

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
March 7 and 8, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, March 7 and Wednesday, March 8, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Kenneth W. Cannestra, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 7. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Cannestra, were Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Juanita P. Baranco, Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey.

Chair Cannestra noted that the Regents would be visiting the Capitol that afternoon because the Senate Higher Education Committee would be holding a hearing to confirm Regents Allgood, Cater, Harris, NeSmith, Wooten, and Yancey.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, March 7 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Charles H. Jones, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. 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 February 8 and 9, 2000 were unanimously approved as distributed.

PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: “WAYS IN”

Chair Cannestra called upon President Richard A. Skinner of Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education (“Georgia GLOBE”) to make a presentation to the Board.

President Skinner thanked Chair Cannestra. He reminded the Regents that he spoke to them at the November 1999 Board meeting to give them a status report on Georgia GLOBE. At that time, the pieces of the puzzle were just beginning to come together. There was one piece of the puzzle that was a particular challenge, though. He had called it a portal, but the Chancellor had said that it would be helpful if he explained that concept in more straightforward terms. So, he looked up the definition in the *American Heritage Dictionary*, and it defined a portal as a “doorway, an entrance, or a gate... [such as] a portal of knowledge.” In World Wide Web language, this portal is a single Web site where a student can find real-time information about online learning opportunities from a variety of sources. It can carry out a wide array of integrated student services that enable a student to engage in online learning and give her direct access to the online courses and programs that are being offered by the institutions of the University System. President Skinner noted that this gives students a very simple but powerful way to seek access to online learning. The first deliverable of this initiative is the portal. It will be created initially for the University System of Georgia and then ultimately for the entire Southeast region. He said that in order to do this, the System was going to have to seek out partners. Georgia GLOBE has been looking at partners within the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism, Georgia Public Broadcasting, and the Southern Regional Electronic Campus (“SREC”). Georgia GLOBE also intends to seek out partners in the business community.

At this meeting, President Skinner would be covering four points with the assistance of Dr. Bruce Chaloux, Director of the SREC. Those four points were to provide a context in which this initiative is going forward, to tell the Regents the directions in which the initiative will take the University System, to suggest what opportunities working with the SREC will provide, and to discuss the specific actions the initiative will take. In June 1999, the Board adopted a policy document titled “Educational Technology and the Age of Learning: Transforming the Enterprise.” (This document is on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.) The document stated that the University System was about to enter into a period in which it would transform the work it does. It is not enough that the University System respond to what is taking place with the use of technology for learning; it must anticipate and create leadership in the field. This approach harkens back to a 1995 guiding principle that directs the University System to “pursue coordinated approaches to statewide, national, and international telecommunications and other technological initiatives that maximize public access to information... and improve educational access, quality, and cost-efficiency.” That directive has driven Georgia GLOBE.

President Skinner explained that the policy document adopted in June 1999 had a number of elements that he wanted to review to clarify where Georgia GLOBE is going. One of its principles addressed minimizing costs. Georgia GLOBE has tried to establish standards such that investments in technology are not wasted. The Board also directed that the initiative try to achieve some level of discount. In this case, Georgia GLOBE hopes to achieve some significant discounts for institutions as they use technology to provide services to students. The third principle sought to ensure that regardless of whether students were in a classroom or in front of computer terminals, they would be provided support services that would eliminate time and place barriers. Georgia GLOBE will find a way through its portal to create access for students anytime and anyplace. Most importantly, the portal is a single point of entry to all of the essential student services. The fourth principle of the document stressed keeping the infrastructure in place. One of the most **PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: “WAYS IN”**

important things was to ensure that all 34 System institutions would be able to participate in the new technology-rich environment. Georgia GLOBE will be able to achieve that goal. The Board also wanted to ensure that the System was staying abreast of new technology. This is extremely important, because technology changes fairly rapidly. The sixth principle stated that the technology initiative should extend learning opportunities to Georgians wherever they are and to non-Georgians attracted by the quality of those offerings. The Board also directed that Georgia GLOBE work with ongoing national projects and the private sector to make certain it was on the cutting edge of technology. Specifically, the Board said to “establish cooperative agreements with other entities to meet Georgia’s need for higher education where existing System resources are not available.” Georgia GLOBE is now able to do that. The Board wanted partnerships with industry to ensure that Georgia GLOBE was on the cutting edge and to be sure that when companies develop new products and services, they are mindful of the educational market. The Board wanted Georgia GLOBE to be involved in national projects of significance, and it is. Principle fourteen directed that the University System develop an organization that would be entrepreneurial, have new management models, look at ways to improve student federal and state financial aid, and begin marketing what the University System has to offer.

For some years, the University System of Georgia has had a relationship with the Southern Regional Education Board (“SREB”), and now it has an opportunity to work with something that is the most successful venture in distance learning, the SREC. To explain to the Regents the roles of the SREB and SREC, President Skinner played a five-minute video introduction. After the video, President Skinner introduced Dr. Chaloux and asked him to speak to the Board about the SREC and how it plays into the Georgia GLOBE initiative.

Dr. Chaloux greeted the Board and said that he wanted to spend a few minutes talking about the SREB, which is the parent organization of the SREC. The SREB has been in existence for 52 years. It was established to find ways to share the resources of the 16 Southeastern member states. He noted that the Academic Common Market allows students to take courses from a non-home state at the in-state tuition rate through contract programs. Georgia has a number of these programs in which citizens of the State are allowed to participate. The SREB collects, analyzes, reports on data about its member states, both on the K-12 and post-secondary levels. It spends a significant amount of time promoting good academic policy in the region. It has significant links to governors, legislators, and educational leaders. In fact, governors and four individuals from each state are appointed to the board. The SREC makes use of the connectedness of the SREB and its relationships to establish an electronic marketplace of courses, programs, and services. It is a single point where students and prospective students can go to view a variety of different course and program opportunities. By establishing this electronic marketplace, the SREB hopes to create new learning opportunities for students, increase access, share those resources, and reduce barriers to learning. An SREB policy document entitled “Principles of Good Practice” is utilized heavily in the review procedures for course and program activity. The SREC has established a free trade zone which allows institutions to operate freely within the 16 states of the SREB. It promotes regional economic development attempts to reach the underserved, not only the people in urban and rural areas who might not have immediate access, but also the students who by virtue of their work schedules or other commitments are not able to have access to traditional programs. The SREC was launched in January 1998 with 45 colleges and universities participating. At its inception, the SREC had 104 courses, but no degree programs and no support services. As of February 2000, there were approximately 260 colleges and universities participating from the 16 SREB **PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: “WAYS IN”**

states and nearly 3,200 courses and over 100 degree programs from which to choose. The first service component, library services, was added through an agreement between the University System of Georgia and SREB, making the Georgia Library Learning Online program (“GALILEO”) available to all students

enrolled in the SREC. Dr. Chaloux remarked that GALILEO is the envy of most of the states around the country.

The SREC has taken some important steps in its two years of existence, stated Dr. Chaloux. It has a very effective and scalable quality assurance process. It has established an effective back-office data entry system. It is user-friendly and effective, and it provides linkage to participating colleges and universities. Dr. Chaloux noted that there are many initiatives in which the SREC is involved, some of which involve issues of policy. The SREC is particularly interested in the development of policy which would be supportive of distance learning via technology. There is a National Guard initiative in Louisiana in which 14,000 people know what they want and need but cannot get access because of policies currently in existence that do not allow them to participate in financial aid programs. Mary Washington College in Virginia is a small liberal arts public institution. Unlike most of the institutions that want to deliver courses to other students in the region, this college wants to bring courses in from other institutions. The Distance Learning Policy Laboratory (the "Laboratory") was established in July 1999 by the SREB. Its mission is to find ways that the SREC can establish, create, and enhance policy to help the states, region, and nation overcome a variety of different barriers to distance learning. Such policy issues include financing and distance learning, budget flexibility, faculty development and workload issues, quality assurance, accreditation, and tuition rates. The SREC is proposing a single rate charged for a course delivered electronically irrespective of the student's state of residency.

Regent Baranco asked whether it was also irrespective of the course.

Dr. Chaloux clarified that it would be respective of the course. The electronic rate would be a single rate for a particular course for all students who enroll. He continued, explaining that there are some student services offered through SREC. One of the major service components is GALILEO. There are nearly 50 different institutions who are participating in this pilot project. This is seen as a first step toward finding ways to link the other statewide library initiatives in the region to create a tremendous online library resource for all citizens in the Southeast. Dr. Chaloux turned the floor back to President Skinner to discuss the Ways In initiative in particular.

President Skinner explained that Ways In is a research and demonstration initiative involving the SREC and the University System of Georgia. It is based on sharing resources and enlisting significant corporate partners. The initiative already has a commitment from SCT, the principle student information system for the University System. SCT has indicated its willingness to work on this project not only for the University System, but also beyond the System. President Skinner stressed that it is important to develop the portal in strategic stages, beginning with the University System of Georgia and then moving to the region at large. He explained that the Ways In initiative builds upon existing relationships between the SREB and the University System. This coordination will contribute to the initiative's policy, because there are state and federal policies that the initiative will have to address. Ways In will move through four stages of development. Georgia GLOBE will provide the leadership in the first three stages, and then, as the initiative shifts into an interstate environment, the leadership will shift to SREB. This is seen as a way to leverage **PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: "WAYS IN"**

assets building upon what this collaboration has already established with regard to GALILEO. For the last eight months, Georgia GLOBE has been developing the front end of the portal. It seeks to leverage a commitment of about \$250,000 for future portal development. The SREC brings to the initiative its catalogue of 3,100 courses and 100 plus degrees. The Laboratory that Dr. Chaloux referenced has the best minds in this country advising it and more than \$1 million in grant support to encourage that activity. So, a great deal of resources are being brought together in the development of the portal.

President Skinner explained that the first stage of the Ways In initiative would entail requirements design and analysis. In the first stage, Ways In will provide a functioning portal for the five E-core campuses that are scheduled to come online. This means assessing the work that Georgia GLOBE has already done, which is very timely in terms of the technology master planning initiative. When this assessment is done, it will converge with the Arthur Andersen study of the technology master plan. Georgia GLOBE will then be in a place to determine its business plan for going forward. The second stage will be proof of concept, in which Georgia GLOBE establishes alliances with corporate partners who will help it with further development. In January 2001, Georgia GLOBE will begin bringing more System institutions online. This will be done on an "open architecture" basis so that it does not get into a proprietary relationship which could then force institutions to select other information systems. Georgia GLOBE wants to make sure there is a template, because if there is a template, the same portal could be used by every institution. The Ways In initiative aims to be able to provide institutions with a design they can also build. They would save approximately 30 cents on the dollar, because the design work would have already been done. Stage three will be replicability, in which another seven to ten University System institutions will be added. At that point, two to three additional SREB states will also be incorporated to begin the planning and testing of a multi-interstate model, making sure it works in a complex environment. Stage four will shift to an interstate environment. First, Georgia GLOBE must be sure the initiative will scale and work across lines. Then, the remaining University System institutions and selected institutions from the other SREB states will join in, and the actual formal operation of this interstate portal will begin.

President Skinner stated that the deliverables for the Ways In initiative are rather straightforward. The first one is a single Internet site (portal) for Georgia and then the South from which students can obtain all of the services that will enable real-time online learning. The University System and the SREB will retain the intellectual property rights and the licensing. The second deliverable is the design for and working model of Internet-based integrated student services for single institutions or the entire System. The System needs to make it possible for even the smallest institution to have that. By creating this template in an "open architecture" environment, the initiative ensures that all institutions will be able to participate. Again, the System and the SREB retain the intellectual property and licensing rights. President Skinner remarked that this is an impressive undertaking that responds to the technology initiative policy document adopted in June 1999. It presents another opportunity to provide Georgia leadership in a national effort in education. He thanked the Regents for their time and asked whether they had any questions or comments.

Regent White commended the initiative and remarked that it responds well to the policy adopted last June. He asked whether there is a written agreement between the University System of Georgia and the SREB.

President Skinner stated that there is.

PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: "WAYS IN"

Regent White asked whether there was a 50-50 agreement on the intellectual property and licensing rights that President Skinner had mentioned.

President Skinner said that there is.

Regent White asked whether it was too early to determine projections of where this could lead.

President Skinner responded that the SREB affiliation offers the University System a chance to grow this initiative very large in part because of the SREC. At this point, the most equitable relationship would be a 50-50 relationship. In the long term, the University System and the SREB will probably both contribute

equally.

Regent White asked whether the University System could have a business relationship as a public entity.

Chancellor Portch responded that the SREB can.

Chair Cannestra stated that perhaps this should be examined more closely.

The Chancellor remarked that the Board of Regents legal staff have reviewed the arrangement, and the SREB is the lead agent in the initiative.

Chair Cannestra remarked that this question will become relevant when the initiative begins generating revenue.

President Skinner stated that in the early stages of the initiative, there will not be revenue, but at a certain point in time, there will be. The University System will have to decide at that time where those revenues will repose. Thus far, the matter has been addressed primarily by addressing the question of intellectual and licensing rights.

Chair Cannestra asked whether a student can decide to get a particular degree and take courses at numerous institutions toward that degree.

Dr. Chaloux responded that a student can do that. One of the challenges of doing that right now is whether or not all of the credits would work in a particular program.

Chair Cannestra stated that this could be the greatest problem, because the University System has made credits transferrable in the System. So, transferability of credit is an important consideration.

Dr. Chaloux remarked that the Laboratory is designed to deal with these kinds of barriers.

President Skinner noted that approximately 60% to 65% of American college students will have taken courses from at least two institutions before they earn their degrees. In the future, students may take courses from two to three institutions, perhaps simultaneously. He stated that the “Principles of Best Practice” help to ensure credit transferability. In the broader context, the initiative has to have a policy approach to this. **PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: “WAYS IN”**

Chair Cannestra asked how many people are on the Georgia GLOBE staff.

President Skinner responded that there are five members of the staff.

Regent Allgood asked how the SREB is structured, governed, and funded.

Dr. Chaloux replied that the SREB is a 501C(3) nonprofit organization. The board consists of five individuals from each of the 16 member states. Those five individuals are the Governor and four appointees of the Governor. At least one of those individuals must be a legislator from that state. There is an executive committee made up of Governors and legislators who take care of the day-to-day business of the organization. President Mark Musick also sits on that committee. The SREB is funded by the membership dues of each of the 16 states.

Regent Allgood asked how long Georgia has been a member of the SREB.

Dr. Chaloux responded that Georgia was an initial member in 1948.

Chancellor Portch added that the SREB resides in a building owned by the University System of Georgia on the edge of the Georgia Institute of Technology campus.

Regent McMillan noted that the SREB is also funded by grants and other sources.

Dr. Chaloux agreed. In addition to membership dues, the SREB receives millions of dollars in grants. The Laboratory is an example of an activity supported significantly by grants.

Chancellor Portch noted that when he gives the Board status reports on the University System, it is SREB data that he is using to prepare the reports.

Regent McMillan remarked that the University System has arrangements through the SREB for the exchange of students among states for certain programs.

The Chancellor stated that the Academic Common Market is for programs which not all states have. So, Georgia students take programs in other states which are not offered in the State of Georgia at the normal in-state tuition rates. The Academic Common Market does not apply to every course or program, only those not offered in Georgia. This is a contractual arrangement, and the legislature appropriates specifically for that contract.

Regent Allgood asked whether it was part of the University System budget.

Chancellor Portch responded that the SREB budget is not part of the System budget. However, the SREB contract does flow through the University System budget.

Dr. Chaloux added that medical programs come through this contract, including optometry.

PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: "WAYS IN"

Regent McMillan stated that he did not understand why the University System paid Tuskegee University for veterinary students when the University of Georgia has a veterinary program.

The Chancellor stated that there are some idiosyncrasies in the contract, but largely, it is straightforward.

Regent Hunt asked what was the cost of membership in the SREB.

Dr. Chaloux replied that he did not know that, because it was not his side of the organization, but he could obtain that information for the Regents.

President Skinner wanted to make one final comment. In the prior week, it had been announced that the government of the United Kingdom is going to spend \$1 billion over the next four years to improve its distance learning capabilities. It is doing that to compete directly with the United States. So, the quicker the University System can move toward a comprehensive integrated approach to distance learning, the better it will be able to attain its global leadership role in education.

Chair Cannestra added that as businesses move more toward E-commerce, the boundaries between countries are breaking down even faster.

Regent Jenkins asked what the other SREB states will be contributing to this initiative.

President Skinner responded that they will be asked to contribute. There are already some prospects.

Regent Jenkins asked what kind of contributions they would make.

President Skinner responded that they would be asked to make both in-kind and financial contributions.

Regent Jenkins asked whether the formula had been determined.

President Skinner responded that it had not because the initiative must first go through its early stages. He explained that one governor in a small southern state had said that this initiative was a godsend because it meant that all of his colleges and universities would be able to work together. It is the idea of cooperating rather than competing.

Chancellor Portch noted that GALILEO is being used by the other states on a contractual basis rather than each state creating its own virtual library. The states instead pay the cost of additional staff and technology to add Web sites. The wrinkle in this is some corporate partnerships and the potential revenue stream. This is new territory for the University System, but it was predicted by the Board in its technology initiative principles.

Chair Cannestra stated that corporations would likely find this initiative useful.

PRESENTATION: JOINT INITIATIVE BETWEEN SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: "WAYS IN"

President Skinner remarked that IBM estimates the volume of kindergarten through lifetime learning every year totals \$665 billion in the United States. It is estimated at \$1.3 trillion globally. This is something the University System must think about now because it is a very large business.

Regent Baranco asked what the other states' incentives would be to contribute at this point in the game. She noted that Georgia has already invested heavily in the infrastructure for this.

President Skinner responded that the first stage will examine what all of the costs are to make this a good business plan. If we do not understand the costs, we cannot determine what is a fair return.

The Chancellor added that the University System built GALILEO for its own purposes, but then the public libraries, the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the Department of Education, and the private colleges found the money to come on board. This initiative is the same sort of process. First, the University System must develop the product. Then, others will want to take part in it.

Regent White asked whether there is a timetable for the stages of this initiative.

President Skinner responded that the timetable was outlined in the documents provided to the Regents. The first stage should converge exactly with the technology master planning study being performed by Arthur Andersen.

Regent White asked whether President Skinner would be coming back with the study after stage one.

President Skinner responded that he would. At that point, there should be a reasonable estimate of what will be involved.

Dr. Chaloux added that a business plan will be developed as part of stage one.

Regent White asked when that would be completed.

President Skinner responded that it would be June 2000.

Regent White again commended the initiative.

Chair Cannestra also commended the initiative and thanked Dr. Chaloux for the SREB's participation.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chair Cannestra next convened the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent White.

Chair White explained that there was a walk-on item concerning facilities fees and the HOPE Scholarship Program (“HOPE”) to add to the agenda of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations, which had been included in the Regents’ notebooks. The addition of this item to the agenda required unanimous consent of the Regents, and all Regents voted to add the item to the agenda. Chair White then asked the Chancellor to begin this presentation.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair White. He reminded the Board that at its February 2000 meeting, there was a presentation on the new process for involving students in the setting of mandatory student fees. At that meeting, there was a question on tuition and fee costs in other states and also a question on how other comparable institutions around the country determine their fees. At that time, the Chancellor said that he would come back at this meeting with information on tuition and fees, and then next month, a more detailed disaggregation would be provided. The second issue for discussion at this meeting was a recommendation on a limit on the use of HOPE on facilities fees, which the Chancellor would discuss momentarily. In the Regents’ folders was information on undergraduate tuition and fees from 1998 and 1999. Chancellor Portch noted that this information is not as easy to get as one would assume. This data was taken from Washington state, which has done an annual survey. As the consultants work on the benchmarking initiative, the Regents will get much more comprehensive data, but the data is not readily available. He demonstrated that from the available data, Georgia’s state college and universities are about \$750 below the national average with combined tuition and fees. In Georgia, two-year colleges are set apart, while in other states, they are combined with technical institutions. This is another reason why data interpretation is so tricky. So, the comparison is not perfect, but again, Georgia is in a relatively comparable position. Overall, Georgia is a low-tuition state by any basic measure. Next month, the Regents will have the opportunity to dig inside a handful of institutions from the Southern Regional Education Board states and look at the different levels of fees to get some sense of comparison. (The materials will be mailed to Board members before the April 2000 meeting.)

Chancellor Portch next wanted to recommend a change in what HOPE covers in terms of fees. He had already held discussions with the Student Finance Commission, the Governor’s Office, and Student Advisory Council (“SAC”) Chair John M. Fuchko III. When HOPE was established, it did not cover mandatory student fees, but they were added a year later. At that time, no System institution was building any facilities with mandatory student fees. However, shortly thereafter, a number of institutions got student approval to charge mandatory student fees to build facilities. One example is the Ramsey Student Center at the University of Georgia. Because it was a mandatory fee, no one considered whether HOPE should pay for it or not. However, it was never the original intention that buildings would be built using HOPE monies. Yet, because of the technicality, five institutions moved forward with seven buildings based on that assumption. This information was provided to the Regents in their folders. The Chancellor was recommending that the existing facility fees continue to be HOPE eligible. They were delivered to the students on that basis, and the pro formas for the business plans were built on that basis. Secondly, there are five institutions which have fee requests into the Board that have not yet acted upon by the Board. In the Chancellor’s discussions, it was felt that it was only fair that they be grandfathered in and they too would be HOPE eligible. Other than those, he was proposing that future facility fees, while still possible, would not be HOPE eligible. The Board of Regents alone cannot take that action. It is actually statutorily in the **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

purview or the Student Finance Commission (the “Commission”). So, all the Board would be doing would be recommending to the Commission that it adopt this as its policy. Chancellor Portch stated that he had had conversations with the executive director of the Commission. It was a general consensus that building facilities was never an original intent for HOPE. The Chancellor said that while there is support for continuing HOPE support for mandatory student fees, cleaning up this sort of oversight would be appropriate at this time.

Regent Baranco asked whether there was any sort of provision for ordinary inflationary considerations.

The Chancellor responded that it will not be necessary in the majority of mandatory student fees for facilities, because they were built on a 20-year pro forma, except one Georgia State University facility. If the staff came forward with an increase, that too would be HOPE eligible as long as it was part of the original pro forma.

Regent Baranco asked about other types of fee increases.

Chancellor Portch replied that the Board may still consider all fees each year just as in the normal process. This year, however, recommendations may be particularly rigorous due to implementation of technology fees that the Board would hear about next month. The current proposal only applies to facilities-related fees and only to their HOPE eligibility. If students decided that they still wanted to pay fees to build facilities, knowing that those fees will not be supported by HOPE, they could still do that.

Regent Jenkins asked where the demand for this change originated.

Chancellor Portch responded that it was a significant part of the mandatory student fees discussion in February 2000.

Regent Jenkins asked why the Board would recommend this to the Commission unless it was being requested by the Governor’s Office.

The Chancellor replied that the Commission often looks to the Board of Regents for guidance on matters of eligibility. Such matters are often a two-way conversation. In making this recommendation, the Board is simply being responsive to the concern of the Governor about facilities fees and their demand on HOPE. Most of these fees are rather large amounts. So, in conversations with the Governor’s Office, the facilities fees became a focus. The Chancellor indicated that the Board would be willing to reconsider this kind of fee, and that started the process.

Regent Jenkins asked which schools were the five that had facilities fees requests to the Board.

The Chancellor responded that Georgia Institute of Technology has requested enclosing the natatorium and redesigning the student center. Augusta State University has requested a new student center. State University of West Georgia has requested an expansion of its community center. Kennesaw State University has requested construction of a new recreation center. Finally, Georgia State University has requested a minor inflationary increase related to a facility already approved and in operation.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Regent Jenkins expressed concern that there may be other institutions who need to approach facilities needs in this manner.

Chancellor Portch stressed that institutions can still fund facilities via student fees; however, these fees will not be paid by HOPE. He noted that considering the small percentages of students who are on HOPE at other institutions, this is not likely to be a deciding factor at those institutions.

Regent Jenkins remarked that it seemed every institution should have an equal opportunity to take advantage of this before the Board closes the door on it.

The Chancellor stated that all institutions had already had the opportunity. Moreover, since the majority of institutions have a minority of students on HOPE, this should not influence the decision to bring forward such fee requests in the future.

Regent NeSmith asked whether HOPE students knew when they approved facilities fees that those fees would be covered by HOPE.

Chancellor Portch responded that they likely did. While being HOPE eligible may have influenced the decision, the Chancellor asserted that most students would still likely support those facilities fees.

Regent Cannestra noted that most students are paying these facilities fees out of pocket, while only approximately one-third of them are being paid by HOPE. He asked whether there was the danger that all mandatory student fees would no longer be supported by HOPE.

The Chancellor responded that there was some risk.

Chair Cannestra remarked that the University System fared rather well in that case.

Chair White added that the Board had taken action at the February 2000 meeting requiring more student involvement in the process. He asked whether the Regents had any further comments or questions. Seeing that they had none, he asked for a motion to approve the recommendation to the Georgia Student Finance Commission to exclude mandatory student fees for facilities construction and operation from HOPE Scholarship Program eligibility with the exception of those facilities currently approved or requested. With motion made and seconded, the Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

Chair White next asked for a motion to recess the meeting of the Committee of the Whole. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole was adjourned.

Chair Cannestra then adjourned the Board into its regular Committee meetings.

At approximately 3:00 p.m., the Committees adjourned for the confirmation of Regents Allgood, Cater, Harris, NeSmith, Wooten, and Yancey by the Senate Higher Education Committee at the State Capitol. After the confirmation, the Regents returned to continue their regular Committee meetings. Following Committee meetings, the Board adjourned until 9 a.m. Wednesday, February 9, 2000.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, March 8, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Kenneth W. Cannestra, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Cannestra, were Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Juanita P. Baranco, Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, March 8 by Regent Joe Frank Harris.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, March 8 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Charles H. Jones, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, March 7, 2000 at approximately 2:15 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Glenn S. White, and Regents Connie Cater, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, and James D. Yancey. Commissioner Russ Toal of the Department of Community Health was also present at the Committee meeting. Chair White reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed seven items, four of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Recommendation to the Georgia Student Finance Commission to Exclude Mandatory Student Fees for New Facilities from HOPE Scholarship Program Eligibility

Approved: The Board of Regents approved a recommendation to the Georgia Student Finance Commission to exclude mandatory student fees for facilities construction and renovation from HOPE Scholarship Program eligibility with the exception of those facilities currently approved or requested.

This item was a walk-on item which was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 10 to 12.)

Background: The Georgia HOPE Scholarship Program ("HOPE") provides financial support to qualified students for tuition and mandatory fee expenses and additionally includes a book allowance of \$150 per academic term. The Georgia Student Finance Commission (the "Commission") is authorized by State law to determine which mandatory fees charged by University System of Georgia institutions shall be eligible for HOPE reimbursement. At the present time, mandatory facilities fees used for the purpose of paying debt service and operation of non-academic facilities are considered HOPE eligible. A summary of these fees was provided to the Board and is on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

It was recommended that the Board of Regents propose to the Commission that in the future, mandatory facilities fees other than those already approved or requested be excluded from HOPE eligibility. Facilities fees are limited to a very select number of institutions, and there is a question as to whether HOPE was designed to underwrite special costs beyond the traditional mandatory fee costs associated with athletics, student health services, student activities, and parking/transportation that are common to most of the institutions within the University System. This change is projected to help contain future costs for HOPE.

2. Approval of Benefit Changes in the Board of Regents Indemnity Health Plan

Approved With Modification: The Board of Regents approved the following benefit changes in its indemnity health plan for employees with a target implementation date of August 1, 2000. This item was modified from its original agenda version.

Background: Previously, staff presented information on significant deficits in the budget for the

Board of Regents health plan for fiscal year 2000 and for projected deficits for fiscal year 2001. Although the General Assembly has approved an additional \$33 million appropriation for the health plan in fiscal year 2000, the rate of increase in health plan costs exceeds 14%, and cost containment measures are required. The following benefit changes were approved to achieve the indicated annual savings:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

2. Approval of Benefit Changes in the Board of Regents Indemnity Health Plan (Continued)

Benefit Change	Estimated Annual Savings*
a. Increase employee deductibles from \$200 single coverage and \$400 family coverage to \$300 single coverage and \$900 family coverage	Forthcoming
b. Increase annual out-of-pocket maximum expenditures for employees from \$1,000 single coverage and \$2,000 family coverage to \$2,000 single coverage and \$4,000 family coverage	Forthcoming
c. Increase maximum lifetime benefit from \$1 million to \$2 million (to conform benefits to state health benefit plan)	Rare cases result in negligible annual cost increase

*Estimate for a full year. Implementation will involve a partial-year transition with somewhat less savings the first year.

3. Approval of Increases in Monthly Employee Health Insurance Premiums

Approved With Modification: The Board of Regents authorized, in concept, increases in monthly employee health insurance (indemnity program) premiums, with amounts of premium increases to be determined by further analysis of actuarial projections. The Chair of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations and the Chancellor are authorized to elect the effective dates and premiums, in conjunction with the Department of Community Health, if such decisions must be made prior to the April 2000 Board meeting. This item was modified from its original agenda version.

Background: The staff is developing recommendations for health insurance premiums in fiscal year 2001 based on projected costs and anticipated appropriations, with a target of a 75%/25% employer/employee split in premium share. The staff received some assistance from Towers Perrin, a consulting firm that has also assisted the State health benefit plan in setting premiums.

Because these changes are being made in the middle of a plan year, federal tax regulations require that the amount of the increase be assessed on an after-tax rather than pre-tax basis. After the end of the plan year, all of the employee premium share can be converted to a pre-tax deduction.

These premiums will represent a substantial increase in cost to employees. The staff hope that the combination of these premiums and the other cost-saving efforts they have made will be adequate to control costs. However, a number of factors will affect overall costs, such as the number of employees who choose the new preferred provider organization (“PPO”) option, the healthcare use of members who stay with the indemnity plan, and the impact of mid-year changes in deductibles. Future adjustments in premiums may be required as the impact of these changes becomes clear. Health maintenance organization (“HMO”) rates are expected to remain unchanged.

Commission Russ Toal of the DCH was present at this meeting to discuss this with the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

4. Approval of a Preferred Provider Organization Option as an Additional Health Insurance Option for Employees of the University System of Georgia

Approved: The Board of Regents approved the offering of a preferred provider organization (“PPO”) option as an additional health insurance option for employees of the University System of Georgia. The Chair of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations and the Chancellor are authorized to elect the effective dates and premiums, in consultation with the Department of Community Health (“DCH”), if such decisions must be made prior to the April 2000 Board meeting. This item was modified from its original agenda version.

Background: On November 30, 1999, DCH issued a request for proposal for a Statewide PPO option for health benefits. In February 2000, a joint venture of GeorgiaFirst and Medical Resource Network was selected as the PPO award winner. This plan is expected to generate significant savings for both health plans through discount provider rates as well a benefit design that encourages cost-effective use of healthcare. A benefit summary and comparison table was provided to the Committee. The Board of Regents approved the PPO as an additional option to the existing indemnity and health maintenance organization (“HMO”) plan offerings for employees and retirees of the University System of Georgia and their dependents. Premiums and starting rate for the PPO will be determined at a later date.

5. Information Item: Letter of Agreement With Department of Community Health to Participate in MEDSTAT, Inc. Decision Support System

The State health benefit plan and the State Medicaid program both purchase a decision support system which organizes claims data into a user-friendly database. The vendor is MEDSTAT,

Inc. Using a personal computer, health plan staff can query the database easily as information is needed, rather than request programmers to run special reports from the large claims data files. The Department of Community Health ("DCH") has requested that the Board of Regents indemnity healthcare plan participate in this decision support system. With this improved access to data, DCH expects to be able to identify priority areas for cost savings, estimate the fiscal impact of plan changes, and monitor quality of care across all the plans. This approach is consistent with the Governor's interest in the State acting as a prudent purchaser of healthcare. The cost of participating in such a system is \$132,500 this year to establish the database and approximately \$55,000 per year thereafter, which will be absorbed in the general administrative cost of the overall program.

6. Information Item: Other Proposals for Cost Savings

In previous meetings, other proposals of the Department of Community Health for cost savings have been discussed as possibilities for the Board of Regents indemnity healthcare plan. The staff have been unable to confirm available savings from either the disease management program offered by Unicare or the inpatient behavioral health management services of Magellan Behavioral Health. They expect to modify the current contract with Unicare as necessary for the healthcare plan to participate in Unicare's hospital network for transplant services. The healthcare plan will have the benefit of Unicare's transplant network rates, but members will not be restricted to network providers. Claims data suggests possible savings of approximately \$700,000 annually.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

7. Information Item: Report on Mandatory Fees in Public Colleges and Universities in Southern Regional Education Board States

At its February 2000 meeting, the Committee requested that the staff investigate the mandatory student fees charged in public colleges and universities in the Southern Regional Education Board ("SREB") states and report back to the Committee on their findings. Chancellor Portch presented general aggregated comparison information on tuition and fees to the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 10 to 12.) An additional report comparing fees charged in the SREB states to fees charged by University System of Georgia institutions will be provided to the Board after the March 2000 meeting but prior to the April 2000 meeting.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, March 7, 2000 at approximately 2:40 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Regents Connie Cater, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Regent Coleman chaired the Committee in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair. Regent Coleman reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed six items, four of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Authorization of Project "Expansion of Interdisciplinary Research Center," Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Expansion of Interdisciplinary Research Center, Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") with a total project budget of \$21 million.

Background: This project received \$100,000 in Georgia Research Alliance funding for programming in fiscal year 2000. MCG has had a building program prepared and is preparing an environmental site assessment of the site.

The project meets the guidelines of the Blue Ribbon Commission on the Medical College of Georgia. The November 1998 report confirms the mission of MCG "to be a leading center of excellence in research through the generation and application of biomedical knowledge and technology to human health and disease and to play an expanding role in the transfer of technology to the healthcare delivery system." The goals and strategies for the research mission as stated in the report of the Blue Ribbon Commission include, "...MCG must develop a 'portfolio' of research through targeting appropriate area upon which to build excellent research endeavors..."

The facility will be located on campus adjacent to the existing IRC building (Building Number CA) in an existing parking lot. The project consists of the addition of 94,000 square feet. Proposed spaces include a translational research/technology development area, core research facilities, and animal facilities. The construction cost is estimated at \$18,320,000, or \$195 per square foot. The concentration of research laboratories in the building contributes to the high cost per square foot.

The proposed funding for the project is as follows: \$13 million from the MCG Foundation, \$1 million from the MCG Research Institute, and \$7 million of principal from the Borison-Diamond Recovery Fund. The Board has previously designated the interest earnings from the recovery fund to be used for diversity programs and research grants.

The annual cost of operation and maintenance of the new facility will be approximately \$543,000. The funding source for these expenses will be campus operating funds.

Since the project was approved, the Central Office staff and MCG will proceed with the selection of an architectural consultant.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

2. Authorization of Project No. BR-10-0005 “Myers Hall Renovation,” the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-10-0005 “Myers Hall Renovation,” the University of Georgia, with a total project budget of \$19,360,000 using funds from student affairs auxiliary reserves and internal plant funds.

The request is consistent with the university’s comprehensive housing plan.

Background: Myers Hall, built in 1953 as a 468-bed dormitory, currently operates as a 472-bed dormitory. It currently does not provide the living options, privacy, study/activity space, and technological features required by today’s students. Since its construction, there have been no substantial renovations made to the facility. Consequently, many of the building’s systems are worn out or do not function well and need to be replaced.

The concept of the renovation is to provide approximately 310 beds arranged in clusters of double- and single-occupancy rooms with semi-private bathrooms to be shared by two or three residents. Each cluster will house 50 to 60 students and will include lounge/study room(s) and a kitchen. An apartment (1,200 square feet) for a faculty member in residence has been added to the program to enhance the living/learning interaction. University housing administration space that serves 13 other residence halls and infrastructure upgrades to serve three other halls will also be a part of this renovation.

The renovation cost of the facility is estimated at \$13,847,000, comprised of \$109 per square foot for residential space.

Funding for the project is \$19,360,000 using funds in the amount of \$595,000 for initial planning from student affairs auxiliary reserves and a commitment of an additional \$17,965,000 of student affairs auxiliary reserves. Housing rent increases for fall 2000 have been endorsed by the student resident hall association and are necessary to fund the reserves in this amount. Internal plant funds of \$800,000 are being allocated for an additional contingency allowance in the event that greater than anticipated utility and infrastructure upgrades are required. These funds have been budgeted in accordance with the requirements of the Office of Capital Resources.

The University of Georgia has completed a preplanning/programming study and the Central Office staff, in conjunction with the University of Georgia, will proceed with architectural selection for design services.

3. Conceptual Authorization - “Special Collections & Repository,” the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved, in concept, the construction of a special collections library and repository at the University of Georgia (“UGA”), with the following understandings and stipulations:

- The project has been requested by the university as part of its annual major capital outlay project request, where it is listed as project #2 on the university’s list of priorities;
- This project is consistent with the university’s physical master plan;

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

3. Conceptual Authorization - “Special Collections & Repository,” the University of Georgia

(Continued)

- Mr. Craig Barrow, III, chair of the board of advisors for the UGA library, presented this conceptual project to the Board of Regents at its August 1999 meeting;
- This project will have a total project cost of \$30 million, with the funding to be split between \$10 million in private funds raised by UGA and \$20 million in State funds;
- The campus will raise an additional \$10 million to provide an endowment to support the library's special collection;
- Private gift commitments of over \$8 million have been received and UGA has committed \$600,000 of gifts on hand to fund the preplanning and conceptual design of the project;
- Approval by the Board of the project's concept will aid the University in cultivating prospective donors of both unique materials to enhance the special collection and funds to construct the facility and provide support needs via the endowment;
- Since this project concept was approved, Central Office staff in conjunction with the University of Georgia, will select an architectural firm to commence design services; and
- At such time as the private funds have been received and this project has been identified by the campus as its #1 priority major capital outlay project, the project will be reviewed and evaluated for State funding in accordance with established procedures for the assessment of major capital project requests.

4. Rental Agreement, North Metro Center, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Georgia State University Foundation, Landlord, and Georgia State University ("GSU"), Tenant, covering approximately 49,710 square feet of office space and approximately 24.829 acres of land located on Brookside Parkway in Alpharetta, Georgia for the period beginning February 12, 2000 and ending June 30, 2000 at a monthly rate of \$89,081.33 (\$1,068,975.86 per year annualized/\$21.50 per square foot per year annualized) with an option to renew on a year-to-year basis for 20 years with the rent rate increasing each year based on the Consumer Price Index but not to exceed 5% per year.

Modification: The Committee modified this agenda item to require that the staff report back no later than March 2001 on the progress of inter-institutional collaboration at the North Metro Center next year.

The terms of this rental agreement are subject to review by the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: In March 1998, the Board authorized the creation of the North Metro Center in Alpharetta for GSU. Construction of the facility was completed in February 2000. Georgia State University has satisfied all contingencies that the Board established for this center.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

4. Rental Agreement, North Metro Center, Georgia State University (Continued)

GSU has established a collaborative agreement with Georgia Perimeter College to offer lower-division courses and is working to establish collaborative agreements with North Georgia College & State

University and Kennesaw State University for upper-division courses.

For the center, 24.829 acres of land were provided to the Georgia State University Foundation, which includes 2.5 acres donated by the City of Alpharetta.

The City of Alpharetta has developed all required infrastructure for the center.

An endowment has been established in the amount of \$178,000.

GSU anticipates that additional academic programs will be offered at this center. A request for these programs will be submitted to the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension for approval.

Operating expenses are estimate to be \$296,622 per year. This includes electric service, water, sewer, maintenance, repairs, custodial, trash removal, and pest control. In addition, any taxes or assessments that are not exempted will be paid by GSU.

5. Information Item: Gwinnett Center

In December 1998, the Board approved the Gwinnett Center to be established on Collins Hill Road. This new facility, which is projected for occupancy in fall 2002, will house the library, an interactive learning commons, 14 high-technology classrooms, and computer/technical support spaces. Dr. James L. Muyskens, Chief Executive Officer and Dean of the Faculty at the Gwinnett Center, updated the Board on the facilities needs of the center.

Currently, the Board leases approximately 86,000 square feet of space on Sugarloaf Parkway for lower-division courses of Georgia Perimeter College and University of Georgia graduate courses. This space will still be needed for these purposes when the Collins Hill location is opened. Additionally, the operation plans for the center include initiation of upper-division courses and an expansion of graduate offerings, which will receive an additional 34,000 square feet of space.

The two sites are approximately 3.5 miles apart. Maintaining two locations will necessitate additional expenses resulting from duplication of services, duplication of parking, and bus shuttle service.

To best serve the needs at the Gwinnett Center, the leadership of the University of Georgia and Georgia Perimeter College would like to pursue development of a facility for 120,000 square feet to replace current leased space and provide immediate expansion space for upper-division programs. No increase to the current rent is anticipated.

The Central Office staff will work with the Office of the Attorney General to prepare a request for proposals for public/private development of a classroom/administration building to be located on or adjacent to property owned by the Board of Regents in Gwinnett County.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

6. Information Item: Master Plan, Bainbridge College

Bainbridge College and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the campus. The consultant, Mr. Dan Cash, Vice President of the Atlanta architectural and planning consulting firm of KPS Group and President Clifford M. Brock presented the plan to the Committee. The consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the college's mission statement, its strategic plan, academic and support programs, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate,

students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented five-year and ten-year options for facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian circulation patterns, and campus beautification. Based on the consultants' findings, Bainbridge College's master plan recommendations included the following:

- Create appropriate future facilities for the growing academic, community outreach, and continuing education needs
- Consider additions to existing buildings to accommodate future growth
- Renovate several areas within existing campus buildings to provide modern teaching facilities
- Continue to preserve and enhance the campus environment and landscaping

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, March 7, 2000 at approximately 2:15 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. At Chair Baranco's request, Regent Allgood reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 17 items, 13 of which required action. Additionally, 74 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. Establishment of the Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Technology, Dalton State College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President James A. Burran that Dalton State College be authorized to establish the associate of applied science ("A.A.S.") in manufacturing technology, effective March 8, 2000.

Abstract: The associate of applied science in manufacturing technology is designed to meet a high-priority need within the carpet and rug industry in Northwest Georgia. Created with the assistance of an industrial advisory group, the program offers learning opportunities which introduce, develop, and reinforce academic and occupational knowledge, skills, and abilities required for job acquisition, retention, and advancement.

Need: The increased technological sophistication of carpet manufacturing processes, the ongoing complexity of these business enterprises, and the continued growth of carpet and rug production have resulted in an increased demand for better educated employees at a variety of levels in the workforce. Informal needs surveys indicate that manufacturing is directly correlated with the employment environment in the Dalton State College service area, an area characterized by heavy manufacturing. This industry, previously very labor-intensive, is becoming increasingly automated. Based on an occupational demand analysis for Northwest Georgia conducted by Georgia State University's Applied Research Center, "The results revealed a high degree of need for additional programming in business and technical studies." In addition, the occupational demand analysis survey of area residents revealed that almost 20% of the respondents are interested in completing the bachelor's degree as their ultimate educational objective. The survey further indicated that 90% of the respondents would not commute more than 49 miles to complete a degree. The A.A.S. in manufacturing technology degree can build a better educated workforce while providing access to those who want to pursue a bachelor of applied science ("B.A.S.") degree at Dalton State College. The Northwest Georgia region is home to the largest concentration of carpet and rug manufacturing in the United States. During 1997, Georgia's carpet industry produced \$15.7 billion at retail, accounting for 74% of domestic carpet production and 44% of the world's carpet production. The Dalton area serves as corporate headquarters for Shaw Industries, Aladdin Mills, Beaulieu of America, Mohawk, Queen Carpets, Collins & Aikman, Durkan Patterned Carpets, and J&J Industries. These firms together employ over 50,000 workers. Specialty chemical industries also support the production of carpet and rugs in Northwest Georgia. Representatives of this group include Amoco, BASF, Dow, DuPont, Textile Rubber and Chemical, and Synthetic Industries.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

1. Establishment of the Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Technology, Dalton State College (Continued)

Objectives: With area unemployment currently at 1.8%, industries must compete for employees. With the increased complexity of the region's manufacturing processes, employers demand an equally sophisticated employee. Area employers require that students have 1) the ability to communicate effectively, 2) the technical skills appropriate for the position, and 3) good work ethics. The curriculum proposed for the A.A.S. in manufacturing technology prepares the student in all three areas.

1) Communication Outcomes: Throughout the required general education courses, students are asked to demonstrate appropriate communication skills. By such application and practice, the graduate emerges with excellent communication abilities.

2) Technical Skills: The general focus of technical skill outcomes is centered first on core abilities deemed necessary for any manufacturing application. These competencies include computer applications in word processing, spreadsheets, databases, and computer-aided drafting ("CAD"). In addition to computer skills, management concepts, such as labor economics, supervisory development, and human resource potential, are presented. Finally, all students are given insight into the very foundation of manufacturing process itself, including safety and time/motion competencies. Appropriate outcomes are achieved through courses dealing with the sciences of textile/polymer chemistry, engineering graphics, and carpet fiber, as well as those teaching yarn processes, coloration, and finishing.

3) Work Ethics: Because the A.A.S. degree emphasizes the employability rather than the transferability of its graduates, work ethics is stressed in each major field course. Through strict grading policies, technical faculty give credence to attendance, punctuality, timeliness in assignment completion, and team work in the classroom.

Curriculum: The 65- to 75-semester-hour curriculum will be delivered in two basic formats: a full-time day schedule and a part-time evening schedule. Within each, Internet-based applications will provide supplemental instruction and Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System ("GSAMS") based delivery will be provided on an as-needed basis. The curriculum can be grouped into four modules, two of which are required and from which the student chooses a particular focus or track. The general education courses comprise the first module and are required of all degree-seeking students. The second module includes courses already taught in other disciplines with the exception of Industrial Safety, Time and Motion, and Fundamentals of Manufacturing. The third and fourth modules represent two different tracks or options available to students. Students may choose to focus on carpet manufacturing or the general manufacturing option.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 17, 28, and 40.

Funding: The institution intends to fully fund the proposed A.A.S. in manufacturing technology through internal redirection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

1. Establishment of the Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Technology, Dalton State College (Continued)

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2004, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

2. Establishment of an External Doctor of Education With a Major in Educational Leadership in Cooperation With Columbus State University, Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Hugh C. Bailey that Valdosta State University ("VSU") be authorized to establish an external doctorate of education with a major in educational leadership in cooperation with Columbus State University ("CSU"), effective March 8, 2000.

Abstract: VSU and CSU proposed to establish a cooperative doctorate of education degree program in educational leadership. The cooperative program will prepare school leaders for administrative positions in the public schools. Graduates will be able to meet the intent of principle #4 of the Regents' 1998 policy on educator preparation. That is, they will be accomplished in establishing those conditions in the schools known to support teacher success in improving student learning. While the program will prepare school leaders to handle efficiently the administrative dimensions demanded of them, the primary emphasis in the program is instructional leadership. The program includes 54 semester hours of post-master's level work. Admissions requirements will be those currently in place for the doctorate of education degree program at Valdosta State University. An administrative committee representing both institutions (deans of the graduate schools, deans of the colleges of education, department chairs, and doctoral coordinators) will provide direction for the program. The deans, vice presidents for academic affairs, and the presidents of VSU and CSU have signed a memorandum of understanding, which delineates guidelines for the cooperative degree program.

Need: This program represents one component of the plan to expand access to doctorate of education degree programs that were approved by the Board in June 1999. The Council for School Performance recently completed an assessment of need for school personnel (teachers, principals, etc.) for the University System Central Office, giving projected shortages or overages for the years 2001, 2004, and 2009. This needs assessment shows a projected Statewide shortage of 643 school principals in 2001, 1268 in 2004, and 2201 in 2009.

Outcomes: The program seeks to give school administrators the knowledge and skills they need to support teachers as they continue to learn, encourage teachers to participate in shaping school policies and goals, support teachers in effectively bringing students in the schools to high academic standards, encourage school personnel to work closely with parents, and provide a well-disciplined and safe school environment.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

2. Establishment of an External Doctor of Education With a Major in Educational Leadership in Cooperation With Columbus State University, Valdosta State University (Continued)

Curriculum: The program consists of 54 semester hours, divided into four areas: interdisciplinary studies (12 hours), educational research (12 hours), school leadership (18 hours), and dissertation (12 hours). The courses include extensive opportunities for application in the schools, and the dissertation is school-based. Principle # 4 from the Regents' 1998 policy on educator preparation is the organizing element of the curriculum. Students will go through the program as a cohort, with the first cohort of 20 students admitted in the fall 2000. Students will attend classes offered by both institutions.

Faculty: Courses in the program may be taught by approved graduate faculty of either institution. Graduate faculty members of CSU may be nominated by the CSU deans of the graduate school and college of education for adjunct graduate status at VSU. Nominees will go through the same approval process as that of VSU faculty gaining graduate faculty status and doctoral faculty status.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 20, 40, and 40.

Funding: The institutions will redirect funds for this program.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institutions to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2003, this program will be evaluated by the institutions and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

3. Establishment of the Russell and Sammie Chandler Chair in Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology to establish the Russell and Sammie Chandler Chair in Industrial and Systems Engineering, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of A. Russell Chandler, III and will be administered through the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering.

Biography of Donor: Russell Chandler received a bachelor's degree in industrial engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1967. He continued his education, receiving a master in business administration degree from the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania in 1970.

In 1971, he founded Qualicare, a hospital management company that eventually became the sixth largest hospital management company in the United States. The company was sold in 1983, and for the next several years, Mr. Chandler was a private investor. In 1986, he and a partner purchased United Plastic Films, based in Cartersville, Georgia. The company was sold in February 1993, and subsequently, the Whitehall Group was formed. Mr. Chandler serves as founding partner.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

3. Establishment of the Russell and Sammie Chandler Chair in Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

Rationale: The Russell and Sammie Chandler Chair directly supports the strategic vision of the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering. The vitality of the school, both externally and internally, will be enriched by the presence of this senior scholar of international eminence, whose leadership will contribute in many ways to the learning environment. Each activity with which the chairholder is involved — invited lectures, publications, academic conference organization, presentations, professional society offices, committee assignments, and consultations — will promote the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering and serve to enhance the caliber of its programs and participants.

4. Establishment of the James and Mary Wesley Chair in the School of Literature, Communications and Culture, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) to establish the James and Mary Wesley Chair in the School of Literature, Communications and Culture (“LCC”), effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of A. James and Mary Wesley and will be administered through the School of Literature, Communications and Culture.

Biography of Donors: James W. Wesley, Jr., IM, 1955, is the retired Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Summit Communications Group, Inc., the Atlanta-based owner of Georgia and North Carolina cable systems and a number of radio stations throughout the country. While at GIT, he earned his income as a disc jockey. He was soon on the air at WSB, where he eventually became sales manager.

As an employee of Cox Communications, Mr. Wesley was appointed manager of a Miami station, WIOD AM/FM (now WFLC), in 1965. During his tenure in Florida, he attended school after business hours and earned a master of business administration degree from the University of Miami. Then in 1973, Wesley was transferred to Los Angeles, where he was named vice president and general manager of radio station KFI.

Mr. Wesley left Cox in 1984 to form DKM Broadcasting, which soon acquired seven radio stations from the Shering-Plough Corporation. In 1988, DKM was acquired by Summit Communications. Mr. Wesley was elected chief executive officer of Summit Communications in 1992.

Rationale: The LCC New Media Center in the Ivan Allen College of Liberal Arts sees its most important goal as making even larger numbers of people more aware of the potential of new media. It hopes to create a synergy between the faculty and graduate students who are very knowledgeable about the possibilities of multimedia technology and those groups of people in industry, education, and the community at large who have problems solvable by new media. The center can do this through formal and informal instruction programs that demystify the technology, showcase and demonstrate new technology, and present examples of new media applications developed at GIT and elsewhere. During the next few years, the center intends to become the foremost regional resource for desktop multimedia.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

4. Establishment of the James and Mary Wesley Chair in the School of Literature, Communications and Culture, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

The chairholder will be selected by the dean of the Ivan Allen College or his designee and shall be an individual with recognized expertise in the electronic environments, especially broadcasting. He or she will conduct research and also develop and teach courses in both the DuPree College of Management and the School of Literature, Communication and Culture within the Ivan Allen College.

5. Establishment of the H. Bruce McEver Visiting Chair in Writing, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) to establish the H. Bruce McEver Visiting Chair in Writing, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of H. Bruce McEver and will be administered through the School of Literature, Communications and Culture (“LCC”).

Biography of Donors: H. Bruce McEver (Bruce), IE, 1996, received a degree from Tech University, Hannover, Federal Republic Germany, 1966, and a master of business administration degree (“M.B.A.”) from Harvard University, 1969. He is President of Berkshire Capital Corporation, New York, New York. Bruce is married to Georgia Johnson (Peabody Institute). She is an opera singer and actress. He is a past member of the Ivan Allen College Executive Advisory Board and a member of the board of directors, Loan Pricing Corporation, New York City.

After Mr. McEver received his M.B.A., he served as a lieutenant in the USN Supply Corps. He began his career as a securities analyst at Bessemer Securities Corporation in New York City. After leaving Bessemer in 1974, he went to work at Chemical Bank as Assistant Vice President until 1976. In that same year, McEver began his career at Blyth Eastman Dillon/Paine Webber, Inc. as Vice President of Mergers and Acquisitions. From 1982 until 1983, Mr. McEver was Assistant to the Chair at PaineWebber. In 1983, McEver founded a relatively small banking firm, which has become Berkshire Capital Corporation, where he currently serves as president.

Rationale: This chair recognizes the importance of writing and analytical thought for all GIT students. The chair will set an example, for students and faculty alike, of the significance of writing as the cornerstone of intellectual inquiry. The chair will be filled during each academic year, for a term ranging from two weeks to two semesters. The chairholder, as an accomplished teacher and published writer in one or more genres (essays, drama, fiction, and/or poetry), will be challenged to engage with LCC faculty and students in their ongoing endeavor to reconfigure the meaning of writing and the humanities in a world which is increasingly mediated by science and technology.

Because this chair embraces the spirit of the late James Dean Young, a faculty member in GIT’s English department who founded GIT’s program in literature and science, the chairholder will also participate, where possible, in the annual James Dean Young Memorial Series.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

6. Establishment of the Margaret T. and Henry C. Bourne, Jr. Chair in Literature, Communications and Culture, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) to establish the Margaret T. and Henry C. Bourne, Jr. Chair in Literature, Communications and Culture, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of Margaret T. And Henry C. Bourne, Jr. and will be administered through the School of Literature, Communications and Culture.

Biography of Donors: Henry C. Bourne received his bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, and doctorate in electrical engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Bourne joined the GIT administration in 1981 as Vice President for Academic Affairs. He was named acting president of GIT shortly after the death of Dr. Joseph M. Pettit on September 15, 1986 and continued to provide leadership in that office until November 1, 1987, when Dr. John Patrick Crecine assumed the presidency. Dr. Bourne then resumed his post as Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Before coming to GIT, Dr. Bourne was Deputy Assistant Director of Engineering and Applied Science for the National Science Foundation (“NSF”) and formerly directed the engineering division of the NSF.

Dr. Bourne and his wife, Margaret, are both from Tarboro, North Carolina.

Rationale: A study of the important literature of the world is essential in a complete education. This chair is created to ensure that GIT students will always have an opportunity for first-rate instruction in the great poetry of the world. This opportunity is particularly important for students who are majoring in highly specialized and technical areas of engineering, science, and management. GIT students show surprising aptitude in many areas of the humanities, including drama, music, and literature. These aptitudes should be nurtured and supported as a foundation for life-long learning, which is the purpose of this endowment.

7. Establishment of the H. Milton and Carolyn J. Stewart School Chair in the School of Industrial Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) to establish the H. Milton and Carolyn J. Stewart School Chair in the School of Industrial Systems, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of H. Milton and Carolyn J. Stewart and will be administered through the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering.

Biography of Donors: H. Milton Stewart earned a degree in industrial engineering in 1961. He graduated from Harvard Business Schools’ Owners-Presidents Managers program in 1980 and received a master of business administration degree from Emory University in 1981, finishing first in his class. He was awarded an honorary doctoral degree in business administration from Piedmont College in 1989.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

7. Establishment of the H. Milton and Carolyn J. Stewart School Chair in the School of Industrial

Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

Mr. Stewart recently retired as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Standard Telephone, where he worked since 1960. He has overseen many changes in the company since his father purchased it in 1939. Based in Cornelia, Georgia, Standard Telephone consists of five subsidiaries, including a directory service, a cable television company, paging services, and Internet access. When Alltel purchased the company in 1998, it had approximately 68,000 phone lines and 28,000 cable customers.

Rationale: H. Milton Stewart, Jr. and his wife, Carolyn, have made a total commitment of \$2,500,000 to endow the H. Milton and Carolyn J. Stewart School Chair in Industrial Systems. Dedicated to the leadership of the school, this prestigious gift is the first school chair given at GIT. Funds from the chair will allow the school chair to address areas of extreme importance, including faculty development, student life, alumni activities, facilities and equipment, and support research activities. The flexibility of this type of endowment will also provide the school chair with the resources needed to address unforeseen situations, recruit faculty, and meet administrative needs of the program.

It is expected that the prestige of an endowment for use by the school chair will also serve the College of Engineering in the recruitment of an eminent scholar to the position of the School chair when this position is vacant. Such an eminent scholar will, in turn be instrumental in attracting prestigious faculty members to the program, expanding the reputation for this number one ranked program among graduate and undergraduate students and continuing to provide the kind of leadership that has positioned the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering as a leader in its field in the United States and throughout the world.

8. Establishment of the Harry West Chair for Quality Growth and Regional Development, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough at the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") to establish the Harry West Chair for Quality Growth and Regional Development, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of Harry West and will be associated with the new Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, which will be established at GIT in partnership with other universities. The chair will be administered through the College of Architecture.

Biography of Donor and Honoree: Harry West is a name known to many who have seen the growth of Georgia and its capital over the past three decades. He is the Retired Executive Director of the Atlanta Regional Commission and a respected leader in planning for regional development in the State for the past 30 years.

This chaired professorship was established and named in honor of Harry West by John Williams, a 1964 management graduate of GIT. As Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Post Properties, Mr. Williams has been a longtime member of the board of the Atlanta Regional Commission. He also serves as President of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and is a leader in issues related to urban planning and regional development. Mr. Williams' intention in naming the chair for Mr. West is to honor his long and distinguished career and his contributions to the city and State.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

8. Establishment of the Harry West Chair for Quality Growth and Regional Development, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

Rationale: This chair will be associated with the new Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, which will be established at GIT in partnership with Emory University and Georgia State University. The center will have extensive interaction with the Atlanta University Center and Mercer University in Atlanta, as well as other regional schools with programs and/or interest in the field. It is expected that the chair will contribute significantly to the many complex issues facing our growing community and will participate in finding solutions and providing leadership for the future of Atlanta and Georgia.

9. Establishment of the David and Andrew Lewis Chair in Space Technology, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) to establish the David and Andrew Lewis Chair in Space Technology, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The chair was established through the generosity of David and Andrew Lewis and will be administered through the School of Aerospace Engineering.

Biography of Donors: David S. Lewis is a 1939 graduate of GIT in aerospace engineering, one of the earliest classes in this discipline, which awarded its first bachelor’s degrees in 1932. Mr. Lewis spent his entire career building the aerospace industry and eventually became President and Chief Executive Officer of General Dynamics. In recognition of his extraordinary achievements in the field, the company donated

\$1 million to establish the David Lewis Chair in Aerospace Engineering in the 1980s in honor of his retirement from the company.

David Lewis’ son, Andrew F. Lewis, is a 1976 graduate of aerospace engineering at GIT. Following his father’s example, Andrew Lewis first worked in the aerospace industry, with brief assignments at Lockheed and Martin Marietta, but he has dedicated most of his career to entrepreneurial endeavors, founding a computer hardware manufacturing business. After a number of years in this highly competitive industry, Mr. Lewis incorporated his interest in media, film, and photography and his knowledge of the computer industry into a growing high-tech imaging business. Like his father, he has remained current in the advances of aerospace engineering and shares David Lewis’s belief that the future of the industry, our country, and the world will be well-served by advances in space technology.

Rationale: Future demand for engineers capable of developing new space systems will be intense. The David and Andrew Lewis Chair for Space Technology will conduct and stimulate new programs in this discipline, which includes communications satellites, other earth satellites, space solar power, space transportation, and reentry vehicles. It will focus on preparing engineering capable of optimizing the integration of required technologies including advanced materials, new propulsion systems, thermal management systems, on orbit control systems, life-support systems, and radiation hardening. While residing in the School of Aerospace Engineering, the chair will have extensive interaction and contact with other programs that enhance this interdisciplinary field, including materials science and engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical and computer engineering, and biology.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

10. Establishment of the Agustin A. Ramirez/HUSCO International Distinguished Chair in Fluid Power Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of

Technology (“GIT”) to establish the Agustin A. Ramirez/HUSCO International Distinguished Chair in Fluid Power Systems, effective March 8, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1,500,000. The Chair was established through the generosity of Agustin A. Ramirez and will be administered through the School of Mechanical Engineering.

Biography of Donor: Agustin A. “Gus” Ramirez received bachelor’s and master’s degrees in aerospace engineering from GIT in 1968 and 1969. He continued his education at the Harvard Business School, where he received a master of business administration degree in 1974. After a brief career with Pratt & Whitney and military service, he went on to AMCE, eventually known as HUSCO International. In 1985, Mr. Ramirez succeeded in putting together a management team to purchase HUSCO from its parent company, Koehring. HUSCO manufactures hydraulic systems for heavy equipment and trucks and has extensive facilities and sales in Asia, Europe, and South America.

In addition to funding the endowed chair, Mr. Ramirez, in collaboration with HUSCO International, has provided significant funding to establish a laboratory in fluid power systems designed to enhance the program and serve as a research and instructional resource.

Mr. Ramirez is a community leader as well as entrepreneur and has been a force in creating inner-city resources for minority students in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the location of the company and his long-time residence.

Rationale: This chair is designed to have a significant impact on the fluid power industry by providing high-caliber undergraduate and graduate instruction and research in related fields of fluid power systems design, controls, applications, manufacturing, and reliability. Fluid power systems are integral components of a broad range of industries, including construction, mining, aerospace, marine, and manufacturing systems.

Currently, the strongest programs in the important field of fluid power are located in Europe. The establishment of this chair will provide a much needed resource for U.S. industry, while simultaneously giving our students exposure to a new era of study and potential career field.

11. Revised Institutional Statutes, State University of West Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of Acting President Thomas J. Hynes, Jr. to revise the institutional statutes of the State University of West Georgia (“SUWG”), effective March 8, 2000.

Rationale: The proposed revision of the statutes reflects a thorough review and brings the statutes into line with current Board of Regents policies and procedures. The statutes also clarifies the Staff Advisory Council as an official organization of SUWG.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

11. Revised Institutional Statutes, State University of West Georgia (Continued)

These changes were approved by the general faculty at SUWG. They have been reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and were found to be consistent with the current organization and administrative process at SUWG. The revised statutes are on file in the Office of Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

12. Renaming of the Department of Physiology & Endocrinology to the Department of Physiology, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco of the Medical College of Georgia to rename the Department of Physiology & Endocrinology to the Department of Physiology, effective March 8, 2000.

Abstract: The Medical College of Georgia requested approval to rename the Department of Physiology & Endocrinology in the School of Medicine to the Department of Physiology. The reason for the requested name change is that there is a strong feeling among the faculty in the department that “endocrinology” is a sub-discipline of “physiology,” and thus, the presence of the word “endocrinology” is unnecessary. There is unanimous support for the name change, from the faculty, the dean of the School of Medicine and the senior vice president for academic affairs. Historically, the Medical College of Georgia’s School of Medicine had two separate departments of physiology and endocrinology. They were combined in 1986, and the name changed to reflect both departments. This request is a logical evolution of name change back to the Department of Physiology.

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

The following administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Education Committee Chair Juanita P. Baranco and were approved by the Board. All full-time appointments are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.

Summary of Full-Time Faculty Appointments

<u>University System Institutions by Type:</u>		<u>Totals:</u>
	Georgia Institute of Technology	7
	Georgia State University	4
	Medical College of Georgia	7
	University of Georgia	17
Total Research Universities Appointments		35
	Georgia Southern University	2
	Valdosta State University	0
Total Regional Universities Appointments		2

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System

Institutions

(Continued)

	Albany State University		0
	Armstrong Atlantic State University		2
	Augusta State University		0
	Clayton College and State University		1
	Columbus State University		1
	Fort Valley State University		1
	Georgia College and State University		0
	Georgia Southwestern State University		0
	Kennesaw State University		0
	North Georgia College and State University		0
	Savannah State University		0
	Southern Polytechnic State University		2
	State University of West Georgia		1
	Total State Universities Appointments		8
	Dalton State College		0
	Macon State College		0
	Total State Colleges Appointments		0
	Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College		0
	Atlanta Metropolitan College		0
	Bainbridge College		0
	Coastal Georgia Community College		1
	Darton College		1
	East Georgia College		0
	Floyd College		0
	Gainesville College		0

	Georgia Perimeter College		1
	Gordon College		2
	Middle Georgia College		0
	South Georgia College		0
	Waycross College		0
Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments			5
TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS			50

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

RUBIN, LARRY: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF LITERATURE, COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE, EFFECTIVE JUNE 12, 1999.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

KENNEDY, ROBERT: PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, LEAVE FROM JANUARY 1, 2000 TO JANUARY 1, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

KLEINMAN, DANIEL L.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF HISTORY, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY, LEAVE FROM JANUARY 1, 2000 TO JANUARY 1, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

WANG, JAMES T.: PROFESSOR, CIVIL ENGINEERING, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2000 AND ENDING MAY 17, 2000.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

BURDEN, CHARLES: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, MANAGEMENT, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 15, 2000 AND ENDING JANUARY 14, 2001.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

16. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)

JONES, WILLIAM A.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, MANAGEMENT, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 4, 2000 AND ENDING JANUARY 3, 2001.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

DIRKSEN, THOMAS R.: ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITUS OF RESEARCH AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ORAL BIOLOGY AND MAXILLOFACIAL PATHOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF ORAL BIOLOGY AND MAXILLOFACIAL PATHOLOGY, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

ELLIS, LINDA: ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITA OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH , PSYCHIATRIC NURSING, SCHOOL OF NURSING, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

ELLISON, LOIS T.: PROVOST EMERITUS, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SURGERY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PHYSIOLOGY AND ENDOCRINOLOGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

MULROY, MICHAEL J.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, CELLULAR BIOLOGY AND ANATOMY AND SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

PURYEAR, JAMES P.: VICE PRESIDENT EMERITUS FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HEALTH SCIENCES EDUCATION, STUDENT AFFAIRS, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

WELTER, DAVID A.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CELLULAR BIOLOGY AND ANATOMY AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

PETRONELLA, FARKAS: SENIOR STAFF NURSE 3, GEORGIA WAR VETERANS NURSING HOME, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MARCH 9, 2000 AND ENDING MARCH 8, 2001.

REDMON, ALICE: ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE / ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUGUST 1, 2000 AND ENDING

APRIL 30, 2001.

TALLEDO, O. EDUARDO: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MARCH 9, 2000 AND ENDING MARCH 8, 2001.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

WESTMACOTT, RICHARD N.: PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN, LEAVE FROM JANUARY 1, 2000 TO JULY 30, 2000, WITH PAY.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

AGEE, WARREN K.: PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2, 2000 AND ENDING MARCH 10, 2000.

BRACEWELL, WILLIAM: DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2, 2000 AND ENDING MARCH 10, 2000.

BROUSSARD, RAY F.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 7, 2000 AND ENDING MAY 9, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

FANNING, SANDRA: EDUCATION PROGRAM SPECIALIST, GERONTOLOGY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 6, 2000 AND ENDING JANUARY 13, 2000.

FREE, WILLIAM J.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2, 2000 AND ENDING MARCH 10, 2000.

GARST, JOHN F.: PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2, 2000 AND MARCH 10, 2000.

HALE, WILLIAM H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, GEORGIA CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 24, 2000 AND ENDING FEBRUARY 25, 2000.

JOHNSTON, MARGARET: INSTRUCTOR, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2, 2000 AND ENDING MARCH 10, 2000.

LESTER, CLYDE E.: SENIOR PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2, 2000 AND MARCH 10, 2000.

PROFFER, TED: DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING APRIL 1, 2000 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2000.

SCHNEIDER, DONALD O.: PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEBRUARY 1, 2000 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2000.

SMITH, FREDERICK: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING APRIL 1, 2000 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2000.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

MAJOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

LANGE, DOUGLAS K.: VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS AND DEAN OF STUDENTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000

LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

MILLS, MICHAEL T.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEARNING SUPPORT, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 1999 TO MAY 31, 2000.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

BISHOP, GALE: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY, AEP COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JULY 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

CLAYTON COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

GARDNER, PEGGY A.: DIRECTOR EMERITA OF PLACEMENT AND COOPERATIVE EDUCATION, STUDENT AND ENROLLMENT SERVICES, EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2000.

TENURE TRACK CHANGE APPROVALS:

GRITZMACHER, DEBORAH M.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ARNO, ELSIE R.: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF ECONOMICS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

COOK, CLINE G.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF FINANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

KLEIN, RONALD D.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

KUNDEY, GARY E.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF FINANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

McCOLLUM, JAMES B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ECONOMICS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

SCANLING, FREDERICK H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

TAYLOR, EARLENE P.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ACCOUNTING, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MARCH 8, 2000.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

McCOLLUM, JAMES B.: PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUGUST 1, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 31, 2000.

WENTLAND, THOMAS J.: PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 2, 2000 AND ENDING MAY 31, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS TO SYSTEM RETIREES:

McCORMICK, PAULETTE R.: INSTRUCTOR, DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 12, 2000 AND ENDING MAY 11, 2000.

STEELE, HARRIET: INSTRUCTOR, DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JANUARY 12, 2000 AND ENDING MAY 11, 2000.

KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ANDERSON, THOMAS C.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE, EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 2000.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

BEISE, CATHERINE M.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND
INFORMATION SYSTEMS, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000 TO MAY 15, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

HINSON, PATRICIA M.: ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN, LIBRARY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MARCH 1, 2000 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

14. Information Item: Establishment of the Center for Georgia Studies, Georgia College & State University

Abstract: Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) has established a Center for Georgia Studies after being awarded several grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The center was established as a facility to help Georgians and non-Georgians learn about the State of Georgia within a liberal arts context. The center will be devoted to advancing multi-disciplinary research, instruction, and public outreach programs in both a historical and contemporary context. Through the study of the natural and human environments and through the study of history, literature, music, religion, art, and folk traditions, the center will help Georgians and non-Georgian’s learn about the State’s diverse cultural heritage and its involvement in national and global changes.

Relationship to the University Mission: The creation of the center will more fully enable GCSU to carry out its mission of research, teaching, and public outreach within a liberal arts context. With a principal focus on humanities, the center will seek the involvement and interaction of students, faculty, and various constituencies outside the university community to provide the resources for a greater understanding of Georgia history and culture.

The center will enable the university to do the following:

- Host academic conferences and symposia where scholars, writers, and artists assemble to discuss issues relevant to Georgia
- Plan and promote public programs that broaden public understanding of Georgia through lectures, town meetings, and cultural festivals
- Plan and promote educational outreach activities, such as an educational listserve, an annual Georgia Studies bee, an annual arts/letters competition, and an annual teacher workshop
- Edit and produce publications such as a quarterly newsletter for the center and a biannual publication of articles, reviews, and artistic work promoting an understanding of the work of Flannery O’Connor and of the historical and cultural Georgia in which that literary work was produced

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

15. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7 and 8, 1984, the presidents of the listed institutions have executed the indicated number of memoranda of understanding respecting affiliation of students for applied learning experiences/clinical training in the programs indicated:

Georgia State University		Nursing	4, 3R
Physical Therapy	3, 3R	Physical Therapy	2R
Nursing	3		
Medical College of Georgia		Savannah State University	
Allied Health	3, 11R	Social Work	4
Dentistry	2, 12R		
Hospitals/Clinics	1, 3R	State University of West Georgia	
Medicine	5, 3R	Nursing	3
Nursing	8, 3R	Physical Education	1
Research Institute	1		
University of Georgia		Darton College	
Child and Family Dvlpmt.	4	Occupational Therapy Asst.	2
Communication Sciences	12, 2R		
Counseling	1	Middle Georgia College	
Food and Nutrition	1	Physical therapy Asst.	1
Pharmacy	5R		
Recreation and Leisure	10, 1R	Total	135
Social Work	7		
		R = Renewal	
Georgia Southern University			
Family and Consumer Sci.	3		
Health and Kinesiology	1R		
Leadership/Technology	1		
Nursing	3		
Augusta State University			
Nursing	1		
Psychology	1		
Columbus State University			
Nursing	1		

North Georgia College & State University.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

16. 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 payments as indicated:

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Georgia State University			
Study to prevent gambling	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	12/8/99 - 9/15/00	\$125,000
University of Georgia			
Provide program income	Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs	10/06/99	\$5,886
Revise and update curriculum	Georgia Dept. of Education	10/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$48,500
Fund Children of Choice program	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	12/10/99 - 8/30/00	\$79,000
Support Georgia's Community Collaboratives	“ ” “	11/23/98 - 3/31/00	\$64,500
Fund Unlock the Waiting List 2000	“ ” “	12/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$43,600
Support agricultural pollution prevention program	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	1/1/98 - 12/31/00	\$279,430
Fund FMT 2000 PI	Georgia Office of Planning and Budget	10/6/99	\$6,556
Provide program income for GPSTC	Georgia Public Safety Training	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$835
Provide chart of accounts training	Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs	3/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$9,800
Provide training on special education issues	Georgia Dept. of Education	2/1/99 - 1/31/01	\$85,875
Provide improvement grant for children with disabilities	“ ” “	2/1/99 - 1/31/01	\$64,667
Administer results of Georgia Student Assessment programs	Georgia Dept. of Education	10/31/98 - 6/30/00	\$164,682
Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
University of Georgia (Continued)			
Improve Supporting the Family program results	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	1/1/00 - 6/30/00	\$312,000
Provide paraprofessionals to Ware County	“ ” “	10/1/99 - 9/30/00	\$7,216
Study conserving energy in agriculture	Georgia Office of Energy Resources	10/1/97 - 9/30/00	\$50,000
Provide funding for FMT 2000 PI	Georgia Office of Planning and Budget	10/6/99	\$3,339
Fund Police Academy 2000	Georgia Dept. of Public Safety	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$30,339

Conduct needs assessment	Lanier Technical Instit.	12/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$30,000
Darton College			
Conduct ROPES program	Communities in Schools	1/14/00	\$726

TOTAL AMOUNT - MARCH	\$ 1,411,951
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 To DATE	\$23,701,231
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99 - TO MARCH	\$29,166,643
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99	\$31,358,479

17. Information Item: Annual Report of Research Grants and Contracts

Considerable financial support for the University System is derived from extramural sources. The Committee was provided with the dollar amounts for contracts and grants received by System institutions. The total external support for these activities in all institutions equaled \$574,678,447, an increase of \$38,016,123 or 7.1% above fiscal year 1998. Dr. Charles L. Liotta, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies at the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") made a presentation to the Committee on the value of research to the University System of Georgia. He explained that research is the precursor to discovery and that university research is the intellectual driver for economic growth. Successful research programs depend on outstanding scientists, engineers, and graduate students, as well as state-of-the-art facilities and equipment and an interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary culture. Cutting-edge research leads to technology transfer, commercialization, and economic development.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

17. Information Item: Annual Report of Research Grants and Contracts (Continued)

Extramural Funds Received for Instruction, Public Service, and Research – Fiscal Year 1999

Institution	Instruction	Public Service	Research	TOTAL
Georgia Institute of Technologv	\$3.449.439	\$9.207.737	\$204.416.479	\$217.073.655
Georgia State Universitv	\$4.988.486	\$8.984.615	\$25.236.245	\$39.209.346
Medical College of Georgia	\$3.659.357	\$93.920.105	\$26.335.973	\$123.915.435
Universitv of Georgia	\$14.787.414	\$36.743.183	\$86.599.371	\$138.129.968
Fort Vallev State Universitv	\$1.501.592	\$6.215.715	\$2.660.811	\$10.378.118
Research and Land Grant Univ.	\$28.386.288	\$155.071.355	\$345.248.879	\$528.706.522
Georgia Southern Universitv	\$1.264.753	\$2.288.746	\$1.603.346	\$5.156.845
Valdosta State Universitv	\$2.815.834	\$926.877	\$335.852	\$4.078.563
Regional Institutions Total	\$4.080.587	\$3.215.623	\$1.939.198	\$9.235.408
Albanv State Universitv	\$2.436.927	\$1.048.630	\$200.000	\$3.685.557
Armstrong Atlantic State Univ.	\$548.260	\$1.230.476	\$113.289	\$1.892.025
Augusta State Universitv	\$228.056	\$64.986	\$52.894	\$345.936
Clayton College & State Univ.	\$1.493.004	\$933.332	0	\$2.426.336
Columbus State Universitv	\$1.772.905	\$50.290	\$59.624	\$1.882.819
Georgia College & State U.	\$2.010.263	\$396.989	\$46.984	\$2.454.236

Georgia Southwestern State U.	\$121.497	\$577.882	\$643.577	\$1.342.956
Kennesaw State University	\$509.606	\$2.808.167	\$367.090	\$3.684.863
North Georgia College & State U.	\$222.620	0	0	\$222.620
Savannah State University	\$3.973.829	\$107.697	\$1.840.086	\$5.921.612
Southern Polytechnic State U.	\$635.350	\$474.454	\$146.348	\$1.256.152
State Univ. of West Georgia	\$1.483.960	0	\$824.970	\$2.308.930
State Universities Total	\$15.436.277	\$7.692.903	\$4.294.862	\$27.424.042
Dalton State College	\$2.294.469	\$139.207	0	\$2.433.676
Macon State College	\$25.299	\$463.689	0	\$488.988
State Colleges Total	\$2.319.768	\$602.896	0	\$2.922.664
Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	\$727.077	\$165.419	0	\$892.496
Atlanta Metropolitan College	\$1.124.421	0	0	\$1.124.421
Bainbridge College	\$1.000.664	0	0	\$1.000.664
Coastal Georgia Comm. College	\$1.003.179	\$503.618	\$8.035	\$1.514.832
Darton College	\$137.988	\$176.541	0	\$314.529
East Georgia College	\$64.189	0	0	\$64.189
Floyd College	\$597.243	0	0	\$597.243
Gainesville College	\$13.600	\$247.523	0	\$261.123
Georgia Perimeter College	\$283.684	\$97.813	\$3.383	\$384.880
Gordon College	0	0	0	0
Middle Georgia College	0	0	0	0
South Georgia College	\$229.946	0	0	\$229.946
Wavcross College	\$5.488	0	0	\$5.488
Two-Year Colleges Total	\$5.187.479	\$1.190.914	\$11.418	\$6.389.811
SYSTEM TOTALS	\$55,410,300	\$167,773,691	\$351,404,357	\$574,678,447

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

17. Information Item: Annual Report of Research Grants and Contracts (Continued)

Dr. Liotta discussed the various areas of emphasis in research today, such as biosciences and biotechnology, telecommunications and advanced computing, materials nanoscience and nanotechnology, and environmental science and technology. He also discussed how the University System is responding to those areas of emphasis and bringing that research to the marketplace as well as how the System is educating the workforce in these high-demand fields. Dr. Liotta reported that GIT was selected by leaders in economic development and university-industry interactions as number one in maintaining exemplary research programs. The top research grants in the University System for fiscal year 1999 were as follows:

University of Georgia	Savannah River Ecology Laboratory	\$8,116,000
Georgia Institute of Technology	Gigascale Integration	\$7,750,000
Georgia Institute of Technology	Digital Video and Data System Development	\$2,986,118
Georgia Institute of Technology	Molecular Design Institute	\$2,334,000
Georgia Institute of Technology	Research Center for Engineering Living Tissue	\$2,000,000
University of Georgia	Sustainable Agriculture & Natural Resource Management Collaborative	\$2,000,000
Georgia Institute of Technology	F-15 Redesign and Obsolescence Resolution	\$1,950,000

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, March 7, 2000 at approximately 3:45 p.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Vice Chair Allgood reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had eight applications for review. Of these, six were denied, and two were continued for further information. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

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.

- a. In the matter of Kehe Hou at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning a student disciplinary action, the application for review was denied.
2. In the matter of Bharat P. Singh at Fort Valley State University, concerning post tenure review procedures, the application for review was denied.
- c. In the matter of Charles E. Dalton at Georgia State University, concerning his demotion, the application for review was denied.
- d. In the matter of Gerald Mackey at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was continued.
- e. In the matter of Shelly Jenkins at North Georgia College & State University, concerning involuntary withdrawal from the Nursing Program, the application for review was denied.
- f. In the matter of Preston Hughes at the University of Georgia, concerning a disciplinary suspension, the application for review was continued.
- g. In the matter of Robert T. Macura at Augusta State University, concerning denial of admission to his son, the application for review was denied.
- h. In the matter of Jennifer Cesarone at the University of Georgia, concerning her readmission, the application for review was denied.

2. Bylaw Amendment

The 1999 General Assembly amended Georgia's Open Records Act to require the following:

[W]hen any meeting of an agency is closed to the public pursuant to subsection (a) of this Code section, the chairperson or other person presiding over such meeting shall execute and file with the official minutes of the meeting a notarized affidavit stating under oath that the subject matter of the meeting or the closed portion thereof was devoted to matters within the exceptions provided by law and identifying the specific relevant exception. H.B. 278, § 3(b) (1999).

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

2. Bylaw Amendment (Continued)

In response to this amendment to the Open Records Act, the Board of Regents' legal staff proposed that the Section III.6 of the Board's bylaws, the provision of the bylaws which permits the Board to meet in Executive Session, should be amended to reflect this new affidavit requirement. This bylaw amendment was on the table for 30 days before it was approved at this meeting. The amendment added the language in bold below:

Bylaw III.6 Open Meetings and Executive Session

All sessions of the Board and its committees shall be open to the public and the media except during executive session. The Board of Regents and its committees may, upon open, majority vote of those members present and constituting a quorum for business, meet in executive session to consider and act upon any matter which Georgia law permits. **When any meeting of the Board or of a committee of the Board meets in executive session, the Regent presiding over such meeting shall execute and submit to the Secretary to the Board for inclusion in the Board's official minutes a notarized affidavit stating under oath that the subject matter of the meeting or the closed portion thereof was devoted to business which Georgia law permits to be conducted in executive session. Such affidavit shall include the relevant provisions of Georgia law permitting the Board's or the committee's meeting in executive session.** After an executive session of the Board or of any of its committees, the Board or committee shall announce in public all actions taken in executive session and shall record such actions in the official minutes.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

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

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Let me begin with a legislative update. We are on day 33 of the famous 40 days. The supplemental budget has been concluded in the House and Senate with a very positive outcome for the University System. Among the highlights are:

- The \$33 million for health insurance. We've already received the funding for this.
- University of Georgia hazardous waste remediation (\$3.4 million)
- Support for Medical College of Georgia hospital deficit (\$3.2 million)
- Additional lottery funds for ETACT (Equipment, Technology, and Construction Trust) and equipment for our capital projects under construction (\$15 million)
- Funding to expand our bandwidth and GALILEO (Georgia Library Learning Online) (\$7 million)
- Construction for the next six major capital projects (approximately \$102 million):
 - Learning center at Clayton College & State University
 - Technology and commerce center at Columbus State University
 - Science and nursing building at Georgia Southern University
 - Camden Center facility at Coastal Georgia Community College
 - Russell Library and Information Center at Georgia College & State University
 - Housing residence hall at Savannah State University
- Planning and design of numbers 7 and 8:
 - Nursing/health sciences and outreach complex at Macon State College
 - Agricultural sciences building at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College
- Payback at Savannah State University (companion to the above item) (\$7.5 million)
- Minors construction: renovate the classroom building E at the Clarkston campus of Georgia Perimeter College (\$2.9 million)
- Planning and design for numbers 9 through 12:
 - Darton College physical education building
 - Georgia Southwestern State University recreation/athletic/student center
 - Kennesaw State University classroom and convocation center
 - Augusta State University classroom replacement, phase II
- Additional construction of minors:
 - Renovation of the law library at Georgia State University (\$4.4 million)

- North campus chilled water plant expansion at Georgia Institute of Technology (\$4.8 million)
- Replacement of underground electrical distribution system at Gainesville College (\$1.3 million)
- Planning and design of minors:
 - Classroom and wellness center/dorms at Middle Georgia College (\$590,000)
 - Design for math/science building at Kennesaw State University (\$240,000)
 - Design funds for College of Information Technology at Georgia Southern University (\$500,000)
 - Planning and design for the renovation of the classroom/gymnasium facility at South Georgia College

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

- Additional funds for current projects:
 - Renovation of activity center at East Georgia College (\$250,000)
 - Renovation of the Dublin Center (\$1.2 million)

Our capital total is approximately \$148 million, which is a very good year indeed. The House has made its fiscal year 2001 budget recommendations. Again, they are positive. Fiscal year 2001 House highlights carry forward most of Governor's recommendations:

- \$47 million for "hold harmless" on the formula
- \$1.46 million for Georgia GLOBE (Global Learning Online for Business & Education)
- \$2.64 million for historically black colleges and universities
- \$375,000 for the Hispanic Task Force recommendations
- \$8.61 million for the Yamacraw Mission
- All lottery funds, totaling \$10.96 million

In addition, the House added the Eminent Scholar that we requested at Macon State College, \$945,000 for the ICAPP (Intellectual Capital Partnership Program) rural initiative that we also requested, and \$372,000 for aquaculture at Fort Valley State University.

As we worked on budget issues at the Capitol, I learned a lot from a recent report on economic impact by Dr. Jeffrey Humphreys of the Selig Center for Economic Growth at the Terry College at the University of Georgia. (He must have a big business card.) "In the simplest and broadest terms, the total economic impact of all 34 institutions of the University System of Georgia on their host communities was \$7.7 billion in [fiscal year] 1999, up by 6.4% from [fiscal year] 1998." On average, he reports, every dollar of initial spending generates an additional 56 cents for the economy of the region hosting the institution. The \$4.5 billion value-added impact reported for fiscal year 1999 equals almost 2% of Georgia's gross State product.

The collective employment impact of all 34 institutions on their host communities in fiscal year 1999, including multiplier effects, is 99,965 jobs. Approximately 42% of these positions are on campus — employees of the University System of Georgia — and 58% are off-campus jobs in either the private or public sectors. On average, for each job created on campus, there are 1.4 off-campus jobs that exist because of spending related to the institution. The 99,965 jobs generated by the University System of Georgia account for 2.7% of all the jobs in Georgia, or about one job in 37.

Many of these, of course, are State dollars finding their way back to the various communities. But many of the other dollars are those spent by students, those that come from research grants, and so on. So, our line in the Capitol about funding for the University System being an investment is true, not just in educational terms, but also in fiscal terms.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

Talking of numbers, you have a plethora of them at your places, courtesy of the thirteenth edition of the "Information Digest." It's a great credit to this Board and to the Office of Planning and Policy Analysis that long before accountability was in anyone's vocabulary, we were laying out the good, the bad, and the ugly. In addition, you'll find our annual accountability report that documents how we used the previous year's allocation. I commend both of these documents to you. The "Information Digest" is a particular treasure of facts over time.

On the "Good News" front...

- Skidaway Institute of Oceanography received the Governor's Cup for the third consecutive year for having the highest percentage of contributions per employee during the recent State Charitable Contributions campaign. The Governor's Award went to Georgia Southwestern State University, Atlanta Metropolitan College, and the Georgia Institute of Technology.
- The Board of Regents Central Office, Armstrong Atlantic State University, Dalton College, Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, Savannah State University, and the University of Georgia received the Commissioners Award. The State Charitable Contributions campaign is sponsored by the Georgia Merit System. A total of \$2,730,000 was contributed by employees of the State's agencies.
- Edward Larson, the Richard B. Russell Professor of American History at the University of Georgia, has been named winner of the George Sarton Award by the American Association of the Advancement of Science. George Sarton is considered the originator of the field of science history, and the award is given each year to honor a historian of science for a body of work.
- Aaron Williams, a sophomore and President of the Student Government Association at Waycross College, was selected as the recipient of the Outstanding Student Programmer Award by the Promotion of Campus Activities, a national organization.
- Gunter Burghardt, the new ambassador of the European Union ("EU") to the United States, highlighted the University System of Georgia's EU studies certificate program in a recent speech in New York City by saying, "The EU Center of Georgia has established an undergraduate certificate in EU studies with the full participation of 26 institutions of the University System of Georgia."

- The College of Business at Savannah State University has received candidacy status with the AACSB.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

- The University of Georgia (the highest ranked public institution outside of California) ranking fifth nationally in a study of ecology programs according to the *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*.

Let me share a few snippets of national news with you:

- On a personnel note, Dr. Lloyd W. Benjamin, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Valdosta State University, has been named President of Indiana State University. While I (and President Hugh C. Bailey) hate to lose Lloyd, I think it's a good sign for the System. We should be having people in these positions who are competitive for presidencies, both within our System and beyond.
- On the academic health center front, the challenges continue to mount nationally. Georgetown University has reached an agreement to sell its money-losing hospital to MedStar Health, a nonprofit chain based in nearby Columbus, Maryland. Georgetown will maintain control of its medical school, while MedStar will operate the Georgetown University Hospital as a teaching hospital, as well as other clinical operations.
- The president of the University of Pennsylvania, Judith Rodin, fired the head of Penn's struggling health system on Thursday after the system had lost more than \$300 million over the last two years. (*Chronicle of Higher Education*)
- Another national study (out of UCLA), which has been conducted for many years, gives us insights on the lives of our students. For example, a record number of students (30%) feel "frequently overwhelmed by all I have to do" (up from 16% in 1985). In what is perhaps a related finding, 25% report the likelihood that they will work full-time while going to college.

And let me close with a piece of news of international significance: The Runnin' Regents got back to their winning ways with a magnificent victory over Kennesaw State University. Actually, we had a lot of fun because Kennesaw made it fun. In case you're ever on "I Want to Be a Millionaire," an important piece of sports trivia is that the last point scored was by Regent Cater! It was humbling, however, to see that the crowd gathered after our game to watch cheerleader practice was ten times larger than that to watch us.

But humble is not a bad state to be in, particularly during the next seven days! Mr. Chairman, that completes my report.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

At approximately 9:40 a.m., Chair Canestra convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Jenkins, Vice Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Vice Chair Jenkins explained that the Committee would hear two presentations at this meeting. There would first be a presentation by the lead project consultants for the benchmarking/management review initiative, and then, there would be a presentation by the consultants for the technology master planning initiative. At the February 2000 meeting, Chancellor Portch had announced that the contract for the benchmarking study had just been awarded to an impressive team from Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. (the “Pappas Group”), Arthur Andersen LLP (“Andersen”), and MGT of America (“MGT”). At this meeting, the Regents would hear from Dr. Alceste T. Pappas, President of the Pappas Group, and Mr. James H. Roth, Head of the Higher Education Division of Andersen. They would be briefing the Regents on their approach to conducting the studies, which will help the Board make informed strategic improvements. Vice Chair Jenkins encouraged the Regents to share their thoughts and questions. He then welcomed the presenters.

Dr. Pappas stated first, she and Mr. Roth would discuss the benchmarking initiative, and then, Mr. Roth would discuss the technology master planning initiative. She explained that she has been in the business of higher education for 30 years. She started her career at the University of California - Berkeley. She worked there for ten years and was then recruited by KPMG to start a higher education and nonprofit practice in New York City. She soon became a partner in the practice and later ran the practice herself for a number of years. Eight years ago, Dr. Pappas decided that she wanted to work with clients again, so she created her own consulting firm, which works exclusively with colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations. Over the years, she has been personally involved in a number of projects very similar to the Board’s benchmarking initiative. She has worked with the Oregon state system of higher education, the University of Massachusetts, the City University of New York, and a host of other large systems. The team from the Pappas Group primarily consists of former KPMG consultants who worked together for at least 20 years. Dr. Pappas explained that the world of higher education is undergoing some tremendous challenges, and over the last three to four years in particular, the issue of accountability has become very prominent, particularly in the public sector. As states reassess the level of appropriations to state systems of higher education, issues of differentiation of mission, of value added, and of economic impact become increasingly important. Also, the very core of the institutions is undergoing a great deal of review across the country. The Board is asking some very fundamental questions. The first is “How are we doing both relative to peers and relative to those we aspire to become?” The second question is “How can we do our day-to-day business as it relates to administrative and financial functions?” Additionally, the institutions will be examining enrollment management, which includes admissions, registration, financial aid, and student accounts. The Board wants to know how the University System can provide those services in a more service-oriented manner and whether there are ways in which it can reduce operating costs in those operations. The third question is “How do we get the data in place to continue to measure progress?” This is directly related to issues of accountability and the University System “report card.”

Mr. Roth stated that he is with Andersen’s consulting practice. He has been with Andersen for 20 years and has been a partner for the last 8 years. He started the higher education practice working with Stanford University in the early 1990s, and since then, he has worked with over 70 colleges and universities and even some for-profit organizations. Because of the changes that are taking place in higher education, the concept of for-profit educational institutions is beginning to have an impact, though there is some uncertainty as to **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

what the impact will be. Also, there is significant change occurring with the concept of distance learning.

The focus in the practice has been primarily on the review and assessment of administrative practices and the use of technology to implement those practices to be more efficient and effective in the way that institutions are working. The practice is actively involved at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Roth noted that it is a stressful environment to deal with a \$300 million loss over two years. He stated that he and Dr. Pappas would have the advantage of their collective broad experience.

Dr. Pappas stated that when they responded to the request for proposals (“RFP”), the three consulting firms reached out to each other because what distinguishes the Pappas Group from Andersen is that it has been around a lot longer actually serving in college settings as line managers. The Pappas Group brings with it the campus perspective, which is essential in doing a job as complex as this. Andersen brings a great deal of experience in business process redesign and the application of technology to those redesign processes. MGT brings an interesting blend of folks who have been line managers in healthcare and the public sector as well as higher education. So, MGT approaches things from a very academic statistical perspective when it comes to ensuring the data that are gathered in benchmarking will be statistically valid data that the Board of Regents can depend upon. Dr. Pappas stated that this is a shared project in which the Board of Regents is partnering at the project steering committee level with staff from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (“OPB”) and other State agencies. The committee meets every two weeks to ensure that everyone is working together to reach consensus. This is a very unusual approach, but she said that it is definitely the right one because it ensures that people in OPB and the Governor’s Office are absolutely confident in the methodology of the benchmarking process.

Mr. Roth agreed that this is not the traditional way of approaching this type of project. The collaboration has already been very beneficial. Both sides of the table can learn a lot from each other and have open and active discussions. This has been and will continue to be effective.

Dr. Pappas said that they would like to go through each of the project scope areas in the benchmarking/management review studies and then hear feedback and questions from the Regents. Scope one of the review focuses on the issue of benchmarking. One of the elusive characteristics of educational institutions in benchmarking is trying to identify a nationally recognized database in a way that is statistically valid and objective. Benchmarking is therefore more of an art than a science when it comes to higher education. The consultants are still learning how to take a traditional input-output model of measurement and apply it to higher education. The challenge is determining what to measure. In other words, what are the outcomes of a student’s experience? Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (“IPEDS”) data from the National Center of Education Statistics is used to measure and identify comparator groups or peers. So, in the first step, the consultants will be building on some of the work that has already been done by the Board of Regents Central Office and the institutions to begin to identify the criteria for the selection of those peers. One of the differentiating factors in doing benchmarking in higher education is that educational institutions, unlike businesses, are mission-based and constituency-driven. So, the consultants must focus on the mission of an institution to differentiate what it does from other institutions. The University of Georgia’s mission statement will have differentiating characteristics from the mission of Valdosta State University even though all 34 institutions do three things. They provide teaching, research, and public service. The degree to which each institution gets involved in each area creates nuances of difference. That is the challenge in terms of identifying comparators or peers. The project steering committee will be providing the recommendations to the Chancellor on those peers. The more interesting challenge is how to define an aspirational group for

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

each institution. This will be the first exercise of the consultants. It is not an easy exercise, so the consultants will look to the Board of Regents staff and the University System institutions to work closely with them. Once this process is completed, the consultants will report their findings to the project steering committee and begin to define particular benchmarks against which to measure the peers and the aspirants. That will give the Regents a good sense of the kinds of issues that exist for all 34 institutions. This will be an iterative process in which the consultants will be going back and forth with the institutions to come to conclusions about the appropriate peers and aspirants, and the project steering committee will take a very active role in this. Much time will be spent in this first phase of the project, because the consultants want to ensure that the Central Office, the OPB, and the institutions are all comfortable with the methodology. The benchmarking project and management review will be completed by June 2000. Mr. Roth would next discuss what the consultants are doing in parallel with the benchmarking project. MGT is taking the lead on that scope of the project because of its long-standing experience in that area.

Mr. Roth stated that the second scope of the project is the management review. Essentially, it will be an assessment of the best way to deliver administrative and management functions to the University System. It will examine the Central Office, Macon State College (“MSC”), Kennesaw State University (“KSU”), Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (“ABAC”), and the University of Georgia (“UGA”). The objective is to examine the management and administrative functions that are being provided to determine whether there are ways to improve deficiencies and effectiveness of the delivery of those services. While he did not yet have answers, Mr. Roth knew some of the questions the management review would be asking. He explained that there are different answers for the different perspectives of cost, efficiency, service levels, institutional autonomy, and community interests. So, when the consultants perform the management review of the four institutions and the Central Office, they will have to look at the issues from all angles. The consultants are only looking at a limited number of institutions. One of the burdens they will therefore face is what implications the review has on the entire University System. That is a question that at this point is unresolved. These are issues the consultants will be facing and will be discussing with the steering committee as the information comes in. The process should provide many interesting answers. The other aspect of the management review is that the University System is currently in the process of making a very sizable investment in the implementation of PeopleSoft. The question is what are the expectations in terms of being able to use that technology to deliver services in the most efficient and effective way. Again, the question remains unanswered now, but it will clearly have an impact on the recommendations the consultants will develop at the end of the project.

The third scope of this project is an evaluation of the consistency of data to ensure that the consultants are reporting in an effective way, explained Mr. Roth. The only way to collectively manage a system as varied as the University System is to be certain that the data are reliably reported. This has been a problem at many institutions on the departmental level, let alone on a system level. So, this scope will require a fair amount of effort to determine how to ensure consistent reporting of information across the System.

Dr. Pappas asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Vice Chair Jenkins thanked the presenters.

Regent White asked whether a timetable had been established for each scope of the project.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Dr. Pappas responded that the consultants began their work on March 1, 2000 and will have completed

scopes one and two no later than June 15, 2000, which is a very short time frame. By then, the work will be done and the major issues will be on the table. The downside is that this creates a tremendous time crunch. Dr. Pappas remarked that the institutions have been extraordinarily cooperative in working at the last minute. This week, the consultants were working at MSC on Monday and Tuesday. On Wednesday and Thursday, they would be at ABAC. They would be at KSU March 14, 15, and 16 and at UGA the entire week of March 20. The management review will entail getting a sense of the administrative and financial processes from the diagnostic perspective. The consultants will then review those four campuses and their relationships to the Central Office. Scope three will be completed in September 2000.

Regent White asked whether the consultants discovered anything in previous studies of other systems and institutions that would be applicable to the System institutions.

Dr. Pappas replied that the most challenging issue, particularly at the institutional level, will be changing the way in which processes are undertaken. As processes are changed, redundant steps are eliminated, and new systems are implemented to replace what has formerly been done manually, people on campus are loath to change because they no longer know who does what. So, that is one of the most challenging areas. Even if an area is inefficient or ineffective and users complain, when things are improved, many people are uncomfortable with the change. At the system level, there are some major questions about the role and responsibility of a central office. In Oregon, the central office budget needed to be cut by 50% and it was decided that the office needed to completely divest itself of any day-to-day operations. Based on the needs of that system and state, they decided that the central office of the University System of Oregon should be doing three things: serving as advocates for the system and being present at the state capitol, setting the strategic direction and differentiating the missions of the seven institutions; and engaging in policy. These challenges make such assignments challenging intellectually and in terms of implementation.

Mr. Roth added that at the institutional level, there is often difficulty integrating technology into the business processes and determining what business rules should change. Because institutions have been around a long time, there is a reluctance to change the way they do business. If the consultants examine the best way to deliver service right now irrespective of what the institutions have done historically, the difference between that and what the institutions have been doing is rather significant. Getting people to make that move and realize that there are better ways of doing things is tough both in terms of using the technology and getting people comfortable with the idea that they do not have to do business as usual. There is a way to improve efficiency so that people can focus on what they really want to be doing, but it is difficult to go through that process. At the system level, dealing with the issues of campus autonomy is important both from an operational and strategic perspective.

Dr. Pappas stated that there is a myth in higher education that the cost of doing business is in the offices of vice presidents for finance and business. However, most departments in institutions have their own administrative infrastructures where they keep shadow systems because they do not trust the information that is coming out of the central system on campus or it is late or it does not provide them with the kind of management information that they need from their perspective to manage their budgets on a monthly basis. That is an interesting learning process for the institutions themselves to go through, because there are many people in the institutions who are really doing administrative tasks. So, one of the challenges is that as technology is applied and people have access to real-time information, then people conclude that the **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

administration is dumping more work on them. So, differentiating what is dumping on them versus enabling them to do administrative functions directly is an incredible challenge.

Mr. Roth stated that accountability is easier to measure in the corporate world because there are sophisticated cost accounting systems. Universities do not have those systems, so it is almost impossible to determine the cost of providing services such as instruction and research. This makes measuring the accountability of those functions is very difficult. There are some very tough issues here that need to be addressed, but in the end, the University System will know the best ways to deliver its services. This project will assess how well the University System is doing compared to others and will provide opportunities to determine whether there are better ways to deliver the services the System and institutions provide.

Regent McMillan commented that his comfort level was heightened by this presentation. At a previous meeting, he had experienced a feeling of uneasiness about the benchmarking initiative because he got the feeling that, unlike Dr. Pappas had said, it seemed to be more of a science than an art. He had been worried that the initiative needed to be going in the right direction. He stated that benchmarking can be tricky and he hoped that all the partners will buy into the understanding of this also.

Dr. Pappas stated that there is a science to the project as well. The consultants will be using the national data, and they will be doing some factor analyses. However, the project will be a combination of art and science.

Regent Cannestra stated that he would be worried if the artists took over for the scientists. He wanted the benchmarking to be similar to how it is done in industry. He would like to see how much it costs to procure the final product of educated students against the peer institutions. There are things that are essential to the process, such as faculty, facilities, and equipment. There are also other things that are not necessarily essential to the education of the student but that add value to the education. He would like some cost figures that would determine whether the University System is competitive with its peers. Then, each institution would know how it stacks up against its peers.

Regent McMillan insisted that this process must be mission-driven. He stated that it takes more resources to run an institution that has been deficient in every area than one that has not been in that condition. He said that the process should be both scientific and artistic, but it must be cognizant of mission.

Dr. Pappas responded that this is exactly the kind of conversations the project steering committee has been having, which is good because it will result in both quantifiable measures and profound questions, such as “What do our students really get from the educational process?” That requires longitudinal studies and investing money to follow those students and report back. What is the value of continuing education? What benefit accrues to the State? Dr. Pappas said that the consultants will be able to develop those kinds of measures that will enable the Board and institutions to compare themselves with peers and aspirational groups, but it will also begin to ask some of the most profound questions to promote thinking about what methodology they can agree on in going forward.

Regent Cannestra agreed that the process must be mission-driven in addition to looking at the peers.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Mr. Roth stated that there is a scientific technique that needs to be applied artistically. There is a very process-driven scientific way of gathering the benchmarking information, but there is a story behind all of that information. The creativity comes in with the application and interpretation of the data.

Regent Cannestra stated that when institutions are compared to their peers, some of their stories will hold water and others will not.

Mr. Roth agreed, but he stressed that initially, not everyone will even agree on who the peers are. The interpretation will be the hardest part. The difficulty will be in recognizing the nuances of the individual missions while still making decisions based on the information despite the differences.

Regent Hunt asked how successful the results of the benchmarking and management review process were in Oregon.

Dr. Pappas replied that Oregon had gone through a budget referendum, and the state appropriation to the university system was approximately 30% less. The central office was targeted for a 50% budget cut, and selected institutions were targeted for 30% cuts. The state auditor came back and looked at the institutions a few years later, and in fact, they had reduced their operating costs, they had generated new revenue sources to offset some costs, and some of the activities were either outsourced or they looked to new ways to deliver those services. In Iowa, the board of regents asked Pappas to do an operational audit of the entire system. They examined everything and returned six years later to examine the progress. The data are quantifiable and qualitative, and she could provide them to the Regents. Systems who do this kind of review will ask for that kind of verification. Because of the issue of accountability in the State of Georgia at all levels of education, this Board will have the opportunity to report back to the State in a way that corresponds to both the State and the System.

Regent Hunt remarked that the students are probably better off in the long run as a result of this process.

Dr. Pappas stated that serving the students is the most important aspect of this process. In areas such as enrollment management, many students get bounced between the admissions office and the financial aid office and the registrar’s office in long lines over and over. There are places where “one-stop shops” have been instituted so a student can get all of her questions answered in one place through technology, and the service and retention rates are higher as a result. It is more difficult to prove success on the staff and faculty side.

Regent Wooten asked whether there are other states with university systems that have done a comparable three-tiered benchmarking project.

Dr. Pappas replied, “Not concurrently.” She explained that the University System of Georgia is the first to take on such an initiative.

Mr. Roth added that many states are watching the University System of Georgia.

Dr. Pappas stated that this is good. It demonstrates a partnership to support and manage higher education, and it also provides leadership in the nation with regard to the far-reaching issues this initiative is addressing. **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

She noted that there has been a real shift in Regents beginning to reassess their own role as stewards of public institutions. There are profound responsibilities for stewardship of resources, for positioning, and

for planning and policy. That raises questions about relationships with other State agencies, distance learning, and strategy.

Regent Wooten asked whether there were any additional areas that the study should address.

Mr. Roth responded that the study would not be looking at every administrative and management process. Rather, it would hone in on the most critical processes. Because the study focuses on four institutions and the Central Office, the consultants do not know for certain their ability to extrapolate what they will learn in the process. Eventually, everyone will want to know the implications for the entire System. However, they do not know for certain whether there will be enough information to clearly extrapolate. He stated that it is too early in the process to tell about that. The consultants are looking at different kinds of institutions, but the sample is not exhaustive and institutions are unique in some ways.

Regent Baranco asked whether the perspectives of the business community will be considered. She noted that in recent years, the Board of Regents established an Office of Economic Development. As a part of that process, the Board surveyed the majority of the top chief executive officers in the State about the kinds of graduates they wanted from the University System. As the System engages in the process of benchmarking, particularly with regard to the “softer” issues, that is a perspective that needs to be considered as well. She asked whether it would be incorporated in the consultants’ study. She stated that this would be very valuable because the business community is very interested in and supportive of the University System.

Dr. Pappas replied that the consultants will be working with Annie Hunt Burriss, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development and Economic Services, and Cathie Mayes Hudson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis, to use the data they have already collected and apply it to the benchmarking project.

Mr. Roth added that there are some very practical issues, particularly in the area of economic development, that the consultants have seen before. For example, the consultants were asked to evaluate the purchasing power of another multi-campus system. They found that there are several things that system could do, such as being more proactive to consolidate its purchasing power among the institutions to achieve real savings. Also, administration of procurement processes could be consolidated so that instead of having multiple purchasing areas, there could be fewer than one for each campus. In this case, the chief executive officer of the system had decided that whatever administrative cost savings the consultants could achieve were going to be applied to faculty salaries, which were deemed to be below their peers. The idea was that the better faculty the system has, the better students it will get, and the more the institutions will grow and benefit economic development. That was a clear picture, but it raised a new issue. If the purchasing arrangements were consolidated, then what was previously purchased locally may no longer be purchased locally. The new issue was how that filters back into the process. This is an example of the kind of issue that may be raised during the benchmarking process. Mr. Roth referred back to cost, community, service, and autonomy and remarked that it is tough to make decisions when there are many people weighing in on what they feel.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked whether the benchmarking process would compare institutions on a national or regional level.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Dr. Pappas reiterated that the consultants would be using IPEDS data from the National Center of Education Statistics. Where possible, the consultants would also be using Southern Regional Education Board data, but the national data would be more applicable because the study would need 10 to 12 peers for each type of institution.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked whether there were any further questions, and seeing that there were none, he asked Mr. Roth to discuss the technology master planning study.

Chancellor Portch interjected that before the meeting moved on, he would like Dr. Hanes to introduce the members of the project steering committee for the benchmarking/management review who were present at this meeting.

Dr. Hanes stated that the Board was fortunate to have its colleagues from OPB and the Governor’s Office present at this meeting. They have worked with the Central Office staff since the outset of the project, including the development of the RFP and the consultant selection process. She introduced Mr. Chuck Freedman, Director of Program Evaluation and Management; Mr. David Watts, Director of Education Development; and Ms. Judith Brown, Principle Strategic Consultant. Mr. Ron Jackson, Director of Strategic Planning, was not present at the meeting. Dr. Hanes sits on the project steering committee along with Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers and Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Beheruz N. Sethna and their colleagues from OPB.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked Mr. Roth about Pennsylvania’s \$300 million deficit. He noted that historically, New York and Pennsylvania have been able to attract federal funding because of inner-city hospital formula change, children’s hospital change, teaching hospital change, or the like. He asked Mr. Roth how much of the \$300 million deficit would be addressed by a last-minute appropriation.

Mr. Roth responded that the \$300 million was lost two years ago. He did not know whether there would be policy issues to address this in the future.

Vice Chair Jenkins stated that if New York and Pennsylvania did not get an appropriation, no other state would.

Chancellor Portch noted that Vice Chair Jenkins is a former U.S. Congressman.

Mr. Roth stated that this is a very tough issue and a very difficult environment. It is a plague at many academic medical centers.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked Mr. Roth to proceed with his discussion of the technology master planning project.

Mr. Roth stated that Andersen responded separately to an RFP about the development of a technology master plan. At this point, there are some incredibly strong synergies between the two consulting projects. For example, in considering a better way to deliver administrative services, he would have to consider what tools an institution would have to deliver those services. Because there are many similarities between the two projects, the consultants will be working closely together to ensure that what is determined on the technology master planning side is also applied and considered on the benchmarking side, especially with regard to using **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

consistent data sources. He was glad that they would be able to combine the knowledge gained on both projects to deliver the maximum value to the System. Essentially, the objective of the technology master planning project is to develop a master plan for instructional and information technology in the University System. It asks how technology should be used, developed, and integrated into the System. As a part of that, the consulting team will be developing templates to allow each of the institutions to take the master plan that has been developed at the System level and use it to develop its own strategic plan at the campus level. A major part of this will be determining the proper role of the Office of Information and Instructional Technology (“OIIT”) in delivering services to the System institutions. The consultants will also be looking at which services will best be provided centrally versus by the institutions. That is a moving target in a lot of respects, he said. Because technology is having such a dramatic impact on the ability to deliver services, the consultants have to be forward looking and speculative. Focusing too much on what the University System has done historically may not be the right answer. The consultants will determine what is best given what is available now and what will soon be available. That will have an impact both on the functional levels of the System and at the institutions. The idea is to ask what role technology should play and how the System should prepare to take the most advantage of that technology. Mr. Roth noted that it is a very difficult process. It is much easier to install technology than it is to properly use it. The difference between those institutions that use it effectively and those that just install it is enormous in terms of cost, efficiency, and morale. People want to have access to more technology, and if they do not get it, there is a problem. The consultants will also be evaluating the appropriate technical architecture and services at the System level. That includes the network design and deployment, the architecture for the deployment of courseware, whether the institutions should be independent or consistent with the System from the technology perspective, and the organizational and functional structures of OIIT to determine its best placement and role within the System. The consultants began work in the previous week. They will be talking to chief information officers or their equivalents throughout the System, and they will be discussing current strategies and vision as well as the use of technology among and between the institutions. This will help shed light on where the System ought to be going from a master planning perspective. This project also has a very rapid turnaround time; the consultants hope to deliver their final report to the Board sometime in June.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked whether the Regents had any questions.

Regent White asked whether the consultants would be looking at the courses that the institutions offer in information technology (“IT”).

Mr. Roth responded that this study will not be looking at the academic side of the issue.

Regent White asked Chancellor Portch how the Board is going to keep up with what IT courses the institutions are offering to ensure there is no redundancy.

The Chancellor responded that the staff are working independently of the technology master planning study to create a master plan for what is being offered by which institutions. This too is a moving target in large part because of the Yamacraw Mission, which involves the development of many new courses.

Mr. Roth noted that this begs the question of what the desires are at the institutional level in terms of developing and delivering courseware as well as what technology that will require and to what extent it can and should be coordinated. These are very important issues that the study will address in terms of setting standards and expectations of how this should be approached.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Vice Chair Jenkins thanked the presenters for their outstanding presentations and stated that the Board looks forward to their reports.

Mr. Roth stressed that at this point, there are as many questions as there are answers and there will be many tough decisions to be made.

Chancellor Portch asked how many people are working on each of these consulting projects.

Mr. Roth replied that there were eight to ten people on the projects.

Dr. Pappas stated that there are a dozen people on-site as well as other analysts behind the scenes.

The Chancellor stated that this is an exercise of self-examination which is going to reveal deficiencies. It is important to remind ourselves that the purpose is to improve and not to punish those among us for the way things have been done. If we want people to engage in critical self-examination, they must feel there will be rewards for doing that. The four institutions that volunteered to participate entered into the project with the spirit of wanting critical self-examination and improvement. The purpose is to get maximum dollars to the core functions and to improve upon them.

Regent Baranco stated that the System will reap the benefits of this project in terms of cost-efficiency.

Chancellor Portch agreed. Largely, the study is to examine where funding is most effectively deployed.

Regent NeSmith asked whether the consultants would be recommending the processes by which to improve on the deficiencies or whether they were only going to highlight the areas that need improvement.

Mr. Roth responded that the consultants would not be providing a detailed plan to be executed. However, they may, for example, suggest changes in the roles and responsibilities of the Central Office. They will not create a detailed plan of how to reorganize, but they will provide a general idea of what the Board could do. A detailed design to be implemented would be a separate project.

Regent NeSmith asked whether the project would be done for each institution.

Mr. Roth responded that the benchmarking management review would be done on the four representative institutions and the Central Office. There will be many institutions that will not be reviewed at all.

Regent Hunt asked whether the consultants would be suggesting some best practices of other systems.

Mr. Roth stated that this is part of the benefit of the consulting firms. They have done much work nationally, so that will be part of what they deliver to the Board. There may be other models in other systems that the University System should consider.

Regent NeSmith stated that he had been involved in benchmarking projects before, and one problem is that sometimes too much information is gathered, which can be overwhelming. He suggested that the consultants hone in on the areas that would provide the most results.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Mr. Roth agreed that this is part of why the project has to be done artistically. There are many nuances that differentiate institutions, and every institution has its own set of initiatives. The important thing is to hone in on what the data are demonstrating and what actions the University System should take as a result. The benchmarking exercise is to give the University System some general direction about where

to emphasize its efforts.

Regent Baranco stated that the benchmarking initiative seems like a life-long commitment.

Chancellor Portch responded that this is why scope three is so important. For this initiative to be meaningful, it cannot be a one-shot deal. There will also be a great deal of work for the Board to do after this project. The study will be diagnostic, not prescriptive. The Regents, as policymakers, are going to be the ones who will have to wrestle with implementation. The consultants are not going to be able to provide a product that solves all the problems. It will be an ongoing effort to put in place processes and data for ongoing self-examination.

Mr. Roth agreed that it was unlikely even if the consultants provided a detailed list of things to implement that the Board could or would want to implement them all. The idea is to strategically prioritize those things that make the most sense.

Regent White remarked that the timing of these projects is perfect. He thanked Regent Cannestra, Chair of the Board, for having the foresight to select these issues for the focus of strategic planning this year.

Regent Hunt concurred that these initiatives are very good for the System and its students in the long term.

Vice Chair Jenkins again thanked the consultants. He then asked for a motion to recess the meeting of the Committee of the Whole. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.

Chair Cannestra also thanked the consultants and remarked that the Board looks forward to their final reports.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Cannestra next called upon Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning to present to the Board three honorary degree nominations.

The first and second honorary degree proposals were for Mr. Kyle and Mrs. Sally Spencer by Columbus State University. Mr. and Mrs. Spencer supported the establishment of an international studies program for students, faculty and staff which has been underway for almost a decade. A large number of faculty, staff, and students have studied at Oxford University under their sponsorship. In addition to their support of study abroad opportunities, they have been very generous donors to the Schwob Department of Music. Mr. Spencer currently chairs the Planned Gifts Committee of the Columbus State Foundation and served four years on the executive committee of the foundation, completing his service with the role of Chairman in 1998-1999.

The third honorary degree proposal was for Mr. Charles M. Brewer by Southern Polytechnic State University. Mr. Brewer is the founder, Chairman, and Chief Executive Officer of MindSpring Enterprises (now Earthlink-MindSpring). He founded MindSpring in 1994, and it is now one of the largest independent Internet service providers in the United States. Earthlink serves over one million customers nationwide and has over 1,500 employees. Mr. Brewer was born and reared in Louisville, Kentucky. He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Amherst College with a degree in economics, and he received his master of business administration degree from the Stanford University Graduate School of Business. Mr. Brewer serves on the board of directors of the Midtown Alliance and the board of councilors of the Carter Center.

On behalf of Presidents Frank D. Brown and Lisa A. Rossbacher, Dr. Dunning submitted these nominations for the Board's approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the honorary degrees.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, April 18 and Wednesday, April 19, 2000 in the student center on the campus of Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia. This would be one week later than usual to give the staff time to work with budget and allocation issues.

Ms. Weber also asked that the Regents return to her their signed statements regarding the applications by Fort Valley State University and the University of Georgia for noncommercial FM radio station licenses.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:00 a.m., Chair Cannestra called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a personnel matter. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Cannestra, Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr., and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, and Joel O. Wooten. Also in attendance were Chancellor Stephen R. Portch and Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber. 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 11:20 a.m., Chair Cannestra reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. With motion made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, Regent Baranco and Chancellor Portch were granted authority to make a personnel appointment at their discretion before the April 2000 Board meeting, with the appointment to be ratified by the Board at that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:25 a.m. on March 8, 2000.

s/
Gail S. Weber
Secretary to the Board
Board of Regents
University System of Georgia

s/
Kenneth W. Cannestra
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia