal, regardless of the situation at FVSU.*

**6. Establishment of an External Bachelor of Science in Education With a Major in Early Childhood Education on the Campus of Middle Georgia College, Georgia Southwestern State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael L. Hanes that Georgia Southwestern State University ("GSSU") be authorized to establish one of its existing degree programs as an external Bachelor of Science in Education program with a major in Early Childhood Education on the campus of Middle Georgia College ("MGC"), effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: In each of the last five academic years, 1999-2004, MGC has graduated over 30 students with Associate of Arts degrees in Education who intended to complete their baccalaureate degrees in Early Childhood Education. The external program offering by GSSU will fill a need in the metropolitan statistical area of Central Georgia.

The requirements for admission, retention, and completion of the Bachelor of Science in Education

with a major in Early Childhood Education will be identical to those stipulated for the existing program offered on the campus of GSSU including the requirement that field experiences be embedded in courses and take place only at approved GSSU professional development schools. Resident requirements will be the same for MGC-based students as those stipulated in the university bulletin for GSSU.

Faculty resources are sufficient to offer the program. GSSU is in the process of searching to fill a vacant faculty position. The faculty member will serve as advisor to students who wish to enter the program and those already in the program. Additionally, the MGC-based GSSU program coordinator will be a central point of contact for students regarding other administrative issues. GSSU and MGC librarians are reviewing pertinent library holdings and the GSSU School of Education faculty are identifying needed materials to inform this portion of the GSSU-MGC collaboration. MGC has adequate computer laboratory resources available for courses requiring specific technologies.

The program will be reviewed as part of the School of Education's regular accreditation cycle. Specific program approval will be done in conjunction with the GSSU Early Childhood Education program, which is to be reviewed by the Association for Childhood Education International, a National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education ("NCATE") affiliated specialty professional association. The program is anticipated to continue indefinitely given the current level of interest by students and MGC and GSSU personnel.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 10, 20, and 30 during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program can be offered using current MGC facilities and GSSU resources. President Hanes has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

7. **Establishment of an External Bachelor of Business Administration With Majors in General Business, Management, Accounting, Finance, Human Resources Management, and Marketing Offered Predominantly at a Distance at Middle Georgia College, Bainbridge College, and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College via Multiple Technologies, Georgia Southwestern State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael L. Hanes that Georgia Southwestern State University ("GSSU") be authorized to establish one of its existing degree programs as an external Bachelor of Business Administration degree with majors in General Business,

Management, Accounting, Finance, Human Resources Management, and Marketing on the campuses of Middle Georgia College (“MGC”), Bainbridge College (“BC”), and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (“ABAC”) utilizing multiple technologies, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GSSU proposed the establishment of its Bachelor of Business Administration degree with majors in General Business, Management, Accounting, Finance, Human Resources Management, and Marketing as external degree programs on the campuses of MGC, BC, and ABAC. GSSU proposes that the major courses be delivered both on campus and at a distance via the Internet and the Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”). GSSU sought to offer majors to serve the needs of graduates from Associate of Science in Business Administration programs of these two-year colleges. By incorporating the technology, barriers for working graduates with the Associate of Science in Business Administration to attend and complete the Bachelor of Business Administration program at the institution will be significantly reduced, thus increasing the number of graduates with a baccalaureate business degree in the state.

Need: Currently, 279 students are pursuing the business administration degree at MGC. Offering the external business administration degree will give these students and others the opportunity to matriculate while on the campus of MGC to earn a degree from GSSU. Approximately 15 students are taking courses in the Business Administration sequence at BC, and 55 students are currently matriculating at ABAC. In addition to increasing the number of Georgians earning a baccalaureate degree, the collaborative nature of the external degree at the two-year college institutions will enhance the utilization of resources.

Institutional Readiness: The memorandum of understanding signed by presidents of GSSU and MGC, BC, and ABAC indicates the commitment and readiness of these institutions to offer the business administration degree along with other undergraduate programs. Within GSSU’s School of Business Administration, 11 full-time faculty members and a dean will deliver the proposed programs in the modalities mentioned earlier. All have completed WebCT™ training and currently utilize WebCT™ to enhance and deliver courses.

The Office of Information and Instructional Technology at GSSU provides faculty training and support to teach distance technology delivered programs. The School of Business Administration also has been using GSAMS facilities to offer courses to its students.

MGC, BC, and ABAC agree to provide facilities to offer the external degree programs on their campuses. Modifications for existing facilities to establish and maintain alternate delivery of the majors will not be required. WebCT™ is also available to all faculty and students enrolled at GSSU. Remote access to library resources will be available to students on the two-year colleges and online. Both faculty and students have access to technological support at GSSU’s Office of Information and Instructional Technology. Students will be served by coordinators on the campuses of MGC, BC, and ABAC. GSSU’s School of Business Administration is in its fourth year of candidacy for

accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. The dean of the School of Business Administration along with area coordinators assumes responsibility for program maintenance and program quality. National standards for program quality are addressed through the accreditation process. Academic standards will not differ for the external degree program.

Program Requirements: Students completing the external Bachelor of Business Administration program must satisfy the same residency and program requirements that are required of other students as outlined in the most current publication of the GSSU bulletin.

Projected Enrollment The institution anticipates total enrollments of 85, 98, and 115 during the first three years of the program across all three external sites.

Funding: The program can be offered using current MGC, BC, and ABAC facilities and GSSU resources. President Hanes has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

#### **8. Establishment of an External Master of Music Therapy Offered Predominantly at a Distance via the Internet, Georgia College & State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Dorothy Leland that Georgia College & State University ("GCSU") be authorized to offer its existing Master of Music Therapy externally via the Internet, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GCSU proposed the external offering of its Master of Music Therapy degree that is offered through the School of Health Sciences. While pursuing the Master of Music Therapy degree, students may opt for a general track or specialize in one of four concentration areas: Women's Health, Hospice/Medical, Multicultural/International, or Special Education.

The program will be offered in an asynchronous learning format designed specifically to meet the needs of music therapists whose practice, family, or other life commitments may preclude the possibility of study on a full-time bases in a fixed time and geographic place. By means of online education, teleconferencing, and videoconferencing, this program will permit asynchronous teaching and learning, as well as the establishment of virtual collaborative learning communities not limited by geographic constraints. Periodic on-campus visits will be scheduled as part of the degree program to support these learning communities through face-to-face interaction.

The program strengthens existing undergraduate music and music therapy programs by attracting

students to the degree equivalency/master's program. These individuals seeking a career change to music therapy would possess other degrees in music but would need to take undergraduate music therapy, music, and psychology courses prior to pursuing the graduate music therapy degree.

Need: According to GCSU, the American Music Therapy Association projects that as public awareness of music therapy increases in the twenty-first century, there will be an insufficient number of music therapists to meet the growing demand for music therapy services.

Program Requirements: Distance learning students completing the Master of Music Therapy program must satisfy the same residency and program requirements that are required of other students as outlined in the most current publication of the GCSU bulletin.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 10, 17, and 20 during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program can be offered using current GCSU resources. President Leland has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

## **9. Establishment of an External Global Executive Master of Business Administration Program in Nancy, France, and Buenos Aires, Argentina, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish an external Global Executive Master of Business Administration in Nancy, France, and Buenos Aires, Argentina, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: The degree, offered by GIT's College of Management in two locations in collaboration with the ICN Ecole de Management de Nancy and the Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires, focuses on innovation and change management. The program will appeal to mid-career professionals in various international business disciplines working in the United States, the European Union, and Latin America.

Need: As technological change and globalization proceed and change the international business environment, it is vitally necessary that Georgia and the United States have business professionals who understand technology, globalization, innovation, and the management of change. This program provides such an education.

Objectives: The program will educate mid-career students who will improve their performance and

enhance their marketability in the world of international business. It is designed to help such professionals better understand the international marketplace and to manage innovation and change within the international arena. It fits well with GIT's mission as a global technological university.

Curriculum: The three-semester program begins with a two-week session at GIT. Prior to the beginning of the second and third semesters, students will spend a two-week residency in Nancy and then in Buenos Aires. The curriculum will concentrate on international business practices and procedures, international business innovation, and the management of business change in the international environment. Instruction will be provided via face-to-face classroom meetings, via visits to corporate headquarters, and via the Internet.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 15, 15, and 20 students at each location during the first three years of the program.

Funding: Adequate facilities and faculty are available in Atlanta, Nancy, and Buenos Aires. There will be a special tuition rate in this program to be considered at the next Board meeting. President Clough has provided verification that funding for the program is available at the institution if the premium tuition is approved.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

#### **10. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions**

Approved: The administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by the Chair of the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension and approved by the Board. The full list of approved appointments is on file with the Office of Faculty Affairs in the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

#### **11. Degree Redesignation of the Bachelor of Science With a Major in Criminal Justice as the Bachelor of Arts With a Major in Criminal Justice, Georgia College & State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Dorothy Leland that Georgia College & State University ("GCSU") be authorized to redesignate the Bachelor of Science with a major in Criminal Justice as the Bachelor of Arts with a major in Criminal Justice, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GCSU sought to redesignate the Bachelor of Science with a major in Criminal Justice as the Bachelor of Arts with a major in Criminal Justice because the redesignation would offer both



foreign language and quantitative/system analysis through a combination of course offerings. In short, students will graduate with a stronger degree. The redesignation also allows all of the degree requirements among three majors (Criminal Justice, Sociology, and Political Science) to be similar until students reach their major area of study.

**12. Termination of the Majors in Chemical Engineering Technology and Mechanical Engineering Technology Under the Bachelor of Science, Savannah State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carlton E. Brown that Savannah State University (“SSU”) be authorized to terminate majors in Chemical Engineering Technology and Mechanical Engineering Technology under the Bachelor of Science degree, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: An extensive on-campus program review effort that included both faculty and administrative committees used SSU’s strategic plan and the University System’s comprehensive program review process and concluded that these degrees should be terminated because of low enrollment. There are fewer than ten students in both programs combined, all of whom will be accommodated in other SSU programs. Three or fewer faculty members will be affected by these terminations, all of whom will be given the opportunity to retool to meet other vital needs of the university.

**13. Degree Redesignation of the Master of Arts With a Major in Sociology to the Master of Arts With a Major in Social Science, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce F. Grube that Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) be authorized to redesignate the Master of Arts with a major in Sociology to the Master of Arts with a major in Social Sciences, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GSOU sought to redesignate the existing Master of Arts with a major in Sociology to the Master of Arts with a major in Social Science with concentrations in Sociology, Psychology, History, and Political Science. Following the results of the university’s program review and consistent with the university’s strategic plan, GSOU seeks to transform an historically low-enrollment program (the Master of Arts with a major in Sociology) into a multidisciplinary approach toward the understanding of the social aspects of human behavior, structure, and culture as they relate to individuals, groups, organizations, communities, institutions, and societies. The Master of Arts in Social Science will focus on the practice or application of the disciplines, which also furthers the university’s mission of offering graduate programs with an applied and regional focus.

**14. Revised Institutional Statutes, Floyd College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President John Randolph Pierce that Floyd College (“FC”) be authorized to revise its institutional statutes, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: FC requested that the Board of Regents approve two changes in the statutes of the college. The revisions were recommended by the Statutes and Faculty Affairs Committee and approved by the FC faculty. One change involved replacing the Computer Committee section with a Technology Committee. Another change involved the wording of the Library Committee section. The statutes have been reviewed and will remain on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

**15. Substantive Change of the Master of Science in Nursing Program, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce F. Grube that Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) be authorized to substantively change its Master of Science in Nursing program, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GSOU sought to substantively change its Master of Science in Nursing degree to better align the program with current national curriculum and clinical requirement standards and to clarify the majors listed on the transcript. Minor course changes in the graduate and advanced practice core curriculum were recommended for the concentrations of Family Nurse Practitioner and Women’s Health Nurse Practitioner. In addition, minor changes in the graduate and advanced practice core were proposed for the curriculum in Community Health Clinical Nurse Specialist along with redesigning the specialty core courses. The substantive change includes a revised course delivery format, offering selected courses as a combination of lecture and asynchronous delivery courses using WebCT™. This change will accommodate the increasing demand for online graduate nursing courses. It is anticipated that the proposed substantive change will increase the number of graduate nursing students in the program by 30% over the next three years, raising the total per semester to 60 students.

**16. Termination of Specific Degree Programs, Georgia State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to terminate specific degree programs, effective January 12, 2005.

Abstract: GSU sought termination of specific degree programs due to low enrollments, phase-out by the institution, and a lack of adequate implementation. The following specific academic programs were terminated: Bachelor of Arts with a major in Classics, Bachelor of Science with a major in Medical Records Administration, Master of Science with a major in Environmental Economics, and Master of Education with a major in Secondary Education and Teaching. The terminated programs will not have an adverse impact on students or faculty. GSU’s request was prompted by the most recent listing of degree programs in which the inactive programs were flagged for subsequent action.

**17. Termination of Specific Degree Programs, State University of West Georgia**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Beheruz N. Sethna that the State University of West Georgia (“UWG”) be authorized to terminate specific degree programs, effective June 12, 2005.

Abstract: UWG requested termination of six graduate education programs. The programs are being terminated because of low enrollments and changes in certification requirements. No new students have been admitted to the programs for some time, and the remaining students who have been enrolled in these programs should all graduate by the end of spring semester 2005. The following programs are to be terminated:

- Master of Education with a major in Teaching Field – Mental Retardation
- Master of Education with a major in Teaching Field – Learning Disabilities
- Master of Education with a major in Teaching Field – Behavior Disorders
- Specialist in Education with a major in Teaching Field – Learning Disabilities
- Specialist in Education with a major in Teaching Field – Behavior Disorders
- Specialist in Education with a major in Interrelated Program for Exceptional Children

Courses unique to these programs have also been deleted. UWG indicates that these changes will benefit their respective departments by allowing the faculty to focus their time and resources on more viable programs. Neither faculty nor students will be adversely impacted by these changes.

**18. Information Item: Service Agreements**

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7 and 8, 1984, the presidents of the listed institutions have executed service agreements with the indicated agencies for the purposes and periods designated, with the institutions to receive payment as indicated:

**University of Georgia**

Georgia Department of Community Affairs Provide consulting services, which will enable the Department and its partner, the Rural Development Council, to better deliver its “Leadership Investment Infrastructure Fund” and enhance leadership development opportunities in the state	7/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$200,000
Georgia Department of Education Implement the Effective Behavioral and Instructional Strategies initiative as part of the State Initiative Grant award	9/9/04 – 8/31/05	\$141,443
Georgia Department of Education Train teachers and administrators to integrate service learning into a schoolwide instructional philosophy called democratic learning; experience the power of collaboration in improving student learning;	8/13/04 – 6/30/05	\$25,000

understand the principal's role in improving student learning; and develop an individual action plan for improving student learning through democratic learning		
Coordinate the 2004 School Nutrition Director's Conference and facilitate the designing, printing, and mailing of the conference brochures to school nutrition directors and superintendents	7/16/04 – 1/31/05	\$40,850
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide laboratory support for dead bird-related West Nile surveillance, mosquito pool testing, and field support for local live bird sampling and testing within Georgia	10/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$148,340
Georgia Department of Human Resources Develop a risk communication assessment tool designed to conduct an assessment of the department's ability to disseminate critical health information to the general public (including special needs populations) during a public health emergency	9/15/04 – 5/31/05	\$76,561
Georgia Department of Human Resources Enhance Web-enabled health information site featuring a Geographic Information System	9/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$28,600

Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice Assist with supervision and programming for delinquent youth committed to the state who are participating in department-operated community programs; assist in providing prevention services to youth in the community determined to be at risk for delinquency; and assist in providing diversion programs to the juvenile court to prevent further penetration into the system	8/1/04 – 5/31/05	\$47,260
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Continue the development and maintenance of a statewide inventory of identified archaeological sites in Georgia and provide access to the site file in accordance with the site file policies	7/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$15,000
Georgia Emergency Management Agency Perform the fiscal year 2003 State Homeland Security Program and test the local capabilities of the local response community	9/24/04 – 9/24/05	\$101,100
Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority Work with multiple segments of the agricultural population to provide education, demonstration, and general information regarding the efficient use of energy resources	10/1/04 – 9/30/05	\$70,000
Georgia Forestry Commission Conduct research on phytophthora ramorum to learn more about the methods and modes of spread, potential host species, and methods	9/1/04 – 8/31/06	\$35,000

of infections in various species of plants		
Georgia Cancer Coalition Identify cancer clinicians and scientists who meet the requirement of the Georgia Cancer Coalition program	8/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$380,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peaches Investigate efficacy of attraction pheromones at disrupting mating of pests in a large-scale orchard	1/1/04 – 12/31/04	\$5,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peaches Reduce amount of pesticide used in an orchard while maintaining effective control of plum curculio	1/1/04 – 12/31/04	\$1,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peaches Develop efficient methods of using pesticides or reducing the volumes of pesticides currently in use to give grower variety of tools against pests and delay development of pesticide resistance	1/1/04 – 12/31/04	\$2,000

Georgia Commodity Commission for Soybeans Provide extension education materials and meetings, on-farm visits, and 2005 Georgia soybean production efficiency contest, and grower year	7/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$16,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco Conduct on-farm demonstrations relating to tobacco production, pest management, harvesting and curing, residue management and quality improvement which will provide examples and information useful to tobacco producers of Georgia and which may assist in improving quality and quantity of tobacco	7/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$5,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco Provide funding for printing extension tobacco publications to include the 2005 Georgia Tobacco Growers' Guide, the 2004 Georgia Tobacco Research-Extension Report, and other publications	7/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$7,500
Georgia Department of Agriculture Define roles of the department and the University of Georgia College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences in meeting the goals and objectives of the grant under the direction of the Georgia Agroterrorism Committee	11/1/04 – 12/31/05	\$660,515
Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning Process training approvals for the Department of Human Resources as required by the daycare licensing regulations to develop and maintain a database on trainers, their qualifications, available training, and other related issues	10/1/04 – 9/30/05	\$143,614
Georgia Department of Education	7/1/04 –	\$30,000

Construct an instructional greenhouse according to the approved architectural plans and specifications for an agriculture education facility	12/15/04	
Georgia Department of Education Implement the external evaluation initiative as part of the State Initiative Grant award	9/9/04 – 8/31/05	\$47,458
Georgia Department of Human Resources Expand child welfare through purchase of community-based family support services provided as part of a comprehensive, coordinated service delivery system	10/1/04 – 9/15/05	\$67,500
Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice Provide counseling services to delinquent youth in Clarke County under court supervision	7/1/04 – 6/30/05	\$16,600

### **Georgia Southern University**

Georgia Forestry Commission Develop a comprehensive education outreach with three partners for six target audiences in Bulloch County	8/3/04 – 8/31/05	\$17,411
Southwest Georgia Cancer Coalition Enhance the effectiveness and success of the planned Program of Excellence in Southwest Georgia and potentially enhance the productivity and external funding opportunities of each entity and generate results that exceed what each entity would accomplish without the partnership of the other	8/1/04 – 7/31/05	\$17,322

<b>TOTAL AMOUNT – January</b>	<b>\$ 2,346,074</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2005 TO DATE</b>	<b>\$ 17,065,238</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2004 TO JANUARY</b>	<b>\$ 123,498,688*</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2004</b>	<b>\$ 131,651,016</b>

\*The large income from service agreements last year was due primarily to a \$106 million agreement between the Medical College of Georgia and the Department of Corrections for inmates' healthcare.

### **19. Information Item: Update on Degree Programs Terminated in the University System**

The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, provided a report of degree programs terminated through the Office of Academic Affairs. He reported that in fiscal year 2002, 166 programs were terminated and 31 were approved. In fiscal year 2003, 13 programs were terminated and 19 were approved. In fiscal year 2004, 33 programs were terminated and 47 were

approved. In total, from fiscal year 2002 to 2004, 212 programs were terminated and 97 were approved.

## **20. Information Item: Final Report of the Off-Campus Instruction Committee**

The Senior Advisor for Academic Affairs and Director of International Programs, Richard C. Sutton, provided the final report of the Off-Campus Instruction Committee, which he chaired.

Abstract: The Off-Campus Instruction Committee was empanelled on August 26, 2003, to complete the following objectives:

- To review nomenclature currently in use within the University System of Georgia to designate off-campus instructional sites.
- To recommend names for off-campus instructional sites that may be uniformly applied across sectors.
- To define, in detail, the requirements necessary to qualify for each recommended name, such as (but not limited to) number of permanent faculty, level of student/faculty support services provided, number of courses/programs/degrees offered, type and ownership of facility/physical plant, etc.
- To review Section 303.03 Off-Campus Instruction in The Policy Manual of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and recommend changes, if necessary.
- To review Section 2.15 Centers and Institutes in the Academic Affairs Handbook and recommend changes in nomenclature, if necessary.
- To review “Instructional Programs Off Campus Sites Decision Rules” and determine if any or all of the rules are applicable to committee recommendations.
- To review “Guiding Principles: External Degrees and Off-Campus Offerings” and determine if any or all of the principles are applicable to committee recommendations.
- To create a written policy for review by the Regents’ Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs, the University System Office staff and the Chancellor with the goal of approval by the Board of Regents.

The resultant committee report was shared at the fall 2004 meeting of the Regents’ Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs and at the fall 2004 Presidents’ Meeting for review. The report includes revised policy suggestions and the inclusion of detailed policies for external degrees and off-campus offerings.

At this meeting, Dr. Sutton presented the committee’s report as an information item in order to allow additional time for the Regents’ review. Related approval items will be on the agenda of the February Board meeting. Dr. Sutton reported that the System’s policies on external instruction have been outpaced by events and that the academic marketplace is changing dramatically. The System needs

to move more quickly and efficiently to meet state needs while maintaining necessary standards of public management. It also needs consistent nomenclature for the growing number of off-campus sites. Therefore, the committee recommended the following actions to help resolve these issues:

**20. Information Item: Final Report of the Off-Campus Instruction Committee**

- Substantially revise Board policy on external instruction.
- Create a new section of The Policy Manual for off-campus facilities.
- Revoke existing procedures and adopt new guidelines that emphasize strategic planning, academic integrity, flexibility, and consistent quality.

The proposed new policies and procedures, if approved, will change current Board practices in the several ways. Whenever the Board approves an external degree, it would come to the Board in a more strategic context, rather than as an isolated item. New policies would put less emphasis on geography and more on the nature of the population to be served. Proposed external degrees would look at data for the current and future market, not just past patterns. Moreover, the System would use common site names with common criteria. However, there are some things that will not change under the new policies. The Board will still have to approve all proposals for external degrees. The Board will still have to approve any facilities proposals that cost money. The Chancellor will still have to resolve quarrels between presidents if they cannot work things out themselves.

The net impact of the policy changes will be greater flexibility and responsiveness, integrated strategic plans that cover both external degree programs and facilities, improved communication and transparency, and coordination and oversight led by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs. With these changes, the System will have a new set of drivers for the next decade. The market will drive the offering of individual courses. A new academic planning process will drive the offering of external degree programs (however and wherever they may be delivered). Academic planning will drive every off-campus real estate transaction. Georgians can expect the same level and quality of educational services from places with the same names.

The Board is counting on System institutions to be aggressive in meeting the state's educational needs, strategic in their planning, and mindful of the Board's authority to enforce its new policies. The end result will create expanded avenues to provide more education, in more ways and places, to more Georgians.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Strategic Planning Committee met at approximately 11:05 a.m. on Wednesday, January 12, 2005, in the Board Room. (See pages 23 to 33.) Committee members in attendance were Chair Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Vice Chair Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Regents Michael J. Coles, Elridge W. McMillan, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Allan Vigil. Board Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Chancellor



Thomas C. Meredith, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Martin W. NeSmith, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and J. Timothy Shelnut were also in attendance. Chair Leebern reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed two items, one of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

**1. Approval of Recommendations for Improving the Number, Diversity, and Quality of University System of Georgia Educated Teachers**

Approved: The Board approved the following recommendations for improving the number, diversity, and quality of University System of Georgia educated teachers:

- Adoption of the implementation plan to double the number, double the diversity of teachers prepared by the University System of Georgia
- Approval of new continuous improvement and accountability system, as described in the implementation plan
- Approval of System-level teacher production targets in 2010 (as funds become available) with incremental annual increases between 2005 and 2010
  - Overall teacher production target: 7,000
  - Minority teacher production target: 1,555
- Approval to develop articulation agreement with the Department of Technical and Adult Education for 2+2 programs for pre-kindergarten teachers
- Additional items in the implementation plan to be considered by the Committee on Academic Affairs:
  - Approval for two-year colleges to offer 69 hours within associate of arts degree for pre-majors in secondary education
  - Approval of Macon State College to prepare teachers

For further information on this item, see pages 23 to 29.

**2. Information Item: Discussion of Possible Newton County/Covington Site for Georgia Perimeter College**

President Jacquelyn M. Belcher of Georgia Perimeter College (“GPC”) made an informational presentation on a possible Newton County/Covington instructional site for GPC. For further

information on this item, see pages 29 to 33.

## **CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD**

After the Committee meeting reports, Chancellor Meredith gave his report to the Board, which was as follows:

With your permission, I will give the State of the System Address next month. It has been only eight weeks since we last met, but it's been an eventful two months. For Susan and me, the past seven weeks have been spent in recovery from our accident. Let me say at the outset that we deeply appreciate the expressions of concern and support from so many people. If there has been one single good gift from these past holidays, it's been the gift of caring and concern we have received from so many. Thank you. I'm not making light of this situation; we are blessed to be here and are prepared to make an even greater contribution with this new beginning.

On the other side of the world, we have watched with sorrow the destruction wrought by the tsunami in the Indian Ocean. There are more than 2,500 University System students from countries devastated by this disaster. We send many students to study in this region and our faculty conduct research there. As a System, we are working on a number of ways in which we can help both our international students, should they need assistance, and to make contributions to the overall reconstruction effort.

I want to publicly thank Vice Chair Shelnut and all of you who worked so hard to make the first University System of Georgia Gala such an extraordinary success. The evening was very special.

Recently, questions have been raised regarding whether the University System of Georgia Foundation, Inc. is being used by private corporations and individuals to buy influence and business deals in the University System. The answer is absolutely not! I fully understand the cynicism that has developed as a result of the Enron and WorldCom revelations. However, the wrongdoing of a few should not lead to extreme reactions that will undo time-tested and successful fund-raising principles. Common sense must eventually reign. Corporate and private foundation gifts should be announced, but a private individual's decision to give to a private foundation is another item. Let's be careful.

Because the University System is a beneficiary of strategically targeted philanthropy from the foundations of some of the same Georgia corporations that conduct business on our college campuses, it is unfair to assume and assert wrongdoing and "quid pro quo" transactions. There is absolutely no evidence of such impropriety, merely innuendo that hurts all involved in these false accusations. Such donations historically have been an integral

component of the public-private partnership approach higher education has sought and encouraged as a means of strengthening academic programs, student services, and meeting other needs. The University System greatly needs the private funding that augments the state support we receive. We cannot afford to turn our back on or discourage philanthropic support in order to squelch false and unfounded suspicions of “back-scratching” financial dealings.

We know that our business practices can withstand full scrutiny, and we don't have anything to hide. We will continue to keep a watchful eye to ensure that private support does what it is intended to do. And we will work to strengthen openness so that potential private supporters will feel positive about entering into new and needed public-private partnerships.

I am excited about this legislative session! I hope my picture in the paper this morning will garner us some sympathy. Seriously, with the large number of new legislators, we have a responsibility to make them aware of the wide range of services we provide, the needs we have in order to provide those services, what we are doing to generate our own resources, and what we are doing to become more efficient with the dollars we have. We have a number of publications we send to the General Assembly, and we are starting with the basics, telling them who we are and what we do. Each week, we will add a little more information to help them understand the big picture. We will also be asking you to be involved in the legislative process, as appropriate.

Without question, the University System of Georgia is the answer to our state's future. With our involvement in P-16, about which you have heard at this meeting from the Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, Jan Kettlewell, to our economic development activities, the System has a plethora of activities that I will discuss next month in the State of the System Address.

Let me conclude by saying that I am honored to work with this outstanding Board of Regents. I am proud of the way we operate and the way we do business. I am extremely proud of this University System Office staff and the way they have carried on in my absence. And I am honored to work with our outstanding presidents and colleagues on the campuses. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Chair Wooten asked for a motion to ratify actions taken by Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith on behalf of the Board of Regents since the November 2004 meeting. Regent NeSmith had presented one such item during his report on the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities. (See page 38.) In November 2004, the Board authorized an exchange of property with Integral Real Estate Group, LLC, which appeared as Item 6 on that Committee's agenda, Exchange of Real Property, 17

Piedmont Avenue and 170 Edgewood Avenue, Atlanta, Georgia State University. Since that time, the legal entity formed for this transaction had been changed to Integral GSU Acquisition, LLC. On behalf of the Board, the Chancellor had approved the revision of the name of the party to the transaction from Integral Real Estate Group, LLC to IntegralGSU Acquisition, LLC. There was also one ratification on the agenda of the Committee on Organization and Law (Item 2, page 46), in which the Board ratified Chancellor Meredith's approval of a settlement agreement for the Medical College of Georgia. Motion properly made and seconded, the Board ratified all actions taken by the Chancellor on behalf of the Board of Regents since its November 2004 meeting.

Chair Wooten commended the University System Office staff for this excellent meeting. He remarked that the Regents had gotten a wealth of timely and critically important information, and he thanked all of the presenters for their informative presentations.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business at this meeting.

### **PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, February 1, and Wednesday, February 2, 2005, in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

Secretary Weber also announced that Regent Coles had rescheduled his party that was originally planned for September 7, 2004, to Tuesday, May 16, 2005.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:25 p.m. on January 12, 2005.

s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Gail S. Weber  
Secretary, Board of Regents  
University System of Georgia

s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Joel O. Wooten, Jr.  
Chair, Board of Regents  
University System of Georgia