

**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 12 and 13, 2002**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, March 12 and Wednesday, March 13, 2002, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Hilton H. Howell, Jr., called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Howell, were Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, March 12 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that no Regents were absent on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on February 5 and 6, 2002 were unanimously approved as distributed.

RECOGNITION OF REPRESENTATIVE DUBOSE PORTER

Chair Howell said that he had invited Representative Dubose Porter, Chair of the House Higher Education Committee, to the meeting. He invited Representative Porter to address the Board.

Representative Porter told the Regents that the House Higher Education Committee is fighting for the interests of the University System every day. He noted that the Board of Regents has strong representation with the legislature. He said that on Friday, March 15, he would be escorting Chancellor Meredith to Dublin, Georgia, where he would be introduced to Middle Georgia. He thanked the Regents for all that they do and remarked that it is exciting to be a part of what is happening in higher education in Georgia.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chair Howell next convened the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the Chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern, the Chair of the Committee.

Chair Leebern thanked Regent Howell and noted that this meeting would be the first of two Strategic Planning Committee meetings at this month’s Board meeting. At this meeting, the Committee would hear presentations on the eleventh goal of the new strategic plan. On Wednesday, the Committee would hear presentations on the first, third, and ninth goals. He reminded the Regents that the strategic planning process permits in-depth discussion of all eleven goals that the Board identified at its May 2000 strategic planning retreat. He then introduced the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, to make his presentation on the eleventh goal.

Mr. Daniel thanked Chair Leebern and recognized Representative DuBose Porter, who was in attendance at the meeting. He said that he was pleased to present to the Board the results of the work group formed to assess the eleventh goal of the Board’s strategic plan: maximizing cooperation with other state agencies, boards, the Office of the Governor, and the General Assembly, while maintaining the constitutional authority of the Board of Regents. This goal represents the Regents’ commitment to collaboration with their partners in state government. For the Board, collaboration is not just a buzz word, he said; rather, it is a reality. That commitment is illustrated each day by the University System Office staff; by the faculty, staff, and administrators on the 34 campuses; and by all of the many facilities around the state. In this report, Mr. Daniel and a special guest would paint a vivid picture of both the long-standing and newly developed successful partnerships the University System enjoys with various units of state government ranging from the Governor’s Office to the legislature to the scores of agencies, boards, and authorities that comprise state government. The work group that examined the eleventh goal determined that this goal is being achieved in many innovative and diverse ways throughout the entire University System every day. Mr. Daniel stated that he was delighted to announce that Governor Roy E. Barnes would be joining the Board for a brief visit to acknowledge the University System’s successful record of collaboration and service. This would be the Governor’s second visit with the Board, which speaks volumes about the collaborative relationship the Regents have developed with the Governor and his staff.

The work group surveyed all 34 University System institutions and a wide array of state agencies to assess the current status of collaboration between the University System of Georgia and various state offices. Mr. Daniel stated that the responses were overwhelming and impressive. The survey asked institutions to self-identify a collection of collaborative projects for an 18-month period, beginning July 2000 and ending December 2001. These were the results of that effort. The responses indicated that there were 314 partnerships with state agencies, 50 partnerships with state boards, 25 partnerships with the legislature, and 26 partnerships with the Governor’s Office. In all, there were 415 collaborations. In the Regents’ notebooks, there was a brochure highlighting some of these partnerships. The first area of emphasis in the brochure was collaboration with state agencies. By far, the greatest number of partnerships are interagency compacts. Mr. Daniel explained these are instances when a University System entity joins together to work

with, on, or on behalf of another state agency. In all, the 314 recorded projects in this category range from Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College's hosting the first-ever electronically conducted Georgia Supreme Court hearing to the Georgia Institute of Technology's ("GIT") management of the Severe Storms Research Center for the Georgia Emergency Management Authority ("GEMA"). Expanding the resources of the University System to meet vital state needs is the characteristic thread that is reflected in all of these programs. Through these programs, the service mission of the University System is being met each and every day.

Due to time considerations, Mr. Daniel would feature only two collaborations in each of the respective sectors noted in the eleventh goal. The brochure, however, cited additional examples. To meet the challenge of determining which two programs he would spotlight, he used the criteria of statewide impact and what the work group termed the "wow" factor. He wanted to tell the Regents something they did not already know. For instance, the Regents know that Secretary of State Cathy Cox is working diligently to secure \$54 million to overhaul and update the state's voting system. However, they may not know that Kennesaw State University is directly involved in developing and testing the new electronic voting system, which has been piloted in 13 cities throughout the state. Also, South Georgia College is the first institution in the state to prepare registered nurses to work in K-12 schools as called for in the Governor's Education Reform Act.

Changing the focus of the survey from state agencies to boards and authorities narrowed the responses, said Mr. Daniel, but they were also rather impressive. The responses ranged from Columbus State University's law enforcement training center to the highly successful partnership among the four research universities and the Georgia Research Alliance to the digital archives services provided by the state's public library system. The work being done taps the intellectual expertise within the University System to conduct highly valued and critically needed work for the state. The two state authority examples were unique. One project provides a commentary on the very difficult times in which our nation finds itself. The other is a very timely technological project. The microbiology experts from the Department of Biology at State University of West Georgia are conducting bioterrorism consulting for GEMA. Southern Polytechnic State University has a new distinction. It has been selected by the Georgia Technology Authority to develop the state's digital academy. Scheduled to begin this spring, the academy will serve information technology employees from state agencies, providing them with the very best practices and technical solutions to enhance business operations and to solve common business problems.

The Governor's visit at this meeting is no chance visit, stated Mr. Daniel. The Regents are pleased with the lengthy history of service they have with the Governor's Office, and they are honored by the recognition he extends with his planned visit at this time. The last time the Governor visited the Regents was in November 1999, when he came to salute the Board's courage for volunteering to undergo a state audit. The data generated by that benchmarking effort clearly served as the jumpstart for much of the Board's current strategic planning activities. The Regents' collaboration with the Governor's Office is one that spans the spectrum from helping to drive his Education Reform Initiative to lending leadership to the educational demands of the state's growing Hispanic population. It also includes

helping to host the state's high school honor graduates and their parents each summer at the Governor's Mansion. Mr. Daniel noted that the Regents may not know that Georgia State University's Professor David Bottoms was appointed by the Governor to serve as the state's poet laureate. They may not know that President G. Wayne Clough of GIT chaired the Governor's Natural Gas Deregulation Review Commission. The System's expertise ranges from the highly creative to the highly technical, and it answers the call to serve wherever it is needed.

Turning to the final category, the General Assembly, Mr. Daniel reported that System efforts range from Georgia Library Learning Online ("GALILEO"), which is shared with the state legislative research offices, to administering the legislative intern program. Mr. Daniel's office is the pulse point for the Board's work with the General Assembly. He was proud to say that the attitude of service to this special group of constituents is one that is common throughout the University System. The System and its institutions are called upon often, a testament to the value they provide by serving the legislature. The two partnerships featured in the General Assembly category were the Biennial Institute for Georgia Legislators conducted by the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia and Georgia College & State University's support in planning and hosting the components of the 250th anniversary of representative government in Georgia last year. Again he stressed that the work that the System does ranges from the practical to the cultural.

Next, Mr. Daniel moved to the survey findings. In the richly diverse University System with its almost 35,000 employees, service and collaboration are core values, he said. They happen daily without mandate, fostered by innovation, entrepreneurship, and volunteerism. Collaboration involves absolutely every sector of the System from the two-year colleges to the research universities. However, the larger institutions have significantly greater opportunities to serve due to their expanded resources. The two-year colleges tend to partner more extensively with local governmental agencies. However, location is not as prohibitive as one might believe, he said, as evidenced by Darton College's online training program for middle school math and science teachers.

Mr. Daniel remarked that this concluded his formal presentation, but before asking the Regents for their comments and questions, he wanted to first acknowledge the individuals who worked in the work group. Their names are as follows:

- C Max Allen, Executive Assistant to the President and Director of University Relations, Georgia College & State University
- C Michael Ash, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, Medical College of Georgia
- C Griff Doyle, Associate Vice President for Economic Development and Community Affairs, University of Georgia
- C Caroline Fielding, Director of College Relations, Darton College
- C Andrew Harris, Director of Government Relations and Special Assistant to the President, Georgia Institute of Technology

- C Kathy Ingalsbe, Project Manager, University System Office
- C Helen Mills, Associate Vice President for Public Service & Outreach, University of Georgia
- C John Millsaps, Director of Communications/Marketing, University System Office
- C Fran Mohr, Assistant Director for Corporate Education, Georgia Perimeter College
- C Dave Morgan, Senior Public Service Associate, University of Georgia
- C Arlethia Perry-Johnson, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Media and Publications, University System Office
- C Randy Powers, Director of State Government Relations, University of Georgia
- C Reda Rowell, Director of Development and Alumni Relations, Clayton College and State University
- C Dene Sheheane, Director of State Relations, Georgia State University
- C Susan Shows, Vice President, Georgia Research Alliance
- C David Singleton, Project Manager/PINES Program & Services, Georgia Public Library Service
- C Steve Wrigley, Vice President for Government Relations, University of Georgia

Mr. Daniel also thanked the public relations directors at the institutions who responded to the survey and those at the various state agencies who also provided feedback. He then presented several options for the Board to explore. First, the Regents might want to acknowledge in the strategic plan that collaborative projects extend beyond state government to include regional and local (i.e., county) affiliations and agreements. They might also want to expand communication about the service agreement contracts submitted to the University System Office of Strategic Research and Analysis to encourage expanded contractual activity. They may want to collect or index collaborative capabilities and talents. They may also want to develop marketing activities aimed at potential users of University System services to communicate collaborative capabilities as a University System asset (i.e., a continually updated Web site, brochure dissemination, etc.). In closing, Mr. Daniel said he hoped that the Regents had been inspired by many of the things that they had learned in this presentation. The staff take seriously the Board's commitment to maximize cooperation with other state entities and are pleased that the Regents have made it a key goal of their new strategic plan. If there are areas where the Regents think the staff can further direct their efforts or further leverage the University System's resources, he said, the staff stand ready to accept that charge and welcome the Regents' feedback and recommendations. With that, Mr. Daniel stepped down.

Chair Leebern thanked Mr. Daniel for his presentation and asked whether the Regents had any questions.

Regent White asked whether the System's collaborations with the DTAE and K-12 system were considered among these cooperative efforts.

Mr. Daniel responded that these partnerships were not the focus of his presentation because they are very

well known. The Regents consistently instruct the staff to work with their educational partners in an effort to create a more educated Georgia. This overarching theme is the foundation for all of the System's activities both at the System and institutional levels.

Chair Leebern noted that there were no further questions or comments.

Board Chair Howell then welcomed Governor Barnes to the Board meeting.

Governor Barnes thanked the Regents for inviting him to visit with them at this meeting. He remarked that he would discuss the exchange of ideas in the effort to create the type of University System that will be at the forefront of education well into the future, as well as assist in revolutionizing the way we do business in Georgia. He commended Chair Howell, Vice Chair and former Governor Harris, and all of the Regents for their guidance and input in improving the quality of higher education in Georgia. He also recognized Chancellor Meredith and commended him for quickly learning how the General Assembly operates. The Chancellor is doing a fine job representing the interests of the University System, said Governor Barnes, and with his leadership, Georgia's colleges and universities will continue to be the standard bearers for educational excellence and innovation not only in the South, but also in the nation. The Governor remarked that he came to know the Chancellor through the Southern Regional Education Board, and he assured the Regents that they made the right choice in their recent Chancellor search. He remarked that Chancellor Meredith is a breath of fresh air as well as a workhorse.

The Board of Regents has been a great partner in improving education in our state, said Governor Barnes. In fact, he uses the Board as an example for trying to improve the standards of the K-12 system. The University System has raised standards and seen achievement follow those standards, something that the K-12 system is beginning to do as well. The Board understands that for its reform efforts to be successful, it must have accountability at every level of education. It is evident that accountability works, he said, because it has worked in other states. The Governor remarked that he is proud that the Board has so completely taken the concept of accountability to heart. Not only have the Regents enthusiastically supported his efforts to conduct a management review of state agencies, but they were the first to volunteer to make the University System more efficient. In an effort to make the K-12 schools more accountable and more responsive to the needs of both students and teachers, many people from this Board have stepped forward and served on the Education Reform Commission and have given important insight into what it will take to mold Georgia into a state that offers all of its students, from prekindergarten to college graduation, a great education. This Board continues to provide strong leadership in education reform with its work on the Education Coordinating Council ("ECC"), which is reflected in the Board's strategic p l a n n i n g initiative. Governor Barnes stated that, as members of the ECC, Chancellor Meredith and Chair Howell can attest that the Board should stand by the goals of the ECC, which include common-sense notions of coordination and cooperation, a seamless and integrated public education system, shared and efficient expenditures, and seamless coordination. By championing greater collaboration with state agencies building upon the concept of shared knowledge, the Board is greatly improving its ability to be more responsive to

the people of Georgia.

Governor Barnes explained that the state has many infrastructure needs for many good reasons, including the fact that Georgia has experienced significant growth. However, the legislature is presently struggling to develop an amended budget that includes capital construction for the University System, Department of Technical and Adult Education, Department of Natural Resources, and others. The truth of the matter, he said, is that the state must have more joint use of facilities. Georgia simply cannot afford the cost of each agency's building and operating in its own circle. The buildings do not belong to the University System nor any other agency, he stressed. They belong to the people of Georgia, and to get the highest return on this investment, there must be more cooperation and coordination. This is coming along, Governor Barnes reported, but it is something he will continue to push, and in fact, there is language in the budget requiring joint use of facilities.

There are endless possibilities for Georgia as it moves to further integrate the universities with the workings of state government, said the Governor. With greater cooperation and coordination of efforts, the state will be better able to use the research and best practices developed by its colleges and universities and incorporate them into everyday business strategies that benefit all Georgians. Georgia has already had tremendous success through matching the needs of the business community with the wealth of information and amazing capabilities of the universities. In January 1999, Yamacraw was established to attract the best and the brightest in the computer chip and broadband design fields to Georgia to promote greater economic growth in the technology sector. Today, Georgia is one of the fastest growing high-tech centers in the South and the nation. The goals that were originally set for Yamacraw have been exceeded in terms of the number of employees prepared, the number of jobs created, and the number of business attracted.

Another invaluable part of economic development is the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ("ICAPP®"). When Governor Barnes promotes the State of Georgia to businesses, he stresses that the state has a cooperative effort with the University System to train and produce highly skilled workers and guarantees them. Yamacraw and ICAPP® are examples of public-private partnerships that work both for overall improvement and for the prosperity of the state. Georgia can achieve even greater things by integrating the universities, state government, and the private sector. The research and medical innovations being realized at the Medical College of Georgia and at the colleges of nursing around the state can be used to improve the quality of care in hospitals and other facilities. The legislature has dedicated \$400 million of tobacco settlement funds for the Georgia Cancer Coalition (the "Coalition") and is challenging private companies and philanthropic groups as well

as federal research fund sources to create another \$600 million so that there will be \$1 billion to carry out research, treatment, and prevention programs. The Coalition seeks to improve the health of the citizens of the State of Georgia, which has an abnormally high cancer rate, particularly in certain regions. However, the Coalition is also trying to attract private partners in pharmaceutical and biotech firms that will come here to participate in the clinical trials and to potentially partner with the University System in efforts that could create jobs. The next economic development frontier is in biotechnology. Austin, Texas, beat Georgia in the chip manufacturing area. Georgia should not allow that to happen again in biotechnology, said Governor Barnes. He urged, now is the time to seize the moment, to cooperate, collaborate, and invest

the necessary funds so that Georgia becomes the new biotechnology center in the South and the nation and does not miss the next wave of economic development. Georgia can achieve even greater things than it has in the past by integrating the public universities with the private sector, he reiterated. It is through this synergy that the state can build economic prosperity for its citizens.

Governor Barnes stated that Georgia is and will continue to be at the forefront of the great movement to create a symbiotic relationship between state government, the private sector, and institutions of higher learning. Georgia has a long and proud history of collaboration. Now is the time to capitalize on it so that Georgia can reap the economic benefits for its citizens. The University System has provided dedicated people with expert knowledge in their fields to head up important state agencies, and the Governor said that he has tapped more employees from the Board of Regents than from any other agency. First, he went found Dr. Catherine Ross at GIT, and her strong background in transportation and city planning made her a perfect fit as Executive Director of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority. When he was seeking someone to implement a critical component of our education reform efforts and head the Office of Education Accountability, he tapped President Michael F. Vollmer, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, to lead that important agency. And in his search to find a strong leader to head the Professional Standards Commission, he went to Valdosta State University and asked then Dean of the College of Education Floyd D. Toth to help create a system in which the teaching colleges meet the needs of both the business world and the increasingly important world of technology. He thanked Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Co-Facilitator of the Georgia P-16 Initiative, and everyone else from whom he had “stolen” staff for the service they have given to the State of Georgia.

It is hard to believe that it has been 70 years since the Board of Regents was created, said Governor Barnes. In 1932, a progressive Governor named Richard Russell had the foresight and vision to unify the University System and bring equity to higher education in Georgia. As Governor Barnes talks to other governors around the nation, he finds that they envy the fact that Georgia has a consolidated Board of Regents to govern all of the units of the University System. In closing, he stated that Georgia must continue to build on Governor Russell’s vision of creating a system of academic excellence that will benefit every citizen. With the Board’s help, Georgia will soon make that goal a reality. Governor Barnes then asked whether there were any questions or comments.

Seeing that there were no questions or comments, Chair Howell thanked Governor Barnes on behalf of the Regents for coming to speak to them at this meeting. He pledged the Board’s support for the Governor’s efforts to improve all of education in Georgia and to make higher education more accessible for all of its citizens. At approximately 1:35 p.m., Chair Howell adjourned the Board into its regular Committee meetings.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, March 13, 2002, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent

Hilton H. Howell, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Howell, were Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, March 13 by Regent Hugh A. Carter, Jr.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, March 13 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent Connie Cater had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

Chair Howell then asked the Regents for their Committee reports.

EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, at 10:00 a.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris, and Regents Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith was also in attendance at the meeting. Chair Howell reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which did not require action. That item was as follows:

1. Executive Session

At approximately 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, Chair Howell called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing compensation issues. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Howell and Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris and Regents Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance at times were Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith, Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber, and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services, Corlis Cummings. 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 11:30 a.m., Chair Howell reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, at approximately 11:15 a.m. in room 7005. Committee members in attendance were Chair Connie Cater and Regents George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith was also in attendance at the meeting. The following representatives from the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts were also present: Jerald Goodroe, Audit Manager; Benjamin M. Rider, Audit Supervisor; and Larry M. Whitaker, Deputy Director. At the Committee meeting, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, recognized Mr. Paul M. Johnson, Audit Supervisor for the University System Office, who will be retiring in June 2002. He also introduced Mr. Alan Johns, who will be replacing Mr. Johnson as Audit Supervisor when he retires. At the full Board meeting on Wednesday, Regent Hunt reported that the Committee had reviewed four items, two of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Information Item: Summary of Audits by Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts

The Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts completes an audit or review of each institution in the University System each year. Audits include tests of transactions, evaluations of internal controls, compliance with state and federal laws, and compliance with Board of Regents and State of Georgia policies and procedures. Reviews are much less in depth; tests of transactions, evaluations of controls, and other audit work is limited, although audit findings regarding financial statements are occasionally disclosed.

The Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts, in coordination with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, rates each institution according to the seriousness of audit findings.

Mr. Stark presented this year's ratings and compared them to prior year ratings. He explained that of ten total audits performed by the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts in fiscal year 2001, there were three Code 4 ratings and two Code 5 ratings and that these were the two poorest ratings on the ratings scale. While Mr. Stark stated that institutions rated Code 3 were performing satisfactorily, Chancellor Meredith asserted that it was unacceptable for any institution to rate a Code 3 or worse. The Regents and staff discussed current processes for following up on these audit reports. They concurred that the institutions should be taking quick and decisive action to correct audit findings. The Chancellor stated that he will be communicating directly with presidents on such matters and that they will be held personally accountable for the audits of their institutions.

2. Information Item: Status of Federal Department of Education Financial Aid Review of Fort Valley State University

The Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts identified errors and control deficiencies in administration of financial aid at Fort Valley State University ("FVSU") for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. When these issues are reported to the Federal Department of Education, they are investigated by the Federal Department of Education ("DOE") Case Management Team. University System Office management and FVSU management have been working to resolve the issues identified by the Georgia Department of

Audits and Accounts. The DOE Case Management Team proposed alternative solutions to FVSU and the University System Office. President Kofi Lomotey has elected, with concurrence of the University System Office management, to resolve the audit issues. The proposed solution has many benefits to FVSU. The extraordinary efforts to resolve the issues through the other proposed solutions would have been extremely time-consuming and costly. They also would have deferred the efforts required to correct procedural problems. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, presented a summary of the proposal that was approved by the Committee.

Approved: The Board approved a proposal to settle financial aid issues.

3. Executive Session

At approximately 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, Chair Cater called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Connie Cater and Regents George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Also in attendance were Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith; the Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services, Corlis Cummings; and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark,. 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 12:30 p.m., Chair Cater reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

4. Approval of Updated Internal Audit Charter

Approved: The Board and the Chancellor approved the updated charter of the Internal Audit Department.

Background: The charter of the Internal Audit Department had been updated and required approval of the Chancellor and the Audit Committee Chair. Major changes included a requirement to report findings at least annually rather than four times per year and a new requirement to perform an audit whenever a new president is appointed. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, presented these changes in the charter to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, at approximately 2:05 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair James D. Yancey, Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut, and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Glenn S. White, and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Chair Yancey reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed three items, two of which required action. With motion

properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Policy Manual Addition, Section 802.1301 - Georgia Higher Education Savings Plan

Approved: The Board approved the addition of Section 802.1301 to The Policy Manual permitting institutions of the University System of Georgia to provide for employee deductions for the Georgia Higher Education Savings Plan under the provisions of Internal Revenue Code Section 529.

Background: The Georgia Higher Education Savings Plan is the State of Georgia's Internal Revenue Code Section 529 college savings plan. House Bill 417, signed by Governor Roy Barnes during the 2001 session of the Georgia General Assembly, created the Georgia Higher Education Savings Plan. Under this program, parents, guardians, and others can establish college savings accounts on behalf of children or other beneficiaries.

Contributions to college savings accounts are managed by investment professionals and grow tax-free until withdrawals are made. Withdrawals used for qualified educational expenses are exempt from Georgia income tax. Under the Tax Relief Act of 2001, withdrawals used for qualified expenses are now also exempt from federal income tax. Unqualified withdrawals are subject to Georgia income tax, Federal income tax, and a 10% federal tax surcharge.

Qualified higher education expenses include tuition, fees, required books, supplies, room and board, and equipment necessary for attendance at an eligible educational institution. The Internal Revenue Service Code defines a higher education institution to be an accredited postsecondary educational institution (graduate or undergraduate).

Although federal law does not limit annual contributions to a Section 529 college savings plan, most state plans impose dollar limitations. For the State of Georgia's Section 529 plan, annual contributions may not exceed \$8,000 per beneficiary. The Georgia statute provides a catch-up provision that allows parents with children ages 10 years and older to contribute up to \$16,000 per year for the first three years of the plan's operation. Total contributions per beneficiary may not exceed \$120,000. There will be no employer contribution to the Section 529 college savings plan.

The Tax Reform Act of 2001 expands the portability features of Section 529 college savings plans by allowing benefits to be transferred from one state plan to another. Under this federal statute, benefits for a designated beneficiary may be rolled over from one program to another program for the same beneficiary without triggering a taxable distribution. These types of rollovers are allowed once every 12 months.

On February 1, 2002, Governor Barnes announced that the Georgia Higher Education Savings Plan had chosen TIAA-CREF Tuition Financing, Inc. to manage the program. Tuition Financing, Inc. is a wholly

owned subsidiary of TIAA (Teachers Insurance Annuity Association), which is part of the leading national pension system for colleges and universities. TIAA-CREF Tuition Financing, Inc. is the largest manager of Section 529 college savings plans in the country, currently managing plans in 12 states. The company was selected through a competitive bidding process.

Governor Barnes stated that the Section 529 college savings plan would be available this spring. The Governor also announced that he would back legislation during the 2002 session of the General Assembly to make a number of technical revisions in Georgia’s Section 529 plan. He has stated that he will support the removal of the annual contributions cap and that he will support increasing the lifetime contribution cap up to an account balance of \$235,000.

Under Georgia statute, a board of directors governs the program. The members of the board are the Governor, who serves as the Chair; the Chancellor of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia; the Commissioner of Technical and Adult Education; the Executive Director of the Georgia Student Finance Commission; the State Auditor; the Director of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget; the State Revenue Commissioner; three directors who are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor; and the Director of the Office of Treasury and Fiscal Services.

The proposed addition to The Policy Manual is as follows:

SECTION 802.1301 GEORGIA HIGHER EDUCATION SAVINGS PLAN

Institutions of the University System of Georgia are authorized to provide for employee deductions for the Georgia Higher Education Savings Plan under the provisions of Internal Revenue Code Section 529.

2. Acceptance of Gifts for the Georgia Institute of Technology

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

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Department</u>
Hitachi Telecom (USA), Inc.	\$200,261.87	Fiber Communications Equipment	School of Electrical & Computer Engineering

Background: Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents. The equipment will be used in GIT’s fiber communications lab. GIT has advised that there no material cost associated with the acceptance of this gift.

3. Report on Pooled Investment Funds by Trusco Capital Management

Trusco Capital Management (“Trusco”) was represented at this Committee meeting by James R. Dillon, Jr. CFA, Managing Director ; E. Douglas Hickman, First Vice President; and Marc H. Schneidau, Vice President. They reported to the Committee on the status of the University System of Georgia’s pooled investment funds. There are 26 institutions and/or their affiliated organizations participating in this investment option. They reported that excellent investment performance had been achieved for all pooled funds in the short and long term. Trusco continues to expect market volatility and more normalized investment returns. In closing, Mr. Dillon thanked the Committee for its long-standing relationship with Trusco and stated that Trusco is committed to providing consistent superior investment performance and outstanding client service in the years ahead.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, at approximately 1:40 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Vice Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Board Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith were also in attendance at the meeting. Chair Hunt reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed eight items, seven of which required action. Item 8 was a walk-on Executive Session regarding litigation at the Medical College of Georgia. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Authorization of Modification to Ground Lease for Housing, Georgia College & State University**

Approved: The Board modified the October 2001 authorization of the ground lease for housing to execute a lease agreement between Board of Regents, Lessor, and Georgia College & State University Foundation Property, LLC, Lessee, for the purpose of constructing, renovating, and owning student housing.

Modification: The number of beds and amount of acreage were modified prior to the Board meeting. The final modifications approved by the Board were as follows:

- Add one option period of up to 5 years to be exercised by the Lessee only in the event that there remains at the end of the 32-year term an outstanding obligation on any leasehold security deed.
- Exclude renovation of Bell Hall. Bell Hall is to be included in the ground lease for 12 years, at which time the Board will have an option for Bell Hall to revert to the Board of Regents.
- Decrease the number of beds from 2,000 beds to 1,583 beds.
- Decrease the construction, renovation, and demolition period from six years to four years.

- Decrease the acreage from 40 to 31.1 acres.

After extensive discussion regarding the length of the leases in Items 1 through 3 of the Committee agenda, Chair Hunt suggested that the staff and Committee together create some guidelines for the institutions in developing these types of privatized projects.

2. Authorization of Modification to Ground Lease for Housing, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board modified the October 2001 authorization of the ground lease for housing to execute a lease agreement between Board of Regents, Lessor, and the University of Georgia Real Estate Foundation East Campus Housing, LLC, Lessee, for the purpose of constructing, renovating, and owning student housing, as follows:

- Add one option period of up to 5 years to be exercised by the Lessee only in the event that there remains at the end of the 33-year term an outstanding obligation on any leasehold security deed.
- Decrease the parcel size from 20.244 acres to 18.796 acres.

3. Authorization of Modification to Ground Lease for Parking Deck, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board modified the October 2001 authorization of the ground lease for parking deck to execute a lease agreement between Board of Regents, Lessor, and the University of Georgia Real Estate Foundation East Campus Housing, LLC (“LLC”), Lessee, for the purpose of constructing and owning a student parking deck, as follows:

- Add one option period of up to 5 years to be exercised by the Lessee only in the event that there remains at the end of the 33-year term an outstanding obligation on any leasehold security deed.
- Increase the parcel size from 2.693 acres to 4.141 acres.
- Decrease the parking deck size to 850 cars and retain a 400-car surface parking lot for a net increase of 50 cars and a total capacity of 1,250 cars.
- The Board will lease this parking by separate agreement on a year-to-year basis from the LLC for 30 years. The total annual rent will not exceed \$800,000 for the first year, with rent increasing up to 3% per year for each option period. Approval of this rental agreement will be requested of the Board at such time as construction of the parking deck is complete.

4. Authorization of Project, “Building A, University Village Renovation,” University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-10-0201, “Building A, University Village Renovation,” University of Georgia (“UGA”), with a total project budget of \$1,640,430.

Understandings: In April 2001, the Board approved in concept “University Village Renovation” as a ten-year plan for renovating ten buildings. The renovation of one-and two-bedroom units will update all finishes and systems to meet a broad student market with a wide range of unit offerings.

Building A will be the second building to be renovated as part of the University Village Renovation. It will be renovated at a construction cost of \$1,283,000 and a total budget of \$1,640,430.

The University Village Renovation is consistent with the University of Georgia Physical Master Plan.

Design and construction funding for the University Village Renovation will utilize student affairs auxiliary funds.

The University System Office staff and UGA will proceed with the selection of appropriate professional consultants for Building A, University Village Renovation.

5. Authorization of Project, “Candler Hall Renovation,” University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-10-0202, “Candler Hall Renovation,” University of Georgia (“UGA”), with a total project budget of \$3,000,000 to be funded by UGA’s operational budget and anticipated fiscal year 2003 major repair and renovation (“MRR”) funds.

Understandings: UGA critically needs to renovate this circa 1901 building for the School of Public and International Affairs.

The 26,000-square-foot building is four stories tall and requires complete interior renovation and upgrade of all systems. The construction cost is estimated to be \$2,165,000.

The two-pipe heating system and window-mounted air-conditioning units will be replaced with a connection to the campus chilled water loop. Electrical and plumbing systems will also be replaced. Accessibility will be improved by the addition of an elevator and reconfiguration of the restrooms.

This project is consistent with the University of Georgia Physical Master Plan, which envisions sequential renovation of the historically sensitive North Campus buildings.

Authorization is requested to permit design of the project to expedite the construction schedule should fiscal year 2003 MRR funding be made available for this project. Approval of this project is not a commitment to provide MRR funding.

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

6. Reconsideration of Project “Athletic Facility and Softball Stadium,” Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board authorized project “Athletic Facility and Softball Stadium,” Kennesaw State University (“KSU”), with a total project budget of \$3,000,000 to be funded by athletics funds and private donations.

Understandings: At its August 11, 1999, meeting, the Board approved the “Athletic Facility and Softball Stadium” project at KSU with the provision that “if full funding is not provided, the project scope will be scaled back and completed within the funds available and brought back to the Board for reconsideration.”

The project has been scaled back from a \$4,000,000 to a \$3,000,000 budget. The estimated construction cost for the project has been revised from \$2,900,000 to \$2,500,000.

The original scope of 24,000 square feet included a two-story field house and a 400-seat softball stadium. The revised scope will consist of a 20,500-square-foot two-story field house and a 350-seat softball stadium. The field house will include athletics staff offices, locker rooms, training rooms, a multipurpose room, and storage and support spaces. The softball stadium will include a concessions area spectator restrooms, a press box, and dugouts.

Funding for the project will be \$1,000,000 from athletic funds and \$2,000,000 in gifts. KSU has received \$1,400,000 in gifts and has pledges for the remaining \$600,000.

KSU has prepared an architectural program and environmental site assessment. If the project is approved, the University System Office and KSU will proceed with the design of this project using an architectural consultant in accordance with the Board of Regents Building Project Procedure Manual.

7. Information Item: Food Processing Technology Building, Georgia Institute of Technology

In March 1999, the Board authorized Project No. BR-30-9902, “Food Processing Technology Building,” with a total project budget of \$9,700,000 with funding from the State Traditional Industries Program, Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), and private/corporate funds.

The Board authorized the project with the understanding that additional private/corporate funding would be secured and that if this funding was not secured, GIT would return to the Board in order to provide an update of the project with a revised project scope and budget. GIT has not secured the anticipated full funding and is submitting this information item as a project update.

The project has now been revised to include two phases to accommodate the level of secured funding. Phase I will consist of the construction of a multistory facility with approximately 36,000 gross square feet. When additional funding becomes available for Phase II, Board authorization will be requested to proceed with the addition of approximately 14,000 gross square feet of additional research lab program space.

The total project budget has been reduced from \$9,700,000 to \$7,570,578. The construction cost has been reduced from \$7,650,000 to \$6,000,000.

This project is planned for a portion of the North Avenue Research Area, which was accepted by the Board as a gift of property for the use and benefit of GIT in November 2000. Street right-of-way for Wesco Way is within the planned project site. Acquisition of this right-of-way will be presented to the Board for consideration when negotiations with the City of Atlanta are finalized.

8. Executive Session

Chair Hunt explained that there was a walk-on item concerning litigation at the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) to add to the Committee’s agenda. The addition of this item to the agenda required unanimous consent of the Committee members, and all members present voted to add the item to the agenda.

At approximately 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, Chair Hunt called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing litigation at MCG. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Vice Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance were Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith; Board Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr.; the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (Contracts), Robyn Crittendon; the Interim Vice Chancellor for Facilities, G e o r g e W i n g b l a d e ; t h e A s s i s t a n t V i c e Chancellor for Facilities (Design and Construction), Linda Daniels; the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Facilities (Real Properties), Peter J. Hickey; and Assistant Attorney General George S. Zier. 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 2:50 p.m., Chair Hunt reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. He then moved that the Board approve the settlement of litigation at the Medical College of Georgia. Motion properly made and variously seconded, the Committee unanimously approved the motion.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, at approximately 1:50 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Allene H. Magill, Vice Chair Martin W. NeSmith, and Regents William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris,

and Elridge W. McMillan. Chair Magill reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed nine items, seven of which required action. Additionally, 130 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. **Revision of Policy 303.05, Collaboration Between the University System of Georgia and the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE)**

Approved: The Board approved revisions to Policy 303.05, Collaboration Between the University System of Georgia and the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE), concerning the establishment of the mini-core, effective March 13, 2002.

Abstract: The “Mini-Core” Project parameters were ratified by the Board at its January 2002 meeting. In response to the ratification of the principles concerning collaboration and access between the Department of Technical and Adult Education and the University System of Georgia when articulating math and English course transfer, revisions of existing Board policy have been developed to reflect the mini-core agreement. The proposed policy changes are as follows (bold texts indicate additions and strike-through texts indicate deletions):

303.05 COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA AND THE DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL AND ADULT EDUCATION (DTAE)

The State of Georgia is best served by strong systems of technical and university education, each with a distinctive and nonduplicative mission and both supporting academically sound movement of students between the systems. Such a structure extends the separate systems by building bridges so that students can use both systems.

The relationship between the two systems is based on three principles:

1. The needs of the students will come first.

Movement between the two systems is encouraged to meet the changing needs and goals of students who have the preparation to follow such a move, whether registering for a single class or transferring into another program ~~to a successful outcome.~~

2. Each system retains a distinctive mission of its own.

The mission of the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE) is to contribute to the economic and workforce development of Georgia by providing quality adult literacy education, continuing education, customized business and industry training, and technical and occupational education at the certificate, diploma, and associate degree levels.

The mission of the University System of Georgia is to contribute to the cultural, economic, and social advancement of Georgia by providing first-rate collegiate general education and academic programs leading to pre-baccalaureate, baccalaureate, master's, professional, and doctoral degrees; by contributing to leading-edge basic and applied research, scholarship, and arts; and by bringing these resources to bear on committed public service.

In keeping with their different missions, the programs offered through the DTAE are designed to prepare students for specific and immediately productive occupations and jobs, whereas University System programs are designed to maximize long-term civic leadership and career advancement for middle managers, executives, and practitioners of the traditional professions (e.g., medicine, law, teaching, and engineering).

3. Within broad parameters, cooperative agreements between the two systems will be negotiated with a view to particular local situations.

Both pre-baccalaureate and occupational educational needs are currently being well served in various ways in certain parts of the state: by a single institution offering jointly funded programs in some communities, by two institutions (one from each system) in other communities, and by one institution that imports particular courses from the other system in yet other communities. Depending on the pragmatic strengths of the institutions involved, any of these patterns of collaboration can be effective and should be encouraged.

It is recognized that both systems should continue to offer continuing education programs; however, the intent of this agreement is that each system should focus its continuing education activities on areas appropriate to its mission, as described in this section.

All policies governing the relationships between the two systems will derive from the principles of serving student needs, maintaining mission distinctiveness, and expanding collaborations. They will therefore follow these general policy directives:

1. The two systems will work cooperatively to help high school students, as well as nontraditional students, make the most appropriate postsecondary choices to meet their needs, given their preparation and goals. Generally, a student who expects to pursue occupational programs to bring training to the workforce at the earliest possible time should begin at a technical college or at a System college division designated by the two systems for the purpose of offering occupational programs.

2. **In general**, the University System will provide theoretical general education courses, which are delineated by the Regents core curriculum, and the technical colleges will provide applied general education courses as required by applicable accreditation standards for Associate of Applied Technology (AAT) degree programs in occupational areas.

Theoretical and liberal arts general education courses are defined as those courses which are designed to have general application across many academic disciplines and serve as a broad preparation for baccalaureate degrees.

Applied general education courses are defined as those courses which are specifically designed to provide the necessary general education portion of applied technology degrees. Diploma and certificate courses typically have more emphasis on applications of principles than do their collegiate, theoretical counterparts and are offered at the level of specificity appropriate to immediate job entry.

Technical colleges are authorized to offer the AAT degree, and they will teach only applied general education courses essential to the AAT programs they offer.

They shall not expand their education offerings merely to add options for students; rather, students should be encouraged to seek options provided through courses provided by University System institutions.

3. Where the DTAE and the University System both have institutions in the same community, the DTAE institution will provide job-entry occupational instruction (including certificates, diplomas, and associate degrees designed primarily for immediate job entry rather than preparation for a baccalaureate degree), unless the two institutions mutually agree that a particular occupational program is best offered at the University System institution because of an established programmatic strength or because the program provides a foundation for baccalaureate study, or that it should be offered at both institutions because of particularly pressing state needs (e.g. in allied health fields).

Where both systems share institutions in the same community and the DTAE offers an Associate of Applied Technology degree but it is not involved in a cooperative Associate of Applied Sciences degree, the DTAE institution will cross-list the core curriculum courses offered by the University System institution. The University System will be the only system to offer liberal arts general education courses. **The essential skills courses in English and mathematics may be taught by both the University System and DTAE.**

Institutions generally serving the same population should jointly develop collaborative efforts to meet the education and training needs of the area utilizing the strengths of each institution. In the event institutions cannot resolve issues locally, **The Georgia Postsecondary Education Coordinating Council (GPECC)** will recommend to the Chancellor and Commissioner a negotiated outcome based on its procedures.

Technical colleges offering AAT degrees will develop cross-lists of courses offered at nearby University System institutions that can substitute for required applied general education courses and

will make this information available to students. All institutions will be encouraged to publish comparable lists.

4. Where both systems have institutions in the same community, they will encourage cooperative Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree programs that prepare both for immediate occupational employment and for baccalaureate study. DTAE students in such programs will not be required to complete more general education than the minimum standards set by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for credits to be taught by the degree-granting institution, unless professional accreditation standards for the particular program require additional related academic studies.

As needed to serve students, cooperative AAS programs shall be developed jointly by DTAE and University System of Georgia institutions. The number of hours of general education required for AAS cooperative degrees shall range from 21 to 24 semester credit hours but shall normally be no less than 21 semester credit hours or 25% of the total degree requirements, whichever is greater (not including institutional health and physical education and military science requirements). However, programs having specialized accreditation and/or licensure criteria may require a higher number of general education hours. All current and future programs will be reviewed for compliance with this guideline.

Institutions should work cooperatively to meet the needs of technical college diploma graduate students who move from other areas of the state and who wish to obtain a cooperative AAS degree. For example, University System colleges might ask local technical colleges to validate student completion of a program of study that is included in the agreement between the local University System and technical colleges.

5. Apart from cooperative programs **and essential skills courses in English and mathematics**, there will not be an automatic assumption that general education courses will transfer from DTAE institutions to University System institutions. Each system will encourage its institutions to avoid unnecessary duplication by evaluating additional courses and programs in the other system for cross-listing or transfer on a case-by-case basis (i.e., course by course, depending on the student's program).

Institutions of the University System of Georgia will accept the following core courses for transfer from DTAE institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools:

Introduction to Mathematical Modeling – MATH 1101 (USG)/MAT 190 (DTAE)
College Algebra — MATH 1111 (USG)/MAT 191 (DTAE)
Pre-calculus — MATH 1113 (USG)/MAT 194 (DTAE)
Composition I — ENGL 1101 (USG)/ENG 191 (DTAE)

Composition II — ENGL 1102 (USG)/ENG 193 (DTAE)

This agreement is effective for students who enroll in English and mathematics courses beginning January 2002 and who have met the requirements, including the minimum test score requirements agreed to by DTAE and the University System, for exemption or exit from developmental studies/learning support.

6. Both systems will support the development by individual institutions, on a pilot basis, of 2+2 programs between associate degree programs in occupational areas and closely related baccalaureate degree programs. The University System institution in any such program will determine which associate-level occupational courses will be accepted towards major or elective requirements for the baccalaureate.

Because there are many different student and program circumstances, not all 2+2 programs will be completed in as few as four years.

7. Where a community has significant, documented need for new DTAE or University System services, the two systems will work cooperatively to meet those needs.

Nearby institutions should inform one another of programmatic initiatives prior to submitting them for governing board approval.

8. In communities currently being served for occupational programs by a jointly funded vocational division at a University System institution (i.e., at Bainbridge College, Coastal Georgia Community College, Clayton College & State University, and Dalton State College), the two systems will continue jointly to support and enhance those programs. Furthermore, the DTAE will not establish new institutions or branches in the primary service area of these four colleges, since the occupational program needs are being met collaboratively.

In the service area of the four University System institutions with vocational divisions, those institutions will provide all DTAE-related services.

9. Any existing technical college that is not currently, but wishes to be, within a state system should first apply to the DTAE system.

10. Wherever feasible and cost-effective, the DTAE and the Board of Regents encourage institutions to share facilities.

11. The DTAE and the University System will embark on a joint feasibility study toward developing information matrices on all course transfer agreements, to be continuously updated and made computer-accessible to students.

12. The DTAE and the University System will establish a small joint council consisting of senior administrators from both systems and from their institutions. This council will develop the specific details of implementation, monitor the terms of this agreement, and pro-actively seek areas of collaboration.

The Department of Technical and Adult Education and the University System of Georgia will jointly undertake the collection of data on student experience and success in moving between the two systems (BR Minutes, December 1994, p. 26).

2. Revision of Policy 402, Undergraduate Admissions

Approved: The Board approved revisions to the policy on undergraduate admissions to include the implementation of the agreement between the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”) and the University System of Georgia concerning the mini-core articulation.

Abstract: To implement the mini-core articulation agreement between the University System and DTAE approved by the Board in January 2002, it is proposed that Section 402 of The Policy Manual, Undergraduate Admissions, be revised to allow institutions to accept learning support placement and exit test scores from Commission on Colleges-accredited DTAE colleges. The University System of Georgia has two tests approved for placement: the Collegiate Placement Examination (“CPE”) and COMPASS. DTAE institutions use COMPASS and another test called ASSET. Under the agreement approved by the Board, the University System will accept COMPASS and ASSET scores for students who transfer from Commission on Colleges-accredited DTAE institutions.

After each of the references in Section 402 of The Policy Manual to requirements for students to take “CPE or COMPASS administered by a University System institution,” the following statement will be added:

(For students transferring from a Commission on Colleges (COC)-accredited DTAE college, comparable scores from the DTAE college may be used according to guidelines issued by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs.)

The guidelines will indicate that students must have attended the DTAE college and have scores recorded on the transcript. The guidelines will also provide comparable score tables.

The change will become effective for students entering University System of Georgia institutions in summer 2002.

3. Establishment of the Associate of Applied Science in Information Technology, East Georgia College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Jeremiah J. Ashcroft that East Georgia College (“EGC”) be authorized to establish the Associate of Applied Science in Information Technology, effective March 13, 2002.

Abstract: The Associate of Applied Science in Information Technology degree attempts to meet regional needs for careers in positions to support computing in a networked environment. To complement the stand-alone associate’s degree, EGC has also developed a Certificate in Information Technology. The proposed program will allow students to enter a school-to-work associate’s degree program.

Need: The EGC campus recently became the site of the Georgia Rural Economic Development Center, a public-private partnership funded by the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP®”) and private donations. The Swainsboro/Emanuel County Joint Development Authorities have determined that the direction of development will be the construction of a technology park. In order to provide a qualified workforce for companies locating in the park, EGC will provide an associate degree and certificate programs in information technology. In addition, fast-track training will be provided by Swainsboro Technical College and retraining opportunities, especially for administrators and managers, will be made available through North Georgia College & State University.

Objectives: The program will provide opportunities that prepare students to succeed in the modern workplace. Upon completion of the program, students will be qualified to enter entry-level positions in technical support, database design, and network administration.

Curriculum: The program consists of 42 hours of general education and 24 hours of information technology course work. The general education courses can be taken prior to entry or concurrently with the information technology courses. The program will be characterized not only by its flexibility in applying the curriculum, but also by its ability to adjust and expand to meet the changing needs in the information technology workplace.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 20, 35, and 50 for the first three years of the program.

Funding: No new state allocation has been requested.

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

4. Establishment of the Major in Biology Under the Existing Bachelor of Science, Southern Polytechnic State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Lisa A. Rossbacher that Southern Polytechnic

State University (“SPSU”) be authorized to establish the major in Biology under the existing Bachelor of Science, effective March 13, 2002.

Abstract: SPSU’s proposed program will provide students a curriculum of study in Biology with Bioinformatics and Biochemistry/Molecular Biology tracts. SPSU’s Biology major is intended to meet the high-priority needs for biologists and biotechnologists within Metropolitan Atlanta, to assist Cobb County in developing a high-tech workforce to attract new industries and maintain its current industrial base, and to expand the base of educational programs for a more competitive workforce in Georgia.

Need: SPSU’s Biology major was developed in response to a societal need for bioscientists, environmentalists, and biotechnologists, as documented in the Governor’s Development Council report, *Building a New Economic Engine for the 21st Century: Strength from Diversity*; the Georgia Research Alliance’s *Annual Report for GRA Investment Products Industry*; the Georgia Biomedical Partnership’s *Annual Report and Directory*, and the Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce’s report *From Discovery to Profit: The Case for Creating a Biotechnology Development Marketing Program for Metro Atlanta*.

Objectives: Upon completion of the program, graduates will be qualified to pursue post-baccalaureate educational opportunities as well as employment in the biosciences and biotechnology.

Curriculum: The program consists of 120 semester credit hours. Students pursuing the major are strongly encouraged to avail themselves of SPSU’s cooperative education relationships with industry as an integral part of their educational experience.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 45, 100, and 145 for the first three years of the program.

Funding: No new state allocation has been requested. The institution will reallocate funds for the implementation of the program based on existing budget allocations.

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

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

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

6. Redesignation of the Existing Master of Science in Administration With a Major in Public Affairs to the Master of Arts in Public Affairs, Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Rosemary DePaolo that Georgia College & State University be authorized to redesignate the existing Master of Science in Administration with a major in Public Affairs to the Master of Arts in Public Affairs, effective March 13, 2002.

Abstract: The Public Affairs major is designed for students who are seeking an understanding of the broad social, philosophical, political, and scientific contexts of public life and public policy issues. It is a liberal arts-based graduate program, centered on the theme of public leadership and focused on such concepts as statesmanship and public policy making. The designation of Master of Arts is the more appropriate title for a degree with such a focus.

7. Termination of the Major in Logistics Systems Under the Existing Bachelor of Science, Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Rosemary DePaolo that Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) be authorized to terminate the major in Logistics Systems under the existing Bachelor of Science, effective, March 13, 2002.

Abstract: Georgia College & State University deactivated the Bachelor of Science with a major in Logistics Systems in March 1999. Following an inactive period of up to two years, GCSU recommended approval to terminate the major. As part of the memorandum of understanding with Robins Air Force Base, all affected parties were informed of the plan to review the program during this time period. The education services officer at Robins Air Force Base has been involved in discussions concerning the deactivation and planned termination of the program. The termination of this program has the support of all parties involved and does not pose any adverse consequences for students or faculty members.

8. Information Item: Progress Report on the Establishment of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing R.N. to B.S.N. Completion Program, Macon State College

The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs, Frank A. Butler, met with representatives from Georgia College & State University and Macon State College to discuss and resolve the issues that exist regarding the proposed Macon State College Bachelor of Science in Nursing R.N. to B.S.N. Completion program. Drs. Papp and Butler apprised the Committee of the status of those discussions and meetings.

9. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

periods designated, with the institutions to receive payment as indicated:

Georgia State University			
Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Develop logic models	Georgia Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism	5/16/01 - 5/31/02	\$38,359
Evaluate economic development	“ ” “	5/16/01 - 12/31/02	\$39,744
Prepare information needs and availability issues	“ ” “	5/16/01 - 3/31/02	\$45,406
Perform county segment study	“ ” “	5/16/01 - 2/28,02	\$62,952
Conduct student industry study	“ ” “	5/16/01 - 6/30/02	\$13,500
Conduct pre-kindergarten longitudinal study	Georgia Office of School Readiness	6/1/01 - 6/15/02	\$385,111
Evaluate Georgia Fatherhood program	Georgia Department of Human Resources	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$337,025
Study irrigation auction mechanisms	Georgia Department of Natural Resources	6/29/01 - 6/30/02	\$156,903
Study revenue collections processes	Georgia Office of Planning and Budget	7/1/01 - 9/30/01	\$31,003
Analyze community-based projects	Georgia Department of Human Resources	7/1/01 - 12/31/01	\$73,145
Conduct home care satisfaction survey	“ ” “	6/1/01 - 8/15/01	\$71,364
Study consumer education needs	Georgia Office of the Governor	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$144,620
Study foster care placement requirements in Georgia and South Carolina	Georgia Department of Human Resources	6/15/01 - 2/28/02	\$25,000

Evaluate support for Healthy Grandparents program	Georgia Department of Human Resources	10/1/01 - 9/15/02	\$150,000
Conduct customer satisfaction survey	Georgia Department of Labor	10/1/01 - 9/30/02	\$193,403
Provide support to Project Healthy Grandparents	Children's Trust Fund Commission	10/1/01 - 9/30/02	\$36,503
Study residential substance abuse treatment services	Georgia Department of Human Resources	9/16/01 - 9/30/02	\$515,000
Study asthma disease management	“ ” “	9/30/01 - 6/30/02	\$73,329
Study networks for rural health	Georgia Department of Community Health	10/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$750,000
Study Safe Children Action Group	Georgia Department of Human Resources	8/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$54,500
Study school nurse educational program	“ ” “	9/30/01 - 9/30/02	\$200,000
Provide consultative services in electronic court filing	Georgia Courts Automation Commission	7/1/01 - 12/31/01	\$70,000
Provide human resource development	Griffin Technical College	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$132,712
Monitor Georgia Geographic Alliance	Georgia Board of Education	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$47,500
Conduct pre-kindergarten program	Georgia Office of School Readiness	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$69,497
Conduct Skilled Credentialed Early Interventionist project	Georgia Department of Human Resources	10/1/01 - 9/30/02	\$534,000
Provide nutrition education for new Americans	“ ” “	10/1/01 - 12/31/01	\$90,000
Study concept of cultural competence	“ ” “	9/30/01 - 9/15/02	\$50,000

Conduct reading recovery support program	Georgia Department of Education	12/21/01 - 12/31/02	\$237,500
Study Driving Under the Influence Prevention program	Georgia Department of Human Resources	10/9/01 - 6/30/02	\$75,000
Conduct HIV/AIDS services and training	“ ” “	9/29/01 - 9/15/02	\$206,820
University of Georgia			
Advance use of Doppler radar system in peanut growing	Georgia Commodity Commission for Peanuts	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$7,500
Promote rural development strategy in Georgia	Georgia Department of Community Affairs	6/15/00 - 10/31/02	\$130,000
Promote rural development in Georgia	“ ” “	11/15/01 - 10/20/02	\$81,000
Conduct Children of Choice FY 2002	Georgia Department of Human Resources	11/15/01 - 9/30/02	\$85,360
Conduct ACET quality improvement (Advancing Careers through Education and Training)	“ ” “	10/1/01 - 9/30/02	\$200,000
Maintain ACET trainer registry	“ ” “	9/30/01 - 9/29/02	\$146,080
Maintain Georgia archaeological site file	Georgia Department of Natural Resources	7/01/01 - 6/30/02	\$30,000
Design green space at Etowah River watershed	Georgia Forestry Commission	9/1/01 - 8/31/02	\$17,248
Use precision farming techniques to protect ecosystem	Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission	1/4/99 - 4/30/03	\$70,500

TOTAL AMOUNT -MARCH	\$ 5,677,584
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2002 TO DATE	\$ 20,149,600
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2001 (TO MARCH)	\$ 20,860,912
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2001	\$ 23,180,836

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, at approximately 2:10 p.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor’s Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris, Allene H. Magill, and Martin W. NeSmith. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith and Assistant Attorney General Alfred Evans were also in attendance at the meeting. Chair Carter reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items, both of which required action. Item 1 included six applications for review; two of these were denied as moot, two were continued, and two were referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

- a. In the matter of Keron Reginald Koon at Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning disciplinary actions, the application for review was denied as moot.
- b. In the matter of Catherine L. Touchton, at Valdosta State University, concerning non-renewal of contract, the application for review was denied as moot.
- c. In the matter of Brenda F. Hogan, at Fort Valley State University, concerning termination of employment, the application for review was referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings.
- d. In the matter of Gerri M. McCord, at Fort Valley State University, concerning termination of employment, the application for review was referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings.
- e. In the matter of Garrett Hagin, at Middle Georgia College, concerning the suspension of the football program, the application for review was continued.
- f. In the matter of John Tamburo, at Middle Georgia College, concerning the suspension of the football program, the application for review was continued.

2. Amendments to The Policy Manual, Section 909.02

Approved: Section 909.02 of The Policy Manual was amended to provide for the Chancellor's home, as follows (underlined texts indicate additions):

909.02 CHANCELLOR'S HOME AND PRESIDENTS' HOMES

The policy of the Board regarding presidents' homes and the Chancellor's home shall be as follows:

- a. The Chancellor shall be required to live, without charge, in the Chancellory. Presidents of research universities will be required to live, without charge, in university housing, unless an exception is granted by the Chancellor. Existing presidential housing at other institutions will be phased out as rapidly as possible, and no additional presidents' houses shall be purchased or constructed for those institutions. Presidents who are currently furnished housing shall continue to occupy that housing during their tenure as president (BR Minutes, 1984-85, p. 114; BR Minutes, 1985-86, p. 53-54).
- b. The institutions shall be responsible for the repair and upkeep of the buildings and grounds of the homes furnished for presidents.
- c. The institutions shall be responsible for furnishing utilities, including local telephone service.
- d. No food, food service, or other services shall be provided for the presidents and their families (BR Minutes, 1967-68, pp. 416, 645).
- e. Any proposed project for improvement of a president's home, other than routine and necessary maintenance, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. Any subsequent changes in the scope of the project or budget shall be similarly submitted for review and approval (BR Minutes, 1990-91, p.385).

All the requirements stated above apply to the home furnished for the Chancellor. However, the Board of Regents will review and approve any improvements to the Chancellory and will be responsible for furnishing utilities, etc., and for the repair and upkeep of the buildings and grounds of the home (BR Minutes, March 2002).

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Because there are a number of goals to cover in the Strategic Planning Committee today, let me take just a few moments to provide a brief update.

First, there is good progress underway at all of our institutions. We are blessed to have excellent presidents. I have been impressed by their commitment, by their passion for their institutions, and by their dedication to these jobs that are literally 24-7. The more time I spend with them, collectively and individually, the more I am impressed with this fine group of leaders.

In a system as large as ours, there always will be some challenges at the institutional level, but we are all committed to making changes, where necessary, to move forward. My philosophy is that with the single and critical exception of the teaching and learning experience that occurs in the classroom, our institutions should be viewed essentially as corporations. They need to be run in a business-like manner. I know you believe that, and we will continue to move in that direction.

I don't want to dwell just on the challenges our institutions face. In fact, a great deal of what is happening on our campuses represents good news, and in future reports, I'll spend more time updating you on the achievements of our students, faculty, and staff. I continue to be gratified and proud of the number of awards and honors that are being garnered by our various institutions, and this Board justifiably should feel proud.

We are blessed to have several teams playing in the National College Athletic Association ("NCAA") or the National Invitation Tournament ("NIT"). I know we will follow them. I was pleased to note that I have four different teams to cheer for in the NCAA. First on the list, of course, is UGA. Also Alabama and Mississippi are there, as well as Western Kentucky University. Watch out for the Hilltoppers! Regardless of the outcome of the tournament, President Michael F. Adams should be congratulated. He was selected recently by a coaches' association as its president of the year. I told him, as a result, we expect some major wins in this tournament.

Let me turn to the legislative session. I am thankful for the positive working relationship we have with this legislature and the Governor. They are very open to us. They are willing to meet with us at any time and are open to input into their decision making. I am glad we do not have the Wisconsin situation. Some of you may have read that the Wisconsin legislature cut the University of Wisconsin System by \$71 million. The Wisconsin System immediately responded by suspending admissions to all undergraduate programs. The legislature responded by cutting another \$13 million to show their displeasure with that decision. We don't have that kind of relationship, and we're going to make sure that we don't.

Revenue collections are still down and have been down seven or eight straight months in Georgia. It is my hope we will see a turnaround soon, but even at that point, there is going to be a delay in an increase in revenue. It will take some time for people to return to work,

for production and inventories to build, for tax collections to increase and, finally, for state revenues to return to past levels.

The bottom line for the University System is that in our current and upcoming fiscal years, we are seeing some significant cuts. In fiscal year 2002, we are taking a 2.5% budget cut. All of that will be firmly decided next Monday or Tuesday, when we think the conference committees will reach agreement. In addition, we've been asked to take a 5% cut for fiscal year 2003. On top of that, we received word a week or so ago that we will have another 0.82% cut on our "A" budget and a 0.85% cut on our "B" budget. So, it is going to be a challenge. To make these cuts even more challenging, our major repair and renovation ("MRR") budget has lost 22% in fiscal year 2002 and almost half in fiscal year 2003. The legislature is very concerned about cuts in MRR funding. They understand the importance of not falling behind in this arena. But the state is short on money, and we understand that. We are going to work in partnership and in cooperation with the state to try to address this shortfall.

However, there is some positive news in this budget, and we must not overlook it. The Governor once again has put semester conversion money in the budget – almost \$30 million for 2002 and \$27 million for 2003. We are deeply appreciative of his recognition of the absolutely critical need at our institutions for these dollars and also to the legislature for its support.

I have never been in a state where a pay raise was proposed alongside budget cuts. But this state, this Governor, and this legislature have a real commitment, and rightly so, to make sure that we stay competitive in attracting good faculty and staff to our institutions. As a result, initially, a 3.5% raise was proposed for this next year. It had to be cut to 3.25%, but as I pointed out to some institutional administrators, this is great news. I was baffled to see a letter to the editor blasting everyone because the proposed raise had been cut. There shouldn't be any raise, given the dollars available. Yet, this state has made that kind of commitment. As I've said before several legislative committees, I've been on the other side of pay raises in states where the commitment was not made and, as a consequence, Georgia has continued to pirate away good faculty and good staff. Georgia has maintained that commitment, and it has paid off. Over the years, you have been able to attract some of the best and brightest people because of that commitment. I am glad to see this state is still committed to providing competitive salaries.

The last piece on the legislative side is bond projects. The Governor has made a commitment to help stimulate the economy during these difficult times through continued construction, which puts people to work. That is going to pay off. We have a number of projects in the fiscal year 2002 amended budget approved by the Board as part of your capital projects priorities list. This will be very positive for us.

So, there is good news and bad news on the legislative front. I'll sum up my report on the budget and legislative process by telling you that I have been tremendously impressed by the commitment of the leadership in the legislature and the Governor to support higher education. The recognition by this state's elected leadership that higher education is important has a long history and, I believe, a long future. As long as we continue to recognize and acknowledge this support, as long as we continue to work together to move this state forward, particularly in public higher education, you should feel very good about this System's prospects.

I'm very pleased to bring you up to date on a couple of presidential searches. Regent Carter is chairing the Special Regents' Committee for the Middle Georgia College ("MGC") Presidential Search. The Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Shelley C. Nickel, will be forwarding some recommendations to the Committee around the first of next month. I'm delighted to announce that there is a recommendation on the Gordon College presidency that will come before the Board for approval later today. It has been an interesting and very positive search. Dr. Lawrence V. Weill, Dean of Academic Affairs at Hopkinsville Community College in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, has agreed to come to Gordon College upon approval by this Board of Regents. Dr. Weill and his wife, Jennie, have been at Hopkinsville since about 1988. He has a doctorate in Studies in Higher Education from the University of Kentucky, a Master of Arts in Humanities from the University of Evansville, and a Bachelor of Science in Mathematics from Brescia College. The faculty and staff at Gordon College were very impressed with Dr. Weill. He certainly understands the academic side of this institution. It is clear to everyone that Sherman Day has done a tremendous job as Interim President of Gordon College. The community and the college are in love with Dr. Day, and he is in love with retirement. He told me that his affection for the college is very deep, but he is eager to get on with retirement. Dr. Weill will provide a great deal of leadership in the academic arena. He comes with a strong background in working with the community, and we know that he will be a wonderful addition to Gordon College. I now know so much about the college I'm curious to see the campus. If you approve his appointment today, then I'll finally have the chance to visit the campus, where we will announce Dr. Weill's appointment tomorrow and introduce him to Gordon College.

Mr. Chairman, that is my report. Thank you.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

After the Chancellor's report to the Board, Chair Howell convened the second meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. He then turned the Chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern, the Chair of the Committee.

Chair Leebern explained that the Strategic Planning Committee had three agenda items at this meeting: the first, third, and ninth strategic goals. He then introduced the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, to begin the presentations.

Dr. Papp explained that he was excited about the presentations at this meeting not only because there would be excellent presenters, but also because the subject matter in the first and third goals in particular deal with the very reasons the University System of Georgia exists: learning outcomes and quality curriculum. The presentations on the first and third goals would be led by the Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs, Frank N. Butler. Dr. Butler has been in the University System Office for about nine months, but he also has a long history within the University System. He has served in such capacities as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Interim President at Armstrong Atlantic State University for 16 years. So, he understands well academia and the University System of Georgia. Dr. Rebecca H. Rutherford, Professor of Computer Science and Program Head, Information Technology, Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”), and Dr. Mark J. T. Smith, Professor of Electrical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), would be assisting in the presentations on the first and third goals, respectively. Dr. Rutherford has degrees in Music, Education, and Computer Science. She is acutely aware of what is going on both at the System level and at the institutions. All of Dr. Smith’s degrees are in Electrical Engineering, and he was also a member of the 1984 U.S. Olympic fencing team. All of the information provided on the first and third goals was developed by a faculty committee that consisted of 12 people from 12 different institutions and 12 different disciplines from across the University System. Dr. Papp remarked that it was a pleasure to work with such an impressive group of faculty. The first meeting was face-to-face, and the rest of the work of the committee was performed electronically. Dr. Papp recognized committee member Dr. Wayne Bosche, Professor of Mathematics at Dalton State College, who was also in attendance at the meeting. Other committee members were as follows:

- C Richard Cebula, Professor of Economics, Armstrong Atlantic State University
- C Everett D. Cordy, Associate Professor of Business Administration, Albany State University, and Executive Director of the Albany State University Community Development Corporation
- C Thomas G. Dyer, Professor of History, University of Georgia
- C A. Katherine Hamrick, Professor of Mathematics, Augusta State University
- C Caroline S. Helms, Professor of History and Chair, Department of Social Science, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College
- C Curtis E. Ricker, Associate Professor of Writing and Linguistics and Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia Southern University
- C Gail B. Schiffer, Professor of Biology, Kennesaw State University
- C Jitendra Bal (“J. B.”) Sharma, Professor of Physics, Gainesville College
- C Wayne Urban, Regents’ Professor, Professor of History, and Acting Chair, Department of Educational Policy Studies, Georgia State University

In closing, Dr. Papp turned the floor over to Dr. Butler.

Dr. Butler remarked that he was pleased to have the opportunity to discuss two of the strategic goals with the Regents. At previous Board meetings, the Regents had heard a great deal about other goals and objectives that relate to the infrastructure of the educational enterprise. However, this meeting would be about the heart and soul of the University System embodied in the first and third goals — academic quality, instruction, and research — and what System graduates should know and be able to do. Dr. Butler stated that it is our freedom that allows us to build institutions of higher education, but institutions of higher education allow us to sustain our freedoms. The first goal of the Board’s strategic plan is “developing graduates who are intellectually and ethically informed individuals with defined skills and knowledge, capable of leadership, creative endeavors, and contributing citizenship in an ever-increasing interconnected world.” From this goal, the committee developed a list of objectives and characteristics for System graduates to possess. Each of these objectives and characteristics requires working partnerships among the students, faculty, and staff at the institutions.

Dr. Butler next dissected the goal. With regard to “graduates who are intellectually and ethically informed,” he said this means that they should have operative values like integrity, openness, character, civility, and respect for diversity. It also means that graduates should want to continue to learn and grow both personally and professionally. Most importantly, it means graduates who respond to human needs. Next, he discussed graduates “with refined skills and knowledge.” This means graduates with critical and analytical capabilities who can use information and computer technologies and who have the ability to communicate. He suggested that these skills and knowledge must be assessed in a way that is meaningful and defensible. It is also critical that graduates have mastered the concepts and knowledge of their disciplines. Dr. Butler stated that leadership is hard to define, but with regard to graduates “who are capable of leadership,” phrases like interpersonal skills, teamwork, working with people who view things from different perspectives, and a grasp of the “big picture” come to mind. Creativity moves us forward, he said. In looking at graduates “who are capable of creative endeavors,” it is important that they be responsible not only for creating original and synthesized knowledge, but also for using and applying knowledge and analyzing information and doing all this in a real-world environment. Finally, with regard to graduates “who are contributing citizens in an increasingly interconnected world,” he said it is important that graduates be aware of major issues and be able to put them into local, national, and international frameworks. It is also important that they exercise civic responsibility. Next, he called upon Dr. Rutherford to discuss some of the possible policy and tactical responses to the objectives he had outlined.

Dr. Rutherford thanked him and greeted the Regents. She explained that in addition to the objectives that Dr. Butler had discussed, the committee also developed a series of options to explore. They are suggestions of how the Board might carry out the various objectives of the first goal and how to assess the results. The committee were recommending that academics be more closely associated with student life. This can be achieved through collaborative and cooperative programs within the institutions. The committee were also suggesting that the Board require institutions to develop academically centered

freshman seminars. The committee further recommended integrating ethical studies more fully into general education. Dr. Rutherford stressed that this does not mean adding another course, because ethics should be incorporated throughout the general education curriculum. She suggested similarly integrating diversity studies more fully into general education. Next, she recommended expanding opportunities for internships and co-op programs, emphasizing the importance of continuing education, setting minimum standards for computer skills, and allowing selected majors to move beyond 120 semester hours. She suggested setting goals for a percentage of graduates for in-service learning. This will help expand students' leadership capabilities as well as better connect them with the communities. The committee also recommended creating academic structures that encourage interdisciplinary learning, such as joint programs. It is also important to support extracurricular activities that promote learning leadership and to include international issues across the curriculum and in extracurricular activities.

Dr. Butler asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments thus far.

Regent Carter stated that many college graduates need more leadership development, and he encouraged these types of efforts. He continued that there are some basic intangible sets of values, such as perseverance, that he felt also should be developed in the course of higher education.

Dr. Rutherford responded that students certainly have to persevere just to get through school in many ways, and she agreed this was certainly a component of the bigger picture.

Regent Carter said there were many other intangible qualities that are also very important in the business world, such as intuitiveness.

Dr. Rutherford agreed.

Dr. Butler added that around the nation, many institutions are beginning to consider leadership and service learning transcripts in addition to academic transcripts because they demonstrate what students have been involved in during their academic careers.

Chair Leebern stated that if employers also understood the backgrounds of their employees, they might be able to see whether the employees have those characteristics that Regent Carter had noted. He then asked which types of programs the committee was recommending extending beyond 120 semester hours.

Dr. Butler responded that in certain programs, external forces such as accreditation and laboratory hours extend the curriculum beyond 120 hours. So, there are a number of exceptions to the rule. This does not mean wholesale credit creep, which did happen under the quarter system. There are more demands in certain fields, such as teacher education and engineering, that require fine-tuning those particular programs.

Regent Hunt agreed that credit creep concerned him as well. He then asked how the System can instill the proper work ethic in its graduates.

Dr. Rutherford responded that she teaches Ethics in Computer Science. College cannot change a student's morals, she said, but it can make students aware of professional guidelines. It is important to expose students to proper work ethics and for the faculty and staff to demonstrate those ethics. Unfortunately, she said, college cannot change a person's attitude; only that person can.

Regent NeSmith said that he would like to see the System create a pool of guest speakers from the private sector because those people can best expose the students to real-world issues and problems.

Dr. Rutherford remarked that this was an excellent idea.

Chancellor Meredith stated that worker attitude is a critical problem. He said that it is a common problem and more pervasive than just in the System. It will take a major effort to change attitudes, but a lot of this can be addressed by how faculty approach teaching in universities. If they allow students to come to class late, the students will assume they can also come to work late. If faculty do not expect students' assignments to be on time, then the students will be delinquent with their work. So, how the faculty operate and how they teach their classes can carry over to what the students think about the real world.

Board Chair Howell stated that he believes that issues of values, ethics, leadership, drive, judgement, and ability are really rooted in liberal education. He asserted that higher education needs to return to liberal arts and the humanities. The humanities are a framework for students to articulate and to judge themselves in terms of those critical intangible assets. The liberal arts are the foundation of an educated individual, he said.

Dr. Butler agreed with Chair Howell and said that the System needs to develop more creative ways to accomplish this. For example, at one institution, the subject of ethics is team-taught by philosophy professors using the great works of philosophy along with the professor from the particular discipline. Dr. Butler said that there should be more collaboration between various departments and the humanities areas.

Chair Leebern asked whether there were any more questions. Seeing that there were none, he asked Dr. Butler to continue with the presentations.

Dr. Butler explained that the third goal is "improving continuously the quality of curricula, research activities, and international opportunities." The faculty are the stewards of the curriculum, he said. Improving its quality suggests a set of objectives that keep faculty current through professional development so that they can use the best practices and latest pedagogy in the classroom, use instructional technology effectively, and make certain that academic programs are really cutting-edge. Faculty in the System have done wonders in collaboration, but there is much more to be done and the Board should develop formal ways to promote more collaboration not only among faculty at the institutions but also across institutions. Research is the engine of creativity, said Dr. Butler, and it leverages great economic benefits for the state.

Effective research is done by faculty who have time and support for it. This is achieved through government agencies, grants, foundations, industry, commercialization of innovation, and a variety of other means, including some support for research by the state. He asserted that research is best when the students are engaged in the research with the professors. Teaching can also be a good form of research when it better the profession of teaching and is shared appropriately through peer scrutiny. With regard to improving the quality of international opportunities, Dr. Butler said that much is being done in the System, but it would benefit from better coordination among and between institutions and at the System level. Information about international opportunities must be more readily accessible to students and potential participants. System students deserve the chance to gain personal and professional experience about international business, politics, organizations, etc. Exchange opportunities for students and faculty are much more important now than ever, and the System should expand those opportunities significantly. Dr. Butler then called upon Dr. Smith to discuss the committee's recommendations for the third goal.

Dr. Smith thanked Dr. Butler and greeted the Board. He said that the first options to explore were implementing a comprehensive program review and reviewing all personnel performances annually. By and large, these are practices that are already established in the System. However, it is critical to recognize the importance of these practices, because it is through these review mechanisms that the System can ensure it has the right people in the right places doing the right things, that there are appropriate resource allocations, that all programs are current, and that all of the pieces in the various programs still match with each other. Another committee recommendation was limiting the use of part-time faculty. Dr. Smith noted that part-time faculty have a very important role because they allow an institution to be dynamic and to respond to increases in student demands. However, there are also some dangers to relying too heavily on part-time faculty. Research shows that the best quality instruction comes from the full-time faculty. So having some guidelines in place is important to ensure the right balance between full-time and part-time faculty. Another suggestion was to include research, creativity, scholarship of teaching and learning, and efforts to attract external funding on faculty evaluations when and where appropriate. This speaks to the issue of evaluation and incentives, he explained. Institutions should be encouraged to think strategically about their reward systems in order to steer the enterprise in the right direction. Another option to explore is developing a consistent process for study/research leaves, including sabbaticals. Dr. Smith stressed that it is very important for faculty members to recharge in order to stay current and, more importantly, get ahead in their fields. The committee proposed sabbaticals, which typically occur every seven years. On sabbatical, a faculty member goes elsewhere to perform research or to interact with other scholars, such as Nobel Laureates and distinguished researchers, in order to return to the institution with new ideas and a better understanding of the direction in which her field is headed and where she should be focusing her scholarship. If faculty members do not have such opportunities, their teaching and research become stale. The concept of the sabbatical is common in the academy, and most institutions have sabbatical programs. The University System does not have a sabbatical program, but it does have research and study leaves. However, these leaves are neither uniform nor consistent. Dr. Smith explained that it would be best to have a uniform policy to ensure that faculty have the opportunity to reenergize.

Dr. Smith also suggested setting up sponsored program offices to help faculty obtain grants and funding. He explained that some institutions have such offices in place, but others do not. It is a very good idea to have external funding involved at all institutions, he said. To make that happen, there must be an office at each institution to handle the administration and identify sources of funding and help faculty write funding proposals. He also suggested creating a Systemwide distance learning center. This is an issue of leverage, he explained. Institutions have distance learning activities, but it would be better to pool all of these resources in one location and make them available. Dr. Smith noted that GIT collaborates with a number of other institutions via distance learning through the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”). There is a set of researchers who perform multimedia signal processing and are doing research in telepresence in an effort to make technology feel more immediate as if a person were actually in the classroom instead of in front of a computer screen. The researchers are developing this new technology and using it as part of GTREP. The students benefit from this new technology, and the researchers are generating cutting-edge technology that can be made available to all System institutions. This is the kind of collaboration the System should be doing, he said. Next, Dr. Smith recommended raising the target percentage of students studying abroad to 4%. The nation’s economy and society are becoming more global, and the System should expose its students to international experiences. The study abroad target participation rate was originally set at 0.25%. It was raised to 2%, but the committee were suggesting a goal 4% or even higher.

Board Chair Howell asked whether there are sufficient System funds to help qualified students who may not have the financial ability to study abroad.

Dr. Smith replied that there are some funds in place.

Dr. Papp reiterated that the participation goal was increased to 2% with the development of the Board’s 1994 strategic plan. At that point, there was almost no funding support available at the System level. Through the hard work of Dr. Richard C. Sutton, Senior Advisor for Academic Affairs and Director of International Programs, among others, the System approached The Coca-Cola Foundation, which provided some funding. Chancellor Emeritus Stephen R. Portch also used some of his contacts in the United Kingdom to achieve some funding there as well. So, external funding has in fact played an extremely important role in enabling the System to increase participation to 2%. However, if the Board raises the goal to 4% or higher, it will need increased external funding.

Chair Howell asked whether there are also funds available at the institutional level.

Dr. Papp responded that there is funding at the institutional level in some cases. For example, some institutions have approached NationsBank, The Coca-Cola Foundation, Georgia-Pacific, and elsewhere to acquire funding. That funding is then awarded to students on the bases of both financial need and academic merit.

Regent Hunt asked whether the System has reached its 2% participation goal.

Dr. Papp replied that the System has just recently met that goal.

Chancellor Meredith asked what percentage of participants receive some funding from the System.

Dr. Papp called upon Dr. Sutton to respond to this question.

Dr. Sutton responded that the University System has been able to stretch available dollars so that approximately 10% of students studying abroad receive some support from the Regents Study Abroad Scholarship program. He also noted that this program requires an institutional match. So, the impact of the scholarship support is effectively doubled.

Chair Leebern noted that although the Systemwide participation rate is up to 2%, that does not mean that participation is distributed evenly across the institutions. He urged that the System must broaden these opportunities for all System students. While participation has greatly improved, he said that there is still a long way to go.

Dr. Smith noted that there are opportunities to leverage funds and those opportunities will likely increase in the future. For example, GIT has a campus in France called Georgia Tech Lorraine. Through the right kinds of collaborations, that campus could be a portal for other students in the University System to study abroad. Because the campus expenses are already covered, this would also be cost-effective. There are also other kinds of international operations being established by the System. As they grow, the System can leverage some of these opportunities so that it gets more value for its investments. Consistent with that notion is the committee's recommendation to consider expanding study abroad opportunities, especially during the Maymester. Not all System institutions have a break in May, but many do. This is a two- to three-week period in which students could have a meaningful study abroad experience.

Dr. Smith continued to discuss other options the Board should consider with regard to the third goal. For example, there could be increased collaboration between the two- and four-year institutions in curriculum. The committee envisioned that there should be a seamless pathway for those students in two-year institutions who want to continue their studies at four-year institutions. The Board should ensure that there is collaboration between the institutions, he explained, because there is a constant evolution in curricula and the institutions must maintain their synchronicity. Another committee recommendation was emphasizing teaching, research, and service to the community. Dr. Smith stated that although this seems obvious, it is very easy to grow complacent and the System should always stay current on these missions. Another suggestion was to expand faculty exchanges and visitation programs within the University System. This is something that could very easily be done and could have a tremendous benefit. A great deal of learning takes place when faculty members from different environments get together to exchange ideas and perspectives. He reminded the Regents that the 1998 Chancellor's Award for Collaborative Excellence was awarded to Dr. Gary B. Schuster, Dean of the College of Sciences and Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry at GIT, for establishing such a collaborative faculty development program for System science, mathematics, and computing faculty. Another committee recommendation was to keep teaching and

learning grants and the Regents Distinguished Teaching Professor program at the System level to ensure that these important programs are not lost. Dr. Smith explained that these programs provide resources and time for faculty members to innovate in teaching and learning. He also suggested emphasizing centers for teaching and learning. Most institutions have such centers on campus, but it would be better if all institutions had centers. They are programs in which faculty members can improve their teaching skills and learn useful classroom technologies to improve the overall quality of education. Another committee recommendation was to expand mentoring programs for faculty, staff, and administrators. Mentoring is well known for improving teaching quality and reducing mistakes and conflicts. It is the perfect embodiment of best practices.

Best practice programs should be instituted Systemwide, said Dr. Smith. Assessing quality is more difficult than simply looking at raw numbers, but it has obvious benefits and costs. Another recommendation was to bring academia and business closer together where appropriate. The System institutions produce the workforce, and the businesses are the consumers of that product. It is only natural that they should communicate, and this communication should be encouraged at all institutions. They benefit from understanding the needs of the business community, and they may also be able to get businesses to make investments in the educational process. Another committee recommendation was to encourage programs to have external advisory boards. This is another natural mechanism for feedback from industry, government, and the community. The Regents might also consider establishing economic development units on each campus as a point of contact for business. There are businesses that would like to work with institutions, he said, but they find it difficult to identify the right individual to contact. The institutions can make it easier to work with businesses. Finally, Dr. Smith recommended that the System help the public understand what it is professors do. The faculty role in the University System is multi-faceted. They spend a lot of time preparing for teaching, but they also do research, write grants, work with industry, write articles and books, and try to anticipate innovation. In an environment where greater cooperation among the institutions, government, and the private sector is being encouraged, having this kind of knowledge is very valuable. With that, Dr. Smith concluded his presentation.

Chair Leebern asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments. Seeing that there were none, he asked Dr. Smith how institutions can better coordinate their requests for external support.

Dr. Smith responded that sometimes it makes sense to coordinate the requests that go before foundations so that the requests are prioritized and funding is maximized. Instead of thinking of this in terms of competition, it is probably better to think of it in terms of increasing funding options. If faculty members are made aware of all of the different funding sources that exists, it would be tremendously valuable. Having an office that notifies faculty members of funding opportunities, even via e-mail, would be very beneficial.

Dr. Butler thanked Dr. Smith for his presentation and turned the floor back to Dr. Papp.

Dr. Papp also thanked the presenters and the committee for their recommendations for consideration. He reminded the Regents that there was still one more goal to discuss at this meeting. The ninth goal of the strategic plan is “making University System of Georgia education seamless with K-12, DTAE, and independent colleges.” He explained that he would approach this goal in four different ways. The first was the overarching theme of seamlessness. Within the State of Georgia, there are a number of different efforts underway that bring several different types of institutions together. For example, the Education Coordinating Council (“ECC”) is chaired by the Governor. Chair Howell and Chancellor Meredith represent the University System on ECC; Commissioner Kenneth H. Breeden represents the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”); State Superintendent of Schools Linda C. Shrenko represents the Georgia Department of Education (“DOE”); and there are a number of other representatives. ECC serves as the body through which the entire state’s educational efforts are coordinated. ECC has only been in place for a few years, he said, but it is becoming increasingly effective. The Office of Educational Accountability (“OEA”) was also created by the Governor and the legislature. OEA is the entity that will be providing the University System and the other educational agencies with report cards. There will be four or five different measures of how the System is performing. The agencies collaborate with OEA by providing information for OEA to compile the report cards. Another collaborative effort is the P-16 initiative. The P-16 Councils around the state bring together both academic professionals from the various areas and community members to help coordinate education from prekindergarten through college. Georgia Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”) is also a collaborative effort, because all of the educational agencies and the public library system have access. Indeed, the public libraries themselves constitute a collaborative effort. In 2000, they were transferred to the University System. These are incredible tools for public access to education throughout the State of Georgia.

Next, Dr. Papp discussed seamlessness efforts with the DOE. He reminded the Board that its fiscal year 1998 strategic planning initiative focused on improving the quality of teacher education. For example, one of the major concerns in the state was teachers who were teaching out of their fields. As a result of the teacher preparation initiative, students in secondary education programs must now major in their disciplines as well as earn teacher certification qualifications. The Board also decided that it would guarantee its education graduates so that if they do not perform satisfactorily, they return to the institution for more training. Dr. Papp stated that there are 16 regional education service areas (“RESAs”) in the state. All of the System presidents serve on their local RESAs, which bring together the presidents with local superintendents and principals to examine issues such as faculty development in the K-12 areas to coordinate purchasing requirements and needs for K-12 systems in particular RESAs in order to aggregate total demand and hopefully reduce costs. Higher admissions standards represent another System-DOE collaboration. Over the last several years, the Board gradually implemented higher standards to send the message to students that they need to perform well throughout their high school and middle school careers if they are going to succeed in the University System. Postsecondary Options (“PSOs”) constitute a program in which System and DTAE institutions provide educational opportunities for high school students. There are many high school students who take courses at institutions of higher education. The Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program (“PREP”) is a program in which institutions work with at-risk middle and high school students in an effort to help them understand what they will need to do and learn to succeed in college. Some institutions will bring PREP students on campus and work with them to attract

and prepare them. Performance Assessment for College and Technical Schools (“PACTS”) is a program that is in its pilot stage under the leadership of Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Co-Facilitator of the Georgia P-16 Initiative. It is a pilot alternate admissions systems in which students compile a portfolio of what they have accomplished in high school and perhaps middle school and submit it for admission to the University System in lieu of the standard freshman index, which is determined based on grade point averages and Scholastic Aptitude Test (“SAT”) scores. This pilot program was created in response to certain issues raised regarding standardized testing. Facilities and resource sharing is another way in which the System can collaborate with the K-12 system. As a matter of fact, many colleges are already sharing both facilities and resources with K-12 schools. Many System institutions offer off-campus classes in local middle and high schools because it is more convenient for the local residents.

Dr. Papp then discussed seamlessness with DTAE. He noted that there are a number of degree programs in place in which System institutions collaborate with DTAE. For example, System institutions provide the general education courses for Associate of Applied Science (“A.A.S.”) degrees. Also, the bachelor of applied science (“B.A.S.”) program is a four-year degree program in which, assuming that the courses taken at the DTAE institution are collegiate in nature and taught by qualified faculty as defined by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (“SACS”), those degrees can be transferred to System institutions and become bachelor’s degrees. The mini-core is another collaborative effort which the Board approved in concept in January 2002 and specifically at this meeting. In the mini-core, certain mathematics and English courses are transferable between DTAE and the University System. Also, ASSET/Compass score acceptance is a program in which students go into DTAE institutions and then can later transfer to the System based on their ASSET or Compass scores. The Georgia Postsecondary Education Collaborative Council (“GPECC”) oversees the entire operation of the seamlessness effort. GPECC includes some of the System presidents, some of the University System Office staff, and presidents and staff from DTAE. Again, the System participates in facilities and resource sharing, but as the Governor had said in his report on the previous day, this effort should be expanded.

Finally, Dr. Papp discussed seamlessness with private institutions. He explained that limited transfer credit capabilities are in place, whereas within the University System of Georgia, there is a very good, but not yet perfect, articulation system in place in which classes can in fact transfer seamlessly between institutions. There is a less concise transfer program in place with some of the private institutions. There are only a few joint degrees in place between System and private institutions, but this effort could expand in upcoming years. The Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”) includes the System’s four research universities as well as Emory University and Clark Atlanta University. The Atlanta Regional Consortium for Higher Education (“ARCHE”) consists of all of the Atlanta- and Athens-based System institutions as well as all of the private institutions in this broad metropolitan area. ARCHE conducts studies and hosts conferences. The Southern Regional Education Board’s (“SREB”) Electronic Campus goes beyond the State of Georgia, but it includes a number of the System’s electronically offered degrees in a database of distance learning degrees offered throughout the Southeast. Finally, the SREB’s Academic Common Market is a program in which students from Georgia and other states in the SREB region can pay in-state tuition to attend an out-of-state school if the program they want is not available in their home state.

The System has made great strides in seamlessness, said Dr. Papp, but there is not perfect seamlessness yet. He said that there are many issues and questions that arise out of this issue. He asked the Regents to consider whether PSOs and PACTS should be expanded. While there are many strong arguments to expand these programs, there are also many arguments against expanding them. Dr. Papp noted that Chancellor Meredith recently presented a math initiative to the ECC. The initiative recognizes that mathematics skills in the State of Georgia are far below where they should be. The Chancellor made a set of recommendations for collaborating with K-12 and DTAE to put some programs in place to improve math scores and pursue some external funding to support those programs. As Drs. Rutherford and Smith noted earlier, curricula change continually. Therefore, it is necessary but not sufficient to ensure that the four-year curriculum is aligned with the curricula of the K-12 and two-year college levels. Dr. Papp asked the Regents to consider the limits to seamlessness and whether there are areas on which each educational agency should exclusively focus. Similarly, the Regents should consider the areas of responsibility of the University System. In closing, he asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent Cleveland asked how well the System communicates information to high school students as they prepare to go to college.

Dr. Papp responded that as a general rule, when it comes to the larger issues, the System communicates reasonably well. For example, when the System implemented its new admissions standards, it began getting the word out in 1996 even though the standards would not be fully implemented until fall 2001. The System continually held meetings with high school guidance counselors and sent letter to principals, superintendents, and guidance counselors to explain the improvements in the admissions standards. He explained that when the System moved the core curriculum standards up from 15 Carnegie units to 16, it communicated this very well. However, a great deal of confusion was created with regard to increasing the number of electives, and in the end, the Board decided to remove those elective requirements. With regard to the PSOs, Dr. Papp explained that the program is very much a collaboration among guidance counselors, teachers, and System institutions. He asked Regent Magill if that is correct.

Regent Magill remarked that it was and that the extent to which school districts participate in PSOs usually has to do with the philosophy of the local high schools within the particular district. She commented that it is a wonderful program.

Regent McMillan asked whether there is any one entity that keeps tabs on all of the collaborative agencies to ensure that there is not duplication of effort. For example, he was not certain of the difference between the ECC and the local P-16 Councils.

Dr. Papp explained that ECC is supervisory and policy-making body. It is a very small policy-focused body that serves as a clearing house for the implementation of all of the other collaborative agencies. The only place where Dr. Papp thought that there might be some overlap and questions about direction would be between the P-16 Councils and the RESAs. He asked if Regent Magill had any thoughts on that.

Regent Magill agreed. She explained that ECC is like a hub of all of the collaborative agencies. However, not all of those agencies are involved in P-16 initiative.

Chancellor Meredith added that ECC looks at the overall needs of the State of Georgia and how to address those needs. That is why he presented the math initiative, which involves every level of education. He concurred that there is likely some overlap among all of these entities.

Regent Magill also agreed. She stated that ECC is more of a coordinating council to bring together certain issues, such as continuous curriculum alignment. The Phi Delta Kappa audit of the DOE's Quality Core Curriculum found that it was not up to par. So, that is where ECC comes in. It gets at the heart of the important educational issues for the citizenry of Georgia.

Chancellor Meredith added that he would be implementing a feedback system and that it would be a valuable communication tool across these various levels and will decrease the likelihood of students falling between the cracks.

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Leebern thanked the presenters and adjourned the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Howell called upon Secretary Gail S. Weber to present to the Board some honorary degree recommendations.

Secretary Weber noted that exceptions were being made for Albany State University, Armstrong Atlantic State University, and Georgia State University which would permit them to grant two honorary degree recommendations each. However, she stressed that there will not be many such exceptions in the future. She then announced that the presidents of the following institutions had recommended the respective candidates to receive honorary degrees:

- C Ray Charles (Robinson), Albany State University
- C Willie E. Gary, Albany State University
- C Robert Adair Burnett, President Emeritus, Armstrong Atlantic State University
- C Mary Vaughan Burnett, Armstrong Atlantic State University
- C Paul Shelby Amos, Columbus State University
- C Ben F. Johnson, Jr., Dean Emeritus, College of Law, Georgia State University
- C Former Regent A. W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Georgia State University
- C Wesley E. Cantrell, Southern Polytechnic State University

On behalf of Presidents Portia H. Shields, Thomas Z. Jones, Frank D. Brown, Carl V. Patton, and Lisa A. Rossbacher, Secretary Weber 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 16 and Wednesday, April 17, 2002, at Kennesaw State University.

Secretary Weber noted that the inauguration of Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith would take place on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, in conjunction with the June Board meeting. She also noted that on August 7, 2002, following the Board meeting, the Regents were invited to the dedication of Allgood Hall at Augusta State University in memory of former Regent Thomas F. Allgood, Sr.

Chair Howell called upon the Chancellor to make some follow-up remarks to his report to the Board.

Chancellor Meredith said that he forgot to thank the Gordon College presidential search committees. The institutional committee was chaired by Daniel J. Jackson, Jr., Vice President and Associate Professor of Chemistry. The Special Regents' Committee for the Gordon College Presidential Search was chaired by Regent Cater and included Regents Yancey and Shelnut.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 10:45 a.m. on Wednesday, March 13, 2002, Chair Howell called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues and a presidential appointment. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Howell and Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance were Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber and Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith. 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 11:00 a.m., Chair Howell reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. He then moved that the Board waive Policy 803.17, Emeritus Title, and bestow the title upon former Chancellor Stephen R. Portch. Regent Hunt seconded the motion, which was then unanimously approved by the Board.

Next, Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith recommended the appointment of Dr. Lawrence V. Weill as President of Gordon College, effective April 1, 2002. Motion was made by Regent Shelnut to accept this recommendation. Regent Yancey seconded the motion, which was then unanimously approved by the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:05 a.m. on March 13, 2002.

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

s/
Hilton H. Howell, Jr.
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia