

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
September 12 and 13, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, September 12 and Wednesday, September 13, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Glenn S. White, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 12. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair White, were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Kenneth W. Cannestra, Joe Frank Harris,, Edgar L. Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith,, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Regents Juanita P. Baranco and J. Timothy Shelnut arrived during the meeting.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, September 12 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent George M. D. (John) Hunt III had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day. Regent Charles H. Jones was also absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on August 8, 2000 were unanimously approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW PRESIDENT OF CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

Chair White called upon the Chancellor to make a special introduction to the Board.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair White and said that he was pleased to introduce to the Regents the new president of Clayton College & State University (“CCSU”). However, before introducing the president, the Chancellor wanted to recognize some people who had been instrumental in the presidential search process. The chair of the CCSU Presidential Search Committee was Dr. Linda E. Nash, Associate Professor of Mathematics at CCSU. Chancellor Portch noted that Dr. Nash is a “total System product” in that she earned her bachelor’s degree at North Georgia College & State University and her master’s and doctorate degrees from Georgia State University. The Chancellor commended her work in the search process and finding the right match for CCSU. He asked Dr. Nash to stand and be recognized. Chancellor Portch noted that Mr. Michael F. Vollmer had served as Acting President of CCSU during the search.

The Chancellor noted that the new president of CCSU, Dr. Thomas K. Harden, was known as the “double dean” at Eastern Michigan University because he held two deanships at once. He was Dean of the College of Technology and was also asked to be Dean of the College of Business for a year. When Chancellor Portch visited the campus, he was most impressed that the College of Business faculty had the highest praise for the job Dr. Harden had performed in some very difficult circumstances. The business community was also very pleased with his outreach efforts. In

addition, Dr. Harden has a solid background in technology, and with the investment the University System and CCSU have made in technology, that was very important to the search. The Chancellor noted that President Harden also has strong strategic planning and implementation skills. CCSU is one of the System's entrepreneurial institutions, and yet, it is time for some strategic planning around that entrepreneurship, said the Chancellor. He asked President Harden's administrative staff in Michigan what was the one thing they would change about their boss. The worst things said about him were that his hair was never mussed and his jacket was never unbuttoned! The Chancellor realized that President Harden was very much liked and admired at that institution. Regent Baranco chaired the Regent committee, which also included Regents White and Yancey. They felt particularly good about their final selection. President Harden has a bachelor of science degree in industrial education from Miami University, a master's degree in educational administration from the University of Dayton, and a doctorate of education in adult technical education curriculum and instruction and educational administration from the University of Cincinnati. Chancellor Portch then introduced President Harden.

President Harden thanked Chancellor Portch and greeted the Regents. He noted that Representative Gail M. Buckner (district 95) was present at the meeting and that there are many supportive leaders in the CCSU community. CCSU aspires to be the institution of choice for that region. President Harden said that he was humbled by the opportunity he has and the knowledge of what has taken place before him at CCSU. He explained that while he was chosen for the presidency, he actually chose this job about three years before it was actually offered to him. He knew at some point that he would like to be a president of a university. He began looking at various institutions and university systems. He came across the Web site for the University System of Georgia and began reading the minutes of past meetings, where he got a sense of what the Board had been doing and who the Chancellor is. He was very impressed. At one point, he came across information about CCSU, and he was tremendously excited by the things going on at that institution. He knew that if the position of President ever came open, he would try his best to get it. He was fortunate enough that it happened at a time when he could apply for the job, and he was the winner of the position. President Harden has been on campus for approximately three months, and his decision has been reinforced daily as the right decision for him. He hopes it will turn out to be the right decision for the university and the System.

President Harden stated that CCSU must be more effective in its fund raising activities, because the university has needs that it must meet. He thanked the Board for treating CCSU well, but it is the university's responsibility to raise some of the funding. CCSU is known as a technology institution to many. Its Information Technology Project ("ITP") has received tremendous recognition and, in some ways, has put the university on the map, along with Spivey Hall and some of the music programs. However, ITP is using equipment that is somewhat dated, and there are some serious challenges with that. So, the university is planning its next iteration of ITP, an iteration that will take it to the next level, building on its successes and proclaiming the tremendous success that ITP has been for the university, the students, and the faculty. President Harden remarked that he is very proud of the heritage CCSU is building and that the university is going into the next iteration with great vigor. He explained that there are many other initiatives and priorities at CCSU, but he did not want to take too much of the Board's time. He thanked the Regents for allowing him to address them and said that they could look for great things to come from CCSU. He also thanked the CCSU representatives in attendance at the meeting for their support. In closing, President Harden stressed that the best is yet to come.

Chair White welcomed President Harden to the University System and to Georgia. He thanked Jennifer Fairchild-Pierce, Assistant Secretary to the Board and the Chancellor, who writes the minutes, for helping attract President Harden to CCSU. He also thanked Dr. Nash and Mr.

Vollmer.

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

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

Chair Yancey explained that the purpose of this meeting was to review the proposed operating and capital budget for fiscal year 2002. He commended Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers and her staff for their hard work in preparing the budget proposal for this meeting. He asked that the Regents hold their questions until the end of the presentation, and then, he called upon Dr. Desrochers to begin the presentation.

Dr. Desrochers thanked Chair Yancey for all the support he has given the budget staff. She also thanked Ms. Sharon Duhart, Administrative Coordinator for Fiscal Affairs, who had created the PowerPoint presentation for this meeting. Dr. Desrochers reviewed the budget process for the benefit of the newer Regents. She explained that during June and July, the Chancellor convenes a presidential advisory committee. The committee membership rotates so that, at some time, all presidents have an opportunity to participate. The committee gets inside issues with the Central Office budget staff and helps the staff develop strategies that are formulated into the budget proposal to the Board. In July and August, the staff requests input on the budget request from the presidents and Regents. In September, the proposed budget is presented to the Board. Once approved by the Board, the budget is presented to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (“OPB”). The Governor then presents his budget recommendations to the General Assembly. At this point, discussions with the Legislative Budget Office (“LBO”) and the legislators begin. All of the issues, as they have been selected by the Governor for inclusion in his budget, must be discussed with and made available to the legislators and the staff at LBO. In March or early April, the General Assembly approves the state budget, including state appropriations to the University System. At the April Board meeting, the Central Office budget staff present to the Board budget allocation recommendations for funds appropriated by the state. Tuition and fee recommendations are also presented for approval by the Board in April. Finally, at the June Board meeting, the staff presents for Board approval a final budget, including all of the previously approved budget allocations and all other revenue sources, such as federal research monies and auxiliary enterprise funds. Also at the June Board meeting, the Regents look at the proposed major capital projects for the following year. The Board votes on which projects to add to the five-year rolling capital projects list for the next fiscal year’s budget consideration. Dr. Desrochers noted that this was the complete year-long process. In this process, the Regents and the presidents have significant involvement.

Dr. Desrochers said that at this meeting, the presenters would be discussing Item 1 of the agenda of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations (page 28). Item 1 is the fiscal year 2002 operating and capital budget request for the University System of Georgia. Additionally, the Board will be asked to approve the fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget request. Dr. Desrochers noted that in recent years, the state has had adequate revenues to be able to make some supplemental amendments to current-year budgets. Again, this year, the Board will be requesting such appropriations. She then introduced the Chancellor, who would be discussing major themes of the proposed budget and several budget enhancements.

Chancellor Portch stressed that development of the budget is very much a team effort. Each year, different presidents comprise the presidential advisory committee. This year’s committee consisted

of the Chancellor and Presidents Rosemary DePaolo, Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”); Bruce F. Grube, Georgia Southern University; Dorothy L. Lord, Coastal Georgia Community College; Beheruz N. Sethna, State University of West Georgia; and Francis J. Tedesco, Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”). One of the major themes emphasized in the budget request is maintaining the momentum of the University System. The Chancellor noted that he would discuss this theme more fully in his State of the System Address at Wednesday’s Board meeting. He explained that the benchmarking and management review initiative was intended to improve the University System’s regional and national competitive position. A number of the budget initiatives are aimed directly at trying to strengthen the System in that regard. In the last few years and now with the establishment of the Committee on Information and Instructional Technology, the Board has come to recognize that technology is a significant part of the academic, business, and fiscal future of the University System. So, there is continued budgetary emphasis on educational and management use of technology. The System’s role in economic development also has established great momentum, which should be continued.

The Chancellor said that the current budget formula, which was created in the 1980s, has served the state extremely well. It was formulated as an equal partnership between the Board of Regents, OPB, and LBO. The University System has been appreciative of that partnership. However, the staff have been in conversations with OPB and LBO in the past several months about the need to modernize the formula. In 1982, instructional technology was perhaps nothing more than a mimeograph machine. Therefore, there is no factor in the current budget formula for technology as we know it today. At the time of this meeting, the staff were still in conversations with OPB and LBO about modernizing the formula. The staff will get back to the Regents with final numbers once an agreement has been reached. There is also not a set figure in the budget proposal for faculty and staff salaries. Chancellor Portch explained that the Governor and OPB are still working on the total state budget, but the staff feel a need to make the case on behalf of the Board that the University System needs a couple of strong salary years. The University System is starting to experience a little slippage in this area. When the Chancellor came to the University System in 1994, average faculty salaries in the University System were around the middle of Southern Regional Education Board (“SREB”) states. After a number of years of significant salary increases, the University System reached number two in SREB states. However, in the last few years, we have slipped back to fourth among those same states. The Chancellor noted that while the University System is not in a crisis, he has been hearing from presidents that the System has lost some potential faculty hires because of salaries. So, the staff would recommend to the Governor that over the next couple of years, the System needs some reversal of the recent trend in terms of salary increases in order to remain competitive and keep its momentum.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Regents that three years ago, the Board’s major strategic planning initiative was teacher preparation. This fall welcomes the entering class to which the University System has assigned its guarantee. Following this presentation, the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension would meet and hear an update on that initiative. The Central Office staff are in very close communication with the Governor’s Education Reform Study Commission. They anticipate that there are several areas the Governor will include in his initiative this year, and they want to be able to respond to this challenge. The Chancellor remarked that if there is a school that is outperforming the backgrounds of its students, there will normally be a number of consistencies: 1) a very gifted principal who can instill great enthusiasm into the school, 2) a principal who treats teachers as professionals, 3) a school that has high standards for all of its students, and 4) a school that has parents who are involved in their children’s education. Virtually every one of those characteristics depends on a gifted principal. The Central Office staff would like to propose a new academy for principals and identifying potential new principals. This would include not only internships in education, but also internships in business, so that future principals can experience

some different ways of looking at management responsibility. A second part of the teacher preparation initiative is that the secondary school teachers will be required to major in their content areas. The update on the initiative would go one step further and require that they need to earn a degree in their respective content areas as well as certification in teacher education. To do that, the University System will need to add not education faculty, but rather arts and sciences faculty. There is also a very serious problem with the number and availability of special education teachers. The Central Office staff are proposing that institutions dual train some teachers so that when they are called upon to either be in special education classrooms or have special education students in their general education classes, they will have training for that. Chancellor Portch noted that the PRAXIS scores are taking on an incredible significance now that reporting the PRAXIS scores is required. There are a few System institutions that need to raise the PRAXIS scores of their students, which would allow some intervention and assistance for targeted institutions for supplemental instruction to try and help students raise their scores. The Chancellor remarked that teacher education continues to be a major priority in the University System and part of the Board's responsibility to the state.

Next, Chancellor Portch discussed the Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program ("PREP"). He noted that it has served over 23,000 students directly and many more who were brought to System institutions and understand that the admissions standards that will be implemented in 2001. This may require reinventing PREP, but there is a need for not only the current funding, but also additional state funding for the program. The University System will also likely have to raise additional federal and/or private funding to maintain its commitment to helping students get ready to achieve at a level necessary to meet the new admissions standards.

The Chancellor next discussed mission-related initiatives, which include a required match from the federal government for Fort Valley State University, one of the System's two land grant institutions. The federal government provides funding for land grant institutions that, through their designations, offer agricultural research and extension services. Over the last few years, the federal government has started requiring states to match that funding. Last year, the state was required to match at 45%, which was over \$1 million. This year, the state is required to match at 50%, which will add an additional \$265,000. The second mission-related initiative relates to GCSU's mission as the state's public liberal arts college. Chancellor Portch noted that on his first tour of Georgia, parents often expressed that they felt the University System needed a public liberal arts college. GCSU stepped forward to take that challenge when it went through the mission review process several years ago. In October 1999, President DePaolo made a presentation to the Board showing how GCSU fared against its competition on several indicators in a benchmarking exercise. The Chancellor said that it is time to accelerate this process. He reported that the College of Charleston in South Carolina currently has 507 Georgia students enrolled and remarked that he would rather see those students enrolled at GCSU. To do that, GCSU must take some further steps. One of the features of a public liberal arts college is relatively small class sizes. Peer comparisons indicate that such colleges usually have a student-teacher ratio of about 17 to 1. Currently, GCSU's ratio is about 22 to 1. So, GCSU needs to hire additional faculty to reduce class sizes and make the feel and quality of the college on par with comparator institutions. Chancellor Portch has told institutions that when they have a mission-related request, they should not depend solely on state funding. Rather, they must present a package plan. GCSU has brought forward an innovative package with three components: 1) a budget request of \$3 million for the purpose of increasing the number of faculty; 2) a tuition increase to generate another \$3 million, if the students agree; and 3) a commitment to raise \$1 million a year of private endowments for this purpose. That combination of public, private, and student partnership would generate \$7 million toward hiring the additional faculty necessary to be competitive. The Chancellor noted that this would be a change for the Board. Typically, tuition is different among the sectors but not within

the sectors. This would be the first time the Board has allowed one institution in a sector to have a tuition differential. He stated that there is a very legitimate reason to do so, and if the students are convinced of that, the Board should be prepared to do that. However, the Board will not have to take that action until next April when it approves tuition increases, but if next April the staff report that the legislature and the students have agreed to the funding, the Chancellor wanted the Regents to be aware of the commitment they are making. He stressed that this is a market-driven move and GCSU has confirmation that students and parents are willing to pay a little extra for this. He noted that the difference between what parents pay to send their children to private liberal arts institutions elsewhere pales in comparison to the additional cost at GCSU.

The final point the Chancellor addressed was the eminent scholars program. He reminded the Regents that the program was started several years ago, but only at the research institutions. Three or four years ago, another institution was able to raise the required money, which is \$500,000. The University System has 13 eminent scholar commitments this year. So, due to Governors guidelines which restrict the size of funding requests, the staff were proposing a minimum of \$3 million in matching monies for the eminent scholars program, which would allow for funding six to eight scholars. Chancellor Portch reminded the Board that the funding is provided to the foundation that has been able to raise the money, and then the endowment is permanently applied to the positions. The Chancellor then introduced Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Daniel S. Papp.

Dr. Papp explained that the technology enhancements in the proposed budget consist of five different initiatives and together total approximately \$18.2 million. In the interest of time, he discussed only the two largest of those five initiatives; the three initiatives he did not discuss were Georgia Global Learning Online for Business & Education (“Georgia GLOBE”), Georgia Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”), and efforts targeted specifically to business and student services. Within the technology enhancements, the two largest concern PeachNet and the technology master planning initiative. The PeachNet effort is a \$7.7 million effort to improve the capability of the PeachNet system throughout the state to provide connectivity to students, faculty, and staff so they can continue to accelerate their involvement in information age learning. With regard to technology master planning, Dr. Papp reminded the Regents that they had undertaken a major technology master planning effort at the System level. The requested funding would begin to address technology master planning at the campus level. There would be an integrated master plan at the System level combined with the campus level planning.

Next, Dr. Papp addressed the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”). It is the program that brings together Armstrong Atlantic State University, Georgia Southern University, Savannah State University, and the Georgia Institute of Technology to deliver programs in engineering in Savannah and Statesboro. There are two major programs being offered through GTREP: computer engineering and civil engineering. There are over 160 students currently enrolled in the second year of this program, and the budget request includes an additional \$3 million for the continuation of the program over the upcoming year. Dr. Papp stressed that the technology enhancements he had discussed are critical components of the University System’s strategic initiatives this year. In closing, he introduced Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development & Economic Services Annie Hunt Burriss.

Ms. Burriss explained that she would discuss the Board’s economic development initiatives. She explained that for every dollar invested in the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP”), there is a \$15 return to the State of Georgia. That does not include capital investments; rather, it includes people who are better educated for knowledge jobs and making more money. For fiscal year 2002, the ICAPP portion of the budget request is approximately \$3.2 million in new funding.

This would be applied to three areas. First, \$1.5 million would be for the ICAPP Advantage program. That would enable Governor Barnes and the University System to attract new companies to Georgia and help existing companies expand. Second, \$200,000 would be made available for marketing. Chancellor Portch has an ICAPP advisory council that is composed of a very diverse group of business leaders from across the state. They have said repeatedly that ICAPP must be marketed. The third area that falls under the requested ICAPP funding is Operation Mobilize, which will help the two-year institutions respond to their marketplaces and have a business liaison to bring in ICAPP Advantage projects. Ms. Burriss recounted that she was on a trip to Israel with Governor Barnes when he was recruiting high-tech companies to Georgia, and the experience was the inspiration for this program. In closing, she introduced President Frances J. Tedesco, Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”).

President Tedesco thanked Ms. Burriss and explained that the biomedical and health sciences collaborative is based on the principle that both the speed and the outcome of biomedical research would be greatly enhanced by the interactive collaboration between research universities. One tangible outcome of the increased collaboration and cooperation between MCG and the University of Georgia (“UGA”) is that the close relationship should allow the institutions to more readily compete for federal funding. President Tedesco noted that the federal budget proposes an increase in National Institute of Health (“NIH”) funding from \$17.5 billion to roughly \$20 billion, an approximate 14.7% increase. This vastly surpasses proposed increases by the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation, which are the two areas that traditionally present the most money available to academic institutions for research. President Tedesco asserted that this is reflective of the fact that this country and its leadership realize that the commitment to biomedical research not only has tremendous impact on human kind, but also has the greatest connection to economic development of any research before. He said that the potential is that with federal increases in funding and the Governor’s new cancer initiative, people are realizing that if we bring together different individuals to work on problems, there can be a tremendous outcome. This is more an investment than a cost, because by bringing together scientists who have tremendous impact in genetics, the likelihood of positive outcomes is very high. This investment in collaboration should result in some immediate tangible outcomes. First, there will be the collaboration and cooperation of both institutions. Secondly, this collaboration should greatly enhance the amount of federal funding that will come to Georgia. Third, if one looks at the number of start-up companies in Georgia, one finds the greatest growth in biomedical areas. In fact, of the five companies presenting next month at a Southeastern conference of start-up companies in this field, three of them are related to either MCG or UGA and this collaborative effort. So, this investment should tremendously enhance not only the educational value, but also the research capability of the institutions. In closing, President Tedesco introduced President Rosemary DePaolo of Georgia College & State University.

President DePaolo stated that the University System had been involved in a thorough assessment of itself through its benchmarking and management review initiative. The proposed budget is a direct response to the benchmarking/management review report by Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. and Arthur Andersen LLP in cooperation with the Governor’s Office and seeks funding to lead the University System from the one-time review to “Accountability Plus,” explained President DePaolo. To get there, the System needs to collect data, archive it, access it, and analyze it. Fundamental to making this possible is the establishment of a data “warehouse.” To illustrate her point, President DePaolo noted that two Regents own car dealerships. They know that to manage their multiple dealerships, they must maintain a very detailed inventory of new cars, used cars, parts, services, repairs, and recalls. Sometimes, they might want to examine that inventory to look at individual components of it, and at other times, they might want to see how those components

connect to each other. Every year, they will want to do an annual review of that inventory and examine trends in the inventory. The management of that information is a data warehouse; it is essentially a system to promote easier access to all the information. For the University System, a data warehouse would provide management of data that have to do with fiscal affairs, student affairs, and faculty and how they all interconnect. As part of the data warehouse, the System also needs to develop the kinds of survey instruments that it currently does not have, such as surveys of students, alumni, and employees. Further, the System needs to ensure staff for the data warehouse, particularly at the smaller institutions that do not have the personnel to engage in this kind of ongoing institutional research. There will also be a need for additional staff resources at the Central Office, because management of the data warehouse will be demanding.

President DePaolo stressed that the Board will need to work closely with the Governor's Office to take these next steps to get the work done so that the benchmarking/management review report will continue to have influence in the System. The Board needs to take the report to the next level of implementation of accountability in a consistent, ongoing, and responsible fashion. However, the Board cannot accomplish this without some direct investment of funds and human resources, in fact, \$7.5 million worth of resources. President DePaolo remarked that the timing is right for the development of the data warehouse, because the System previously lacked the capability to have accountability at this level. Now, with PeopleSoft nearly implemented, the University System has all the pieces in place to take it to the next level of accountability. The University System of Georgia is the only university system in the country that has assessed itself as a whole, and Dr. DePaolo said that the Board should be very proud. However, now is the time to add the additional funding to ensure that the benchmarking initiative maintains momentum and that the University System stays in the forefront nationally, both for its product and the way it assesses itself. In closing, she introduced Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes.

Mr. Bowes began with the budget enhancement request, a total of \$42.9 million, which is just under the 3% guideline established by the Governor. However, the University System is also asking a special request for the Accountability Plus initiative at \$7.5 million, for a total of approximately \$50.4 million in enhancements. Mr. Bowes explained that the adjusted appropriation base for fiscal year 2001 is approximately \$1.432 billion. The total budget enhancement request for fiscal year 2001 is \$50.4 million, and the requested fiscal year 2002 appropriation is approximately \$1.482 billion. Mr. Bowes stressed that these are the items covered by the budget formula and special funding initiatives.

Next, Mr. Bowes discussed the "B" unit request. The "B" unit functions and activities are funded as line items in the annual state budget appropriation and include such activities as agricultural extension, cooperative extensions, agricultural experiment stations, the Central Office, and the state public library system. The total increase for fiscal year 2002 is approximately \$6.2 million. Mr. Bowes noted that responsibility for the Office of Public Library Services is a new function for the University System. The proposed budget request for this is approximately \$937,000, which is proposed to increase the per capita support to the public library systems for materials and programs specifically for targeted groups, such as preschoolers, children, and teenagers. Georgia ranks forty-sixth among states in per capita support for books and materials acquisitions, and this request will begin to move Georgia closer to the national average.

Mr. Bowes then addressed the fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget request, which totals approximately \$37.1 million. The first item in the request harkens back to the budget discussions last year in which the University System had an agreement with the Governor for \$24 million as a match against monies that the System institutions voluntarily set aside from their fiscal year 2000 appropriation to be used in the current year to meet their costs. Those dollars bring the System up

to a level that enables it to meet its current enrollment demand, which is rebounding from semester conversion. Technology initiatives and ICAPP had already been addressed by Dr. Papp and Ms. Burriss, respectively. In the supplemental budget request, there are one-time-only expenditures related to these initiatives for equipment and other such purchases. There is also a request in the supplemental budget for the public library system's Public Information Network for Electronic Services ("PINES"), which is an electronic catalog of all materials in 98 participating Georgia libraries that allows sharing of materials across those libraries. This is a request for \$1.6 million to continue the rollout of this integrated circulation system, which, combined with some year 2000 and federal funds, would add another 155 participating libraries. Regarding health insurance costs, Mr. Bowes stated that no firm figure could be provided at this time. Working in concert with Commissioner Russ Toal of the Department of Community Health, the University System agreed to delay until January 1, 2001 the start of its preferred provider organization ("PPO") plan and making benefit changes in the self-insured indemnity plan, which will result in some continuing deficit in the existing healthcare insurance plans for the current six-month period. Mr. Bowes said that it is expected that the implementation of the PPO will cover full costs, and he noted that the Committee on Finance and Business Operations would be discussing insurance premium rate changes later in its Committee meeting. He explained that at this time, there is no firm figure for the deficit, but the staff have been in communications with OPB, and at some future point, when the staff know the magnitude of that deficit, they will be returning to the Board with a recommendation of how much money will need to be added to the supplemental budget request. The last item in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget request is a pilot information technology project. Mr. Bowes reminded the Board that for the past three years, Clayton College & State University and Floyd College have been conducting a pilot project for the University System, which has transformed the technology infrastructure of those institutions and ensured that all students and faculty use laptop technology in their courses. With the aging of that equipment and the burden that the technology fees have placed on students, this part of the supplemental budget request (\$3 million) will complete the pilot phase of the project and allow both institutions to complete their funding obligations and close out the initial phase of the project. Mr. Bowes reiterated that the total fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget request is approximately \$37.1 million, excluding the anticipated healthcare indemnity plan deficit. Next, Mr. Bowes asked the Chancellor to discuss the capital budget request and wrap up the budget presentation.

Chancellor Portch again stressed accountability. He stated that the staff have developed the Accountability Plus request in consultation with Mr. Michael F. Vollmer, Director, Office of Education Accountability. Mr. Vollmer has encouraged the staff to make this request because he is currently occupied with the K-12 accountability system, which by statute has to go into place before the University System's accountability system. The University System is not required to have its first "report card" until December 2002. One of the outcomes of this year's strategic work plan will hopefully be the University System's first run of a benchmarking "report card" to the public. Chancellor Portch noted that the consultants' benchmarking/management review report had grown since the August 2000 Board meeting from 400 pages to 1,000 pages and noted that the public likely does not want a report card that is 1,000 pages long. So, the Board has its work cut out for it in terms of establishing accountability processes and maintaining them long-term.

The Chancellor reminded the Regents that June is the month in which the Regents vote on the five-year rolling capital projects list. Right now, the list is comprised of 24 projects, 8 of which are in design. This type of rolling list allows the Governor and the legislature to see the System's long-term plan. There are also 15 minors projects in the proposed fiscal year 2002 budget, the majority of which the Regents have seen before and 7 of which are in design. The legislature and Governor have decided to only fund equipment in the year in which construction is actually being done, and so, for the projects that were funded last year, the staff are proposing a request of approximately

\$9 million for equipment. There are also four payback projects, one of which is currently in design, and the total cost of those projects would be approximately \$35 million. Chancellor Portch said that this completed the total operating and capital budget request, and he turned the floor over to Chair Yancey.

Chair Yancey thanked the Chancellor and opened the floor for questions.

Regent Jenkins asked President Tedesco how much funding MCG currently receives from NIH.

President Tedesco responded that MCG currently receives approximately \$22 million a year in NIH funding.

Regent Jenkins asked whether that amount has generally been increasing or decreasing.

President Tedesco responded that the funding has been increasing every year for the last six years. He added that the benchmarking data will outline clearly the status of MCG. The synergy of working with UGA will allow for expansion of research at both institutions and will lessen the investment the state has to make. However, the state will have to make an investment if it wants these institutions to achieve the next level of research.

Regent Carter noted that the budget enhancement request totaled approximately \$42.9 million and asked to what amount that would be added.

Chancellor Portch responded that the \$42.9 million reflects a 3% increase over the current fiscal year 2001 operating budget, a budget directive from the Governor's Office. A few of the projects are new, but the majority of them are repeat items.

Dr. Desrocher noted that Appendix III of the Regents' budget request document identifies those projects which are existing special initiatives and shows the current funding levels.

For clarity, Regent Carter reiterated that \$42.9 million was approximately 3% of the current budget.

The Chancellor stressed that it represents 3% of the current budget, excluding the formula and faculty/staff salaries.

Regent Cannestra noted that the eminent scholars program is an outstanding program, but few of the smaller institutions have been able to attract the private funding necessary to participate in the program. He asked whether there is some way the Board could help those institutions raise that funding, because it seems that an eminent scholar at a smaller institution would be more important than one at a larger institution.

Chancellor Portch responded that one of the smaller institutions, Gainesville College, raised enough matching funding last year to have an eminent scholar, because President Martha T. Nesbitt had made it a priority. Regent Jenkins had helped in this effort.

Regent Cannestra reiterated that the Regents should help the smaller institutions.

The Chancellor noted that Dalton State College ("DSC") and Macon State College had done particularly well in this regard.

Regent Canestra stated that he was referring to institutions like Waycross College, which perhaps would not have the potential for investors that some of the other small colleges have.

Regent Jenkins noted that DSC initially convinced the city and the county to contribute.

The Chancellor remarked that this was a very innovative approach.

Regent Harris stated that he was encouraged with the Chancellor's discussion of the revision of the formula budget. He asked whether the budget must be revenue-neutral in ongoing negotiations.

Chancellor Portch stressed that the staff are not in negotiations, but rather conversations. They hope that the formula will be modernized to include a technology factor, an increase in MRR funding, and funding for the increase in enrollment, all of which will generate additional funding.

Regent Harris remarked that this is probably one of the most important aspects of the budget, and he hopes the staff will be successful in this process.

Regent McMillan asked what happened to the SREB payment and the Regents Scholarships that used to be in the budget.

Chancellor Portch replied that the SREB payment is included in the Central Office budget. However, the Regents Scholarship funds were redirected because of a state audit which questioned the need for its continuation since it has now been superseded by the HOPE Scholarship Program.

Regent White asked whether the \$7.5 million allocated for data collection and benchmarking would be a constant figure in future budget proposals or whether it would increase or decrease.

Chancellor Portch responded that elements of that figure would be constant; however, the data warehouse development effort would be a one-time cost. Nonetheless, where technology is concerned, innovation is constant, and along comes another one-time cost. To give some context to the situation, the Chancellor noted that the data warehouse for the K-12 system initially cost approximately \$50 million. The University System has functioning data systems, but they are only adequate for information, not accountability. The benchmarking/management review report stresses investing resources in collecting and maintaining data. There is also the one-time cost of developing surveys as well as the cost of purchasing licensing results for state and national licensing.

Regent Cater noted that there is an approximate \$1.8 million element in the budget for PREP. He asked for an estimate of how much money has been spent on the program to date.

The Chancellor responded that approximately \$10 million in state funds had been spent on PREP. He stressed that the presidents believe this is critical investment.

Regent Carter asked the Chancellor for an estimated timetable for the changing of the formula budget.

Chancellor Portch stated that when he last met with the directors of OPB and LBO, there were some thoughts that this might be accomplished in two to three weeks. He felt certain it would be done before November, because the Governor must complete his budget. So, between now and mid-October is the window of opportunity.

Regent Carter asked whether the formula would be changed for this budget.

The Chancellor replied that he was guardedly optimistic that it might.

Chair Yancey asked whether there were any further questions or comments, and there were none. He then asked for a motion to approve the budget and supplemental budget.

Regent Leebern made the motion, which was variously seconded. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board of Regents approved the fiscal year 2002 operating and capital budget request and the fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget request.

Chair Yancey thanked the Chancellor and budget staff for their hard work in developing the budget request.

Chancellor Portch also thanked the budget staff for their work.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, Chair Yancey adjourned the Committee of the Whole and turned the floor back to Chair White.

Chair White thanked Regent Yancey and the presenters and creators of the budget request. He then welcomed new Regent Timothy J. Shelnut from Augusta, Georgia and noted that Regent Shelnut would be sworn in at the Governor's Office on Wednesday. At approximately 2:20 p.m., he 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, September 13, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Glenn S. White, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair White, were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Kenneth W. Canestra, Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

Chair White reminded the Regents that they would be recessing for the swearing in of Regent Shelnut, when they receive a call from the Governor's Office.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, September 13, 2000 by Regent Joe Frank Harris.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, September 13 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent George M. D. (John) Hunt III had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day. Regent Charles H. Jones was also absent.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW STUDENT ADVISORY COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Chair White asked the Chancellor to make an introduction to the Board.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair White and remarked that it was a pleasure to introduce Mr. Nels Peterson, President of the Student Advisory Council (“SAC”). The Chancellor noted that some Regents might recognize Mr. Peterson, because he was also very active in SAC last year. Mr. Peterson is the second consecutive SAC President who was home-schooled. He is a senior majoring in political science with a minor in economics who plans to attend law school next year. He has worked as a legislative aide for Senator Richard O. Marable (district 52). He was president of the student government association (“SGA”) his freshman year, and his grade point average is 3.97. His Scholastic Aptitude Test (“SAT”) test score was 1500. In addition to being bright, Mr. Peterson is a very mature leader, said the Chancellor. With that, he invited Mr. Peterson to speak to the Regents.

Mr. Peterson stated that it was an honor to come before the Board to share what the students of the University System of Georgia are looking forward to this year. He explained that SAC is the statewide student government, the primary voice for students on a statewide level. Each institution is a member of SAC, and each institution has one vote. There are approximately six conferences a year, which the representatives of the institutions will attend. SAC will vote on resolutions that become the official position of the student body of the University System. Prior to last year, the focus of SAC was primarily internal to SAC as an organization. Last year, the focus became more external. SAC worked with the Board and Central Office to establish a new student fee policy; with the Chancellor’s Office to create a new policy for the HOPE Scholarship Program (“HOPE”) book allowance, which is still being developed; and with the Governor’s Office to expand HOPE to cover students who receive Pell Grants while retaining full tuition and fees coverage. This year, SAC will continue its external focus while adding an internal focus aimed primarily at educating each institution’s SGA on how to implement the different policies that SAC and the Central Office have established in the past year. Some of the issues on which SAC will focus this year include setting priorities for the year, student voter registration issues, sales tax exemption on text books, supporting the University System budget proposal, the benchmarking initiative, and the new student fees policy.

Mr. Peterson noted that there are many other states that look to SAC and how it interacts with the Board of Regents as a model. Florida recently underwent major changes in the structure of its university system. Prior to those changes, there had been a very strong state student association that was heavily funded by the state government, but now Florida’s students are looking to SAC to learn how to operate on a small budget and how to work within their new structure. Also, South Carolina’s students sent delegates to the last SAC conference and are hoping to form their own state student association there. So, SAC is a model for positive interaction between students and the statewide administration. In closing, Mr. Peterson asked whether there were any questions, and there were none.

Chair White thanked Mr. Peterson. He noted that SAC plays a very important role in the System and that the Board appreciates its efforts. He then proceeded to the Committee reports.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, September 12, 2000 at approximately 11:00 a.m. in room 7005. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Vice Chair Connie Cater, and Regent Martin W. NeSmith. Regent Hugh A. Carter, Jr. also attended the Audit

Committee meeting. Chair Wooten reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items, neither of which required action. Those items were as follows:

1. Information Item: Fiscal Year 2001 Audit Plan

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ronald B. Stark presented to the Committee the fiscal year 2001 Systemwide audit plan. The plan delegates which audits will be performed by the State Department of Audits, Board of Regents audit staff, campus-based auditors, and outside auditors. Board of Regents audit staff prioritizes audits based on risk analyses. The areas of concentration for audits include preventive maintenance (a Board of Regents request), data security, compliance on Board approval of gifts, BANNER reconciliation with general ledger (also a Board request), and small campus business office controls.

2. Information Item: Summary of Systemwide Audit Activity

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ronald B. Stark presented to the Committee the results of all Systemwide internal audit activity. A summary of internal audit findings was also presented, which indicated the ranking of each audit, the significance of each audit finding, and the implementation status of audit recommendations. The Committee requested that Mr. Stark determine the reasons for variances from plans at several institutions.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, September 12, 2000 at approximately 2:30 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Kenneth W. Canestra, Connie Cater, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Vice Chair Howell reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed ten items, eight of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Naming of William and Jeanette Maulding Residence Hall, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the Sixth Street Apartments West at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) the “William and Jeanette Maulding Residence Hall.”

Background: William R. Maulding received his degree in industrial management from GIT in 1957. As a Dean’s List student, Mr. Maulding was involved in a variety of student activities, including Phi Kappa Phi, Delta Sigma Phi, IM Society, Management Club, Army ROTC, and ROTC Beta Club. Ms. R. Jeanette Samples, now Mrs. Maulding, received her degree in chemistry from Emory University in 1957.

Mr. Maulding is a retired executive vice president of the former C & S National Bank, now Bank of America. Mrs. Maulding is retired from the Environmental Protection Agency in Atlanta. Mr. and Mrs. Maulding have no children and have chosen to leave their entire estate to the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. as an expression of their love for GIT and in recognition of the quality education GIT continues to provide.

2. Naming of Red Hill Athletic Center, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the athletic center at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College the “Red Hill Athletic Center” in honor of Tennis Coach Red Hill, who retired in 1999 after 34 years of service to the college as the tennis coach.

Background: Mr. Hill was the “winningest” men’s college tennis coach in the United States. He coached in two National Junior College Athletic Association (“NJCAA”) national championships (1984 and 1999).

He was named National Coach of the Year three times. In 34 years of coaching, only 16 of his players have not received a four-year degree. Sixty-nine of his players were selected for All-American status, and 17 of his players have earned doctoral degrees. Mr. Hill was the fourth person ever inducted into NJCAA Men’s Tennis Hall of Fame in 1993. He also received the Achievement in Sports Award from Georgia Sports Hall of Fame. Mr. Hill as instrumental in raising private funds necessary to construct this building.

3. Naming of Alan and Shirley Lorberbaum Liberal Arts Building, Dalton State College

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the liberal arts building at Dalton State College the “Alan and Shirley Lorberbaum Liberal Arts Building” in honor and memory of Alan and Shirley Lorberbaum.

Background: The Lorberbaums established Aladdin Mills in Dalton many years ago. Aladdin Mills has since become part of Mohawk Industries. Their son, Jeff, continues as president of the company. Both senior Lorberbaums were active community supporters, with Shirley especially active in promoting education.

4. Rental Agreement, New Media Institute, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized the continuation of a rental agreement between Humanism Investments, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 4975 square feet of office space located at 110 E. Clayton Street, Athens, Georgia for the period beginning October 1, 2000 and ending June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of \$5,389.58 (\$64,674.96 per year/\$13 per sq. ft. per year) with option to renew for four consecutive one - year terms with rent increasing 3% for each option exercised for the use of the University of Georgia’s New Media Institute.

The Committee stipulated that approval of this rental agreement be contingent upon approval of the New Media Institute that is being considered by the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension.

Background: Comparable rent in the area is \$13 to \$18 per square foot. This rental agreement is necessitated by a lack of suitable space available on campus, the interdisciplinary nature of the New Media Institute, and the need to interact frequently with private technology companies.

Prior to June 30, 2000, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources temporarily authorized this rental agreement for a period of three months. This action was necessary to meet an occupancy deadline and would allow time for full consideration and approval by the Board for any continuation.

The space will be used as office, classroom, and computer laboratory space for the New Media

Institute, an integrative technology program that will collaborate with private technology firms and technology start-up companies.

Operating expenses for janitorial service and electricity are estimated to be \$16,500 per year.

5. Gift of Four Properties From Foundation, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board accepted title to approximately .683 acres of real property known as 505 Tenth Street and 995 McMillan Street, Atlanta, Georgia from the Georgia Tech Foundation Real Estate Holding Corporation for the use and benefit of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) for the use of the Office of Contract Administration and the Georgia Tech Research Corporation.

The Board also accepted title to approximately .094 acres of real property known as 497 Tenth Street, Atlanta, Georgia from the Georgia Tech Foundation Real Estate Holding Corporation for the use and benefit of GIT for parking and future development.

The Board also accepted title to approximately 1.273 acres of real property known as 676 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Georgia from the Georgia Tech Foundation Real Estate Holding Corporation for the use and benefit of GIT for the use of the Advanced Wood Products Laboratory.

The Board also accepted title to approximately 1.001 acres of real property known as 845 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Georgia from the Georgia Tech Foundation Real Estate Holding Corporation for the use and benefit of GIT for the use of the Office of Information Technology.

The legal details involved with accepting these gifts of property will be handled by the Office of the Attorney General.

These gifts of real property are consistent with GIT’s master plan.

505 Tenth Street and 995 McMillan Street

- Constructed in 1985, 505 Tenth Street is a three-story (10,100-gross-square-foot) office building in generally good condition, built on concrete slab-on-grade with exterior concrete masonry unit (“CMU”) walls and a red brick veneer. 995 McMillan Street is a vacant lot.
- The Office of Contract Administration and Georgia Tech Research Corporation have relocated from the Centennial Research Building under leases from the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. to provide additional space in this building for the College of Computing in support of Yamacraw and the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP”).
- Future expansion of the building is planned to accommodate the Office of Contracts and Grants.
- Georgia Tech Research Corporation will lease a portion of this building from the Board.
- An environmental assessment has been completed on the property. Minor groundwater contamination has been identified. Georgia Tech Foundation Real Estate Holding Corporation has requested a “No Further Action” letter from Georgia Environmental Protection Division (“EPD”).

- The appraised value of this property is \$1,975,500.
- The estimated operating expense is \$59,000.

497 Tenth Street

- There are currently no physical improvements on this property. This property will be incorporated with the plans for expansion of facilities at 505 Tenth Street.
- An Environmental Assessment has been completed on the property. Minor Groundwater contamination has been identified. Georgia Tech Foundation Real Estate Holding Corporation has requested a “No Further Action” letter from Georgia EPD.
- The appraised value of the property at 497 Tenth Street is \$86,000.

676 Marietta Street

- Constructed in 1988, the property at 676 Marietta Street consist of a two-story commercial office building (4,000 gross square foot) attached to a one-story high-bay warehouse (12,600 gross square foot). The site has 19 parking spaces and access for truck loading. The building consist of painted CMU and a metal wall panel system. The building is in generally good condition.
- In May 1998, the Board authorized the purchase of property at 1610 Southland Circle, Atlanta, Georgia for the use of the Advanced Wood Products Laboratory, subject to there being no adverse environmental conditions. This acquisition was not consummated due to environmental hazards on the site.
- This facility provides the necessary high-bay area and loading docks for placements of up to ten large-scale wood processing machines on a factory floor layout for the Advanced Wood Products Laboratory, which is located in this facility under a lease from the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc.
- An environmental assessment has been completed on the property and indicates no significant problems.
- The appraised value of the property is \$2,400,000.
- The estimated annual operating expenses for 676 Marietta Street is \$97,940.

845 Marietta Street

- Constructed in 1980, 845 Marietta Street is a CMU standing-seam metal-front building with 4,832 gross square feet of office space and 8,009 gross square feet of warehouse space. The building is in generally good condition. The warehouse space has been converted to additional office space for the Office of Information Technology. There are 31 parking spaces on the property.
- The Office of Information Technology has relocated, under a lease from the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc., from the core of the campus to this location, which is in

proximity to existing Office of Information Technology facilities at 811 Marietta Street.

- An environmental assessment has been completed on the property and indicates no significant problems.
- The appraised value of the property is \$1,650,000.
- The estimated annual operating cost for 845 Marietta Street is \$75,762.

6. Authorization of Project, Library South, Georgia State University

Discussion of this item was held in Executive Session in order that the Committee might discuss potential litigation concerning Georgia State University's ("GSU") Library South Building. The following Committee members voted to go into Executive Session: Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Kenneth W. Cannestra, Connie Cater, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance for the Executive Session were Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers, Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham, GSU's Vice President for Finance & Administration Katherine M. Johnston, GSU's Assistant Vice President for Legal Affairs John Donald Marshall, Jr., 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. When the Committee returned to its regular session, Vice Chair Howell reported that no action was taken in Executive Session. He then asked for a motion to approved this item. Regent Leebern made the motion, which was variously seconded. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Committee approved the emergency project regarding the Library South Building.

Approved: The Board authorized an emergency project to stabilize and repair the brick veneer on the Library South Building with a total project budget of \$3.7 million to be funded partially by residual funds from Board of Regents projects constructed by Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission ("GSFIC") and by Georgia State University ("GSU") major repair and renovation ("MRR") and other funds.

Background: The Library South Building was originally constructed in 1987. The brick veneer on the building is failing, and immediate corrective action is necessary. GSU has conducted appropriate forensic assessments and proposed corrective action for immediate and long-term resolution.

The fiscal year 2002 budget includes this project as a minor capital outlay request. If this minor capital project is funded, use of MRR funds will require that the campus defer MRR projects funded for fiscal year 2001 until such time as replacement funds are approved.

Since this project was approved, the Office of Facilities will begin selection of appropriate professional consultants for the project. The project will follow a "fast-track" process.

7. Resolution, 2000D General Obligation Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia

Approved: The Board adopted a Resolution prepared by the Revenue Division of the Department of Law covering the issuance of 2000D General Obligation ("G.O.") Bonds by the State of Georgia through the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission for use in funding

projects for the University System of Georgia.

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution to cover the sale of 2000D G. O. Bonds for the following project(s):

I-37	Science and Nursing Building Georgia Southern University	\$22,890,000
I-38	Camden Center Coastal Georgia Community College	\$16,700,000
I-39	Russell Library & Information Center Georgia College & State University	\$18,460,000
I-40	Residence Hall Savannah State University	\$13,970,000
I-85	Law Library Renovations Georgia State University	\$4,400,000
I-88	Renovation of Dublin Campus Middle Georgia College	\$1,200,000
	GPTC Stations Georgia Public Television	\$2,800,000
	TOTAL	\$80,420,000

8. Information Item: Fifth Street Corridor Development

President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) presented to the Committee an update on the general plan he first presented at the April 2000 Committee meeting regarding development of the Fifth Street corridor. His presentation included a short video about the project that is also used for the purpose of fund raising. The project will include a continuing education center, a facility to house the Dupree College of Management, a bookstore and other retail outlets, a large parking deck, and, in cooperation with private industry, a hotel. This project will not only provide more facilities space, but will also eliminate the need for some expensive leased facilities. President Clough estimated that the project will cost around \$150 million. Approximately two-thirds of that cost will be borne by revenue streams from continuing education, the hotel, the bookstore, retail, and parking. The remaining one-third will be derived from private resources; fund-raising efforts are currently underway. President Clough noted that \$8 million has already been committed to the project, and he expects that GIT will be able to raise the rest of the money as needed to complete the project. Ideally, GIT would like to build all of the buildings simultaneously, rather than have ongoing construction for a number of years. GIT anticipates breaking ground late next year, but this is contingent on the success of the fund-raising activities. Nonetheless, GIT hopes to complete the project by 2003. GIT has hired Jones Lang LaSalle, a nationally known firm, as its master planner for the project and is in the process of finalizing selection of its master architect.

9. Yamacraw Building Lease

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between The University Financing Foundation, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 200,000 square feet of office space on the north side of Fifth Street between Williams and Spring Street, Atlanta, Georgia for the period beginning September 2000 and ending June 30, 2001 with the option to renew for 22 consecutive one-year periods for the use of the Georgia Institute of Technology. Rent will be \$1 per year until the building is occupied. When occupied, the building's monthly rental will be approximately \$300,000 (\$3,600,000 per year/\$18 per square foot per year) with the rent increasing 3% for each option exercised.

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

A request to rent this space was submitted by the Yamacraw Steering Committee and its Chief Executive Officer, Dr. Jim Foley. The State Department of Administrative Services negotiated the terms of the lease on behalf of the Office of Planning and Budget ("OPB") and Yamacraw.

Renewal of the lease for the year of occupancy is subject to legislative appropriation of the rent amount.

The building will be purpose-built for Yamacraw. The rent rate of \$18 per square foot may be adjusted when the design and program specifications are finalized by December 2000.

Parking for five vehicles will be provided without charge. Additional parking for 495 vehicles will be provided at \$75 per space per month.

If this agreement is terminated after the building is occupied by the Board of Regents but prior to the fifteenth renewal term after the building is occupied, then a premature termination payment will be due to the landlord. This payment would be \$2,829,047.51 during the first renewal term after the building is occupied, decreasing each year to \$250,000 during the tenth to fifteenth renewal terms.

Operating expenses are estimated to be \$1,600,000 per year. The revenue source for both annual rent and operating expenses is an annual appropriation from the state for Yamacraw.

The facility will become the property of the Board of Regents at the end of the financing period.

Background: In fiscal year 2000, \$200,000 was provided to OPB for the purpose of conducting a Yamacraw building siting study and to provide for the programming of the building. The preliminary results of the siting study is that the Fifth Street corridor is the appropriate location. It is currently anticipated that the building will be constructed via the design-build process by a private firm and rented to the state.

10. Information Item: Master Plan, Coastal Georgia Community College

Coastal Georgia Community College ("CGCC") and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the institution. President Dorothy Lord and Mr. David Harper, President of the Atlanta architectural and planning consulting firm of Harper Partners, presented the plan to the Committee. The consultants reviewed the college's enrollment targets, mission statement, strategic plan, academic and support programs, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented options for facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian circulation patterns, and

campus beautification. Based on the consultants' findings, CGCC's master plan recommendations included the following:

- Create appropriate future facilities for the growing academic needs, community outreach activities, and continuing education needs
- Renovate several existing buildings to provide modern teaching facilities
- Upgrade campus utility infrastructure
- Relocate campus roads and parking to create a pedestrian campus core
- Continue to preserve and enhance the campus environment and landscaping

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, September 12, 2000 at approximately 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair James D. Yancey, Vice Chair Connie Cater, and Regents Kenneth W. Cannestra, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Donald M. Leebern, and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Chair Yancey reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed ten items, all of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Fiscal Year 2002 Operating and Capital Budget Request

Approved: The Board of Regents approved the fiscal year 2002 operating and capital budget request. (The budget request document is on file with the Office of Capital Resources.)

This item was considered by the Committee on Business and Finance Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 4 to 15.)

2. Approval of Preferred Provider Organization Plan and Medical/Dental Indemnity Plan Premiums for Calendar Year 2001

Approved: The Board approved the preferred provider organization ("PPO") plan premiums and the medical/dental indemnity plan premiums for the University System of Georgia for calendar year 2001. The plan premiums are on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

Background: The assumptions used by Towers-Perrin in recommending the 2001 premium figures for the respective PPO plan and the medical/dental indemnity plans were as follows:

- New indemnity plan structure, including the addition of a PPO option, effective January 1, 2001;
- Changes to the prescription drug program (See item 7);
- Employee/employer premium cost sharing at 25%/75%;
- Revised actuarial cost factors between employee, employee plus one, and family categories; and

- Proposed rates are sufficient to cover costs for paid claims, administrative fee expenses, and “incurred but not reported” (“IBNR”) reserve adjustments.

In March 2000, the Board of Regents approved a PPO health insurance plan option for University System of Georgia employees, retirees, and dependents, with the implementation date and premium rates to be determined at a later time. The effective date for implementation of the PPO is January 1, 2001, with open enrollment scheduled from October 16 through November 16.

Also in March, the indemnity health plan received a supplemental appropriation of \$33 million to cover the plan deficit for the remainder of fiscal year 2000.

In May 2000, the Board of Regents approved a 17.4% increase in the employer contribution of indemnity plan premiums, effective July 1, 2000. Effective August 1, 2000, the Board approved a 15% increase in the employee contribution of indemnity plan premiums.

3. Approval of the Medical Indemnity and Preferred Provider Organization Administrative Services Contract With BlueCross BlueShield of Georgia

Approved as Amended: The Committee authorized Committee Chair Yancey and Board Vice Chair Howell, in conjunction with Board Chair White, to approve a recommendation from the Chancellor concerning the BlueCross BlueShield administration services contracts for the medical indemnity plan and preferred provider organization (“PPO”) plan before the October Board of Regents meeting in order to ensure continuation of administrative services for the indemnity plan and new service for the PPO plan.

Background: The current cost of administration for the medical indemnity plan is \$12.73 per employee per month. The proposed administrative fee will be applicable to both the medical indemnity plan and the PPO plan. The effective dates of the contract, if approved, will be from January 31 through December 31, 2001.

4. Approval of the Dental Indemnity Plan Administrative Services Contract With BlueCross BlueShield of Georgia

Approved as Amended: The Committee authorized Committee Chair Yancey and Board Vice Chair Howell, in conjunction with Board Chair White, to approve a recommendation from the Chancellor concerning the BlueCross BlueShield administration services contracts for the dental indemnity plan before the October Board of Regents meeting in order to ensure continuation of administrative services for the dental indemnity plan.

Background: The current cost of administration is \$1.65 per employee per month. The effective dates of the contract, if approved, will be from January 31 through December 31, 2001. The employee bears the full cost of dental insurance.

5. Approval of the Magellan Behavioral Health Contract for the Board of Regents Preferred Provider Organization Healthcare Plan

Approved: The Board approved a one-year contract with Magellan Behavioral Health for participants in the Board of Regents preferred provider organization (“PPO”) healthcare plan. The services to be provided include the following:

- Assessment and referral of all inpatient care;
- Assessment and referral for outpatient care;
- Concurrent review and authorization of all inpatient and outpatient care;
- Network discounts;
- Network credentialing and management;
- Intensive case management of high-risk cases;
- Quality improvement oversight and review; and
- Claims authorization interface with a third-party administrator.

The effective date for implementation of this program will be January 1, 2001.

Background: Magellan Behavioral Health will provide utilization review and managed care for individuals who elect to participate in the Board of Regents PPO healthcare plan and who require mental health/substance abuse services.

The 2001 fee proposal for the University System of Georgia will be \$2.152 per employee per month. The fee proposal is identical to the rate submitted to and approved by the State Health Benefits Plan for these services. The fee will be assessed only for those individuals who elect to participate in the PPO. Magellan Behavioral Health has indicated that the proposed fee would remain unchanged for the next two plan years.

The Board of Regents staff agrees with the Department of Community Health's recommendation to amend its current contract between Magellan Behavioral Health and the Division of Public Employee Health to include the aforementioned program for the Board of Regents.

6. Approval of Unicare Renewal Contract

Approved: The Board approved a one-year extension of a contract with Unicare for the following services for the Board of Regents PPO and indemnity medical plans:

- Hospital inpatient pre-certification and case management review services;
- Outpatient surgical and diagnostic review services;
- Disease state management programs for oncology, diabetes, congestive heart failure and asthma;
- Unicare national transplant network access;
- MedCall 24/7 referral and utilization review services; and
- Referral of PPO plan participants to network providers.

The effective date for implementation of these programs will be January 1, 2001.

Background: Services currently provided for the Board of Regents indemnity medical plan by Unicare are limited to hospital inpatient pre-certification and case management review services. Effective January 1, 2001, the additional programs identified above will be added to the System's indemnity and PPO medical benefit plan designs. These programs have generated significant savings for the Department of Community Health's indemnity plan. Similar results are anticipated for the Board of Regents medical indemnity and PPO plans.

The current cost for the Unicare hospital inpatient pre-certification and case management review services is \$3.05 per contract per month. In addition, the University System of Georgia pays a \$150 per case cost for a review of an employee appeal of plan coverage/plan reimbursement. For calendar year 2001, the cost for this service has been reduced to \$1.92 per contract per month.

The \$150 per case cost for review of an employee appeal will be discontinued in calendar year 2001.

The total cost proposal for all services, excluding the Unicare national transplant network, for calendar year 2001 is \$3.82 per contract per month. The proposed 2001 fee proposals for the University System of Georgia are identical to the cost proposals submitted to and approved by the Department of Community Health.

To realize the savings presented in the cost proposal, the Board of Regents staff agrees with the Department of Community Health's recommendation to amend its current contract between Unicare and the Division of Public Employee Health to include the aforementioned programs for the Board of Regents. Annual Unicare program fee increases will be determined by the Department of Community Health.

7. Approval of Board of Regents Participation in the Department of Community Health Contract With Express Scripts, Inc. for a Pharmacy Benefit Management Program

Approved: The Board approved the inclusion of the University System of Georgia and the Board of Regents in a one-year contract between the Department of Community Health and Express Scripts, Inc. for a pharmacy benefit management program. The contract has renewal provisions for three subsequent years. The effective date of implementation for the Board of Regents is January 1, 2001.

Background: In August 2000, the Department of Community Health executed a pharmacy benefit management contract with Express Scripts, Inc. The contract includes pharmacy cost-containment strategies for the Board of Regents indemnity and preferred provider organization ("PPO") plans, the state health benefits indemnity and PPO plans, the state Medicare program, and the state Peachcare children's program.

The administrative fee for both the Board of Regents healthcare plans and the state health benefits healthcare plans are \$.38 per pharmacy electronic claim and \$1.50 per pharmacy paper claim. The Express Scripts, Inc. pharmacy provider network is national in scope and member accessibility. The program ensures University System of Georgia pharmacy rebates that had previously been retained by the vendor. The program includes performance guarantees for all constituent service delivery. Failure to meet performance guarantees will result in liquidated damages against the vendor. One of the performance guarantees is to increase member education and usage of generic drugs. Generic drug costs are substantially less than name brand drug costs.

The pharmacy benefit plan design includes a \$10 generic prescription drug copayment, a \$20 preferred brand prescription drug copayment, and a 20% copayment for non-preferred brand prescription drugs with a minimum member copayment of \$35 and a maximum member copayment of \$75. Members will also be required to pay the difference between the cost of a generic prescription drug and a preferred brand name prescription drug if both are available. This cost would be waived if a preferred brand name prescription drug were mandated by the attending healthcare provider. Towers Perrin has estimated that these plan design features will produce over \$7 million in savings.

8. Approval of Health Maintenance Organization Contracts

Approved: The Board approved a one-year extension of two health maintenance organization

(“HMO”) contracts. The premium rates are on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

Background: The staff recommended that the Board renew two of the four HMO contracts that are currently offered to employees/retirees of the University System of Georgia, which are listed below. The United Healthcare HMO contract and the Prudential HealthCare HMO contract were not recommended for renewal.

- Kaiser – Kaiser requested a 2.1% rate increase for calendar year 2001. The recommended plan for calendar year 2001 includes an increase in physician visit copayments from \$3 to \$5, an increase in prescription drug copayments at Kaiser Permanente Medical Centers from \$3 to \$5, and an increase in prescription drug copayments from \$9 to \$11 at Eckerd Pharmacies. At the beginning of calendar year 2000, there were approximately 4,975 employees/retirees enrolled in the Kaiser HMO.
- BlueChoice – BlueChoice requested a 5.94% rate increase for calendar year 2001. The initial rate increase proposal for calendar year 2001 was 9%. Last year, the Board approved an 8.6% increase. The only plan design change for calendar year 2001 includes an agreement to discontinue the mail order portion of the prescription drug plan. At the beginning of calendar year 2000, there were approximately 1,915 employees/retirees enrolled in the BlueChoice HMO.
- Prudential HealthCare – The Board of Regents staff recommended that the Prudential HealthCare HMO contract not be renewed for calendar year 2001. Prudential Healthcare is not currently accredited by the National Committee on Quality Assurance (“NCQA”). The Board staff was also advised that the Emory University System of Healthcare and its group of physicians will no longer participate in Prudential HealthCare’s provider network effective October 12, 2000. At the beginning of this calendar year, there were approximately 2,146 employees/retirees enrolled in the Prudential HMO.
- United Healthcare - The Board of Regents staff recommended that the United Healthcare HMO contract not be renewed for calendar year 2001. United Healthcare had requested a 30% increase in employee premiums effective January 1, 2001. The proposed annual family premium for calendar year 2001 would be \$9,645. Earlier this year, it was announced that United Healthcare would discontinue offering its local Medicare program next year. At the beginning of this calendar year, there were approximately 1,419 employees/retirees enrolled in the United Healthcare HMO

The Kaiser HMO is a group model HMO, and the BlueChoice HMO is an individual practice association plan.

There will be an employee/employer premium cost-sharing distribution of 25%/75%.

9. 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 corporations:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Department</u>
----------------	--------------	-------------	-------------------

Spectra Precision Software	\$1,385,000	150 copies of Terramodel and Terra Vista Software	Civil and Environmental Engineering Labs
Hewlett-Packard Company	\$ 632,511	Miscellaneous Hardware and Software	Electrical and Computer Engineering - CREST Center
Hewlett-Packard Company	\$ 84,105	Miscellaneous Hardware and Software	Electrical and Computer Engineering
Hewlett-Packard Company	\$ 337,182	Miscellaneous Hardware and Software	Dupree College of Management – Center for Electronic Commerce

Background: Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents. GIT advised the Committee that these items have been appraised at fair market value and there are no material cost implications to be anticipated with the acceptance of these gifts.

10. Acceptance of Gifts for Georgia State University

Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of Georgia State University (“GSU”) gifts-in-kind from the Georgia State University Foundation:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Department</u>
Georgia State Foundation	\$106,510	Audiovisual Units & Exhibit,	For the Mercer Electronics and Special Collections Artifact Display Units
Georgia State Foundation	\$183,843	Miscellaneous Parts for Six Telescopes, Including Vacuum Boxes, Camera System Mounts, Mirrors, Tubing, and Drive Assemblies	For Upgrades to the CHARA Telescopes

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. GSU advised the Committee that there are no material cost implications to be anticipated with the acceptance of these gifts.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, September 12, 2000 at approximately 2:30 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joe Frank Harris, Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and J. Timothy Shelnut. Chair

Harris reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 14 items, 10 of which required action. Additionally, 366 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. Presentation/Update: eCore™

Due to time constraints, this item was continued from the August 2000 Committee Meeting.

Dr. Kris Biesinger, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Advanced Learning Technologies, and Dr. Joan Lord, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Floyd College and Chair of the eCore™ Subcommittee, provided an update on the status of the eCore™ project. Dr. Biesinger reviewed the project's direct link to the Board's technology principles and action items approved in June 1999. While the eCore™ relates directly to principle 2, action item 1, Dr. Biesinger emphasized that the eCore™ addresses many of the other principles as well, including those relating to the development of innovative governance and effective financing structures. The first six eCore™ courses are being offered this fall term. Dr. Lord outlined the composition and role of the eCore™ Subcommittee, giving particular attention to the coordination activities that ensure that the eCore™ curriculum will meet accreditation standards. The entire curriculum adheres to a set of student learning outcomes that have been approved by the Council on General Education, a System committee that approves curriculum recommendations. The faculty at any institution offering credit for these courses must endorse the curriculum. Five institutions within the System have done so and are offering these courses for credit this fall.

Dr. Biesinger concluded the presentation by outlining the standards that have been adopted for the development and delivery of these courses. They include 1) quality - both in terms of the teaching strategies implemented for online teaching as well as in the provision of services to support students at a distance, 2) accessibility - ensuring that as many students as possible can access these courses (platform, connectivity issues, disabilities, software, etc.), 3) scalability - ensuring that the courses products are usable by many faculty, and 4) sustainability - ensuring that the courses are designed in ways that facilitate easy revision and modification. These elements were demonstrated using of one element of an eCore™ U.S. history course as an example.

Background: The educational technology principles and action items adopted by the Board of Regents in June 1999 committed the University System to the integration of technology as a central element of teaching, learning, student services, public service, research, and institutional management. Principle 2 states that the "University System will employ technologies to expand the learning environment ensuring access to information and educational experiences independent of time, location, and physical boundaries for all types of students from undergraduate through life-long learners." One way the System is involved in addressing this principle is to promote and facilitate expanded student access to the core curriculum using asynchronous instruction and the full spectrum of delivery methods and technologies.

2. Presentation/Update: Institutional Progress of Meeting the Regents' Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools

Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Co-Facilitator of the Georgia P-16 Initiative, made a presentation on the University System's institutional progress toward meeting the "Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools." She reported on the inputs, performance, and results of the implementation thus far. With few exceptions, the inputs of the initiative are in place; however, performance is still highly variable across institutions.

The results demonstrate where the initiative needs refinements, such as requirements for high school teachers, new models for preparation of school leaders, dual degree programs in special education and early childhood education, and assessment of impact on student learning in schools at graduation and at the end of a two-year mentoring program. The initiative may also need adjustments to complement the work of the Governor's Education Reform Study Commission.

3. Approval of Major and Degree Designation Changes in Teacher Preparation Programs in Conformance to the "Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools"

Approved as Amended: Upon recommendation of the Committee, the Board approved this item (details below) on the condition that all programs currently being discontinued be revisited because they are broad-field science and social science programs. Between December 2000 and March 2001, the Committee will revisit the broad-field science and social science issue and develop creative approaches for inventive programming that could include, for example, five-year baccalaureate programs, degree waivers, or the introduction of other approaches. The specified time frame will allow the Committee to gather input from the institutions and secure more information concerning the outcomes of the Governor's Education Reform Study Commission.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA 1998 PRINCIPLES AND ACTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATORS FOR THE SCHOOLS

Proposed Changes in Degree Designations and Majors

Background: At the high school level, teachers may be certified in a single discipline (e.g., biology, mathematics, English, etc.) or in (the natural and social sciences) what is called "broad-field" science or "broad-field" social science. A teacher certified in broad-field science may teach biology, chemistry, physics, and earth and space science. A teacher certified in broad-field social science may teach history, political science, geography, and economics. Teachers with broad-field certification in science and social science do not have a major in an academic discipline. Rather, they have a collection of courses in all of the sciences or social sciences included under the broad-field certification.

Program Changes Required: A major focus of the "Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools" (the "Principles") was to increase the content preparation of teachers. For the content preparation of high school teachers, the Principles require the following:

- All candidates must either meet the requirements for a major in the arts and sciences for each subject to be taught

or for broad-field certification in science and social science:

- Meet the requirements for a major in the arts and sciences in one field and at least 12- to 15-semester-hour concentrations in each of three other fields included under the broad-field.

Not all System institutions that prepare teachers offer programs leading to teacher certification in broad-field science or in broad-field social science, and some offer programs in the single science and social science disciplines as well as in broad-field science and broad-field social science. Of those that do offer programs in these broad fields, the programs are either still under study or institutions have requested that these programs be discontinued and replaced with major programs

in the single science or social science disciplines.

Approval: Listed on the following pages are the majors that were proposed for discontinuation in preparation programs for high school teachers in the natural and social sciences, new majors or degree designations proposed, and the majors available for high school teachers in the natural and social sciences.

Preparation of High School Teachers in the Natural and Social Sciences

Proposed Majors for Discontinuation and Proposed New Majors and/or Degree Designations

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Proposed Majors for Discontinuation</u>	<u>Proposed New Majors and/or Degree Designations</u>	<u>Total List of Majors Available in Science and Social Science</u>
Augusta State University	-BS w/ Major in Physical Science	-BS w/ Major in Mathematics/Physics	-BS w/ Major in Biology -BS w/ Major in Chemistry -BS w/ Major in Physics -BS w/ Major in Mathematics/Physics -BA w/ Major in History -BA w/ Major in Political Science
Columbus State University	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-General Science -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Political Science -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-General Social Science	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Earth Science	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Biology -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Chemistry -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Earth Science -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-History
Georgia Southern University	-BS Ed w/ Major in Science	-BS Ed w/ Major in Biology -BS Ed w/ Major in Chemistry -BS Ed w/ Major in Physics	-BS Ed w/ Major in Biology -BS Ed w/ Major in Chemistry -BS Ed w/ Major in Physics

State University of West Georgia	-BS Ed in Secondary Education w/ Major in Science	-BS in Biology w/ Secondary Education -BA in Chemistry w/ Secondary Education -BS in Physics w/ Secondary Education -BS in Earth Science w/ Secondary Education	-BS in Biology w/ Secondary Education -BA in Chemistry w/ Secondary Education -BS in Physics w/ Secondary Education -BS in Earth Science w/ Secondary Education
	-BS Ed in Secondary Education w/ Major in Social Science	-BA in Political Science w/ Secondary Education -BS in Economics w/ Secondary Education	-BA in Political Science w/ Secondary Education -BS in Economics w/ Secondary Education -BA in History w/ Secondary Education
Valdosta State University	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Science	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Chemistry -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Earth/Space Science -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Physics	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Chemistry -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Earth/Space Science -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Physics -BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Biology
	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field Social Science	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Political Science	-BS Ed w/ Major in Teaching Field-Political Science -BS Ed w/ Major in History

4. Establishment of a New Dual Major in Interrelated Special Education and Early Childhood Education Within the Existing Master of Education Degree, Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Hugh C. Bailey that Valdosta State University (“VSU”) be authorized to offer a new dual major in interrelated special education and early childhood education within the existing master of education degree (“M.Ed.”), effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: In January 2000, the Office of Academic Affairs invited System institutions to consider development of programs that would lead to dual teacher certification in early childhood education and in special education. This proposal from VSU is in response to that invitation.

The proposal is for a five-year, 156-semester-hour program that culminates in an M.Ed. degree. The program will be an alternative to the existing separate major programs in early childhood education and special education at VSU on the baccalaureate level.

Special education is a term used to refer to the teaching of children with one or more mental,

behavioral, learning, or physical disabilities. The terms, interrelated and cross-categorical special education are used interchangeably to refer to a teacher preparation program that prepares teachers to teach children with all of these disabilities.

Need: Special education is the most critical teacher shortage field in Georgia and in most other states. Teacher “burnout” is a major factor contributing to the shortage in special education. Children in K-12 special education programs are “mainstreamed” to the extent possible; that is, they are assigned to general education classrooms for portions of the day but are pulled out and assigned to special education classrooms when needed. As a result, both general and special education teachers work with special education students. Because of the preponderance of special education children in general education classrooms, particularly in grades pre-K through 5, prospective early childhood teachers would benefit from the increased knowledge in special education they would gain through this proposed program. Graduates of the program would also be certified to teach in special education classrooms, thus alleviating, to some extent, the tremendous shortage of special education teachers in Georgia.

There is an additional reason why a dual major in early childhood education and special education makes sense. Teachers prepared for both general and special education classrooms would be able to move back and forth between the two environments over time, which may lessen burnout and teacher attrition.

Objectives: The objectives of this proposed program are 1) to prepare better early childhood teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities in general education classrooms, 2) to increase the number of teachers prepared to teach in special education classrooms, and 3) to see whether this model helps reduce teacher burnout and attrition of special education teachers in the schools.

Curriculum: This program includes a five-year curriculum. In addition to the undergraduate core curriculum, students will meet all of the requirements of the “Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools,” including two 12-semester-hour concentrations in reading and in mathematics. During the junior year and first semester of their senior year, students will complete three practica in general education classrooms in addition to their coursework. During the second semester of their senior year, students will complete a practicum in a special education classroom that serves only students with disabilities. These practica are designed to help prospective teachers to develop knowledge and skills for general education classrooms, special education classrooms, and linkages between the two. During the fifth year of the program, students will deepen their knowledge and skill levels and complete a full semester of student teaching that is split between general and special education classrooms. Upon completion of the program, students will be recommended for certification in both early childhood education and in special education.

Faculty: Faculty for the program will be drawn from the Early Childhood Education and Special Education Departments within the College of Education.

Enrollment: The faculty members intend to market the program heavily in order to attract significant numbers of students who would be prepared to teach students with disabilities in both general and special education classrooms and thus meet some of the demand in area schools.

Funding: No new state allocation has been requested. The university will redirect resources to

support the program.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2006, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness goals, as indicated in the proposal.

5. Establishment of the Major in Special Education Within the Existing Bachelor of Science in Education Degree, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Thomas Z. Jones that Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU") be authorized to establish the major in special education within the existing bachelor of science in education degree, effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: The Department of Special Education proposes to establish a major in special education with specialization in cross-categorical instruction within the existing bachelor of science in education degree to prepare teachers to teach children and youth who are identified as having one or more disabilities. Special education is a term used to refer to the teaching of children with one or more mental, behavioral, learning, or physical disabilities. The terms interrelated and cross-categorical special education are used interchangeably to refer to a teacher preparation program that prepares teachers to teach children with all of these disabilities. Teachers prepared through this program will teach K-12 students with any of these disabilities who are assigned to special education classrooms for all or part of the school day. The teachers must be prepared to work collaboratively with the general education teachers in whose classrooms special education students are placed for a portion of the school day. Special education teachers must also be able to implement plans for "medically fragile" students, develop individual education plans for each child, and keep parents informed about the progress of their children who are placed in special education classrooms.

Need: Special education ranks at the top of the list of fields with teacher shortages in Georgia. Data from the Georgia Department of Education show that throughout the 1990s, the number of special education students has grown from 101,762 to 147,621. Nationally, between 1982 and 1993, the number of disabled youth age 21 or younger served by federally supported programs has grown to 1.1 million (National Center for Education Statistics). In 1999, the U.S. Department of Education reported over 4,000 full-time special education teaching vacancies and close to 28,000 individuals assigned to teach special education children who were not certified. Teacher shortages in special education are projected to continue to worsen in both Georgia and the nation. In the service region of AASU, area school administrators responded with an "urgent need" for this program. Seventy-five students currently enrolled at AASU have already expressed interest in the program.

Objectives: This program seeks to give teachers the knowledge and skills they need to teach children and youth with one or more disabilities, to collaborate with general education teachers in providing the optimum education for special education children and youth, to understand all of the federal requirements for working with special education students, and to provide parents of children with the special needs and help they need to provide for their children's education.

Curriculum: The program is 120 semester hours (which includes physical education and 3 hours of free electives). The program draws faculty members from the Departments of Special

Education, Mathematics, Criminal Justice, Early Childhood Education, Psychology, Nursing, Physical Therapy, and Education. The program will link with Valdosta State University and Georgia State University for students desiring additional areas of specialized certification in hearing impairment and visual impairment, respectively. The program was developed in accordance with the national standards for special education developed by the Council of Exceptional Children (“CEC”). AASU intends to seek specialized accreditation for this program through the Council of Exceptional Children.

Students will go through the program as a cohort of 30 to 40 members, with one new cohort admitted each year. The program will be administered by the Department of Special Education.

Admission Criteria: Students admitted to the program must meet the following criteria: completion of at least 40 semester hours of university courses with at least a 2.7 grade point average, passing score on the Regents’ Test, passing score on PRAXIS I (one of two examinations required for certification), and completion of at least ten hours of approved volunteer service in an educational setting.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 30, 35, and 40.

Funding: No new state allocation has been requested. The university will redirect resources internally to add one full-time and several part-time faculty members needed to support the program.

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

6. Establishment of the Existing Specialist in Education With a Major in Educational Leadership as an External Program at Georgia Southwestern State University, Albany State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Portia Holmes Shields that Albany State University (“ALSU”) be authorized to establish the existing specialist in education (“Ed.S.”) degree with a major in educational leadership as an external program on the campus of Georgia Southwestern State University (“GSSU”), effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: ALSU has been authorized to offer the Ed.S. degree with a major in educational leadership since 1992. Like all programs that prepare educators in System institutions, this program has been redesigned recently to conform to the Regents’ “Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools.” Rather than duplicate a similar degree program at GSSU, the two universities proposed a cooperative degree program to be offered by ALSU on the campus of GSSU.

Students will go through the program as a cohort and may take courses offered on either campus. A cohort of about ten students is anticipated, with the program scheduled to begin in January 2001. Students must be admitted to the program through ALSU.

The faculty for the program will come from both ALSU and GSSU. GSSU will offer four

courses; ALSU will offer the remainder. Credit hours will accrue to either campus in accordance with the faculty member who teaches the course. The two institutions have signed a memorandum of agreement that spells out the roles and responsibilities of each institution.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 10, 10, and 10. The program will admit students in cohort groups.

Funding: The institution intends to fund the proposed program through institutional redirection.

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

7. Establishment of the Internet Alternative Delivery of the Existing Bachelor of Science Degree in Radiologic Sciences, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Thomas Z. Jones that Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU") be authorized to establish the Internet alternative delivery of the existing bachelor of science degree in radiologic sciences, effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: AASU will offer the existing bachelor of science in radiologic sciences degree via the Internet. The Web site address is <http://www.radsci.armstrong.edu/>. The campus-based degree allows students several curriculum options. However, the Internet-based degree will be restricted to students who currently hold an associate degree or a hospital-based diploma and professional certification in radiologic science. The Internet-based degree is designed to provide an avenue for practitioners to complete a bachelor of science in the field. WebCT and the Internet will be the primary delivery systems. WebCT is an Internet-based course management system supported by the University System of Georgia. The "bridge" program will meet the baccalaureate educational needs of radiography and radiation therapy practitioners.

Need: Baccalaureate education in the radiologic sciences prepare the graduate to assume management positions in advanced imaging areas such as computer tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, mammography, and cardiovascular intervention technology. In fall 1999, the *Summit on Radiologic Sciences and Sonography* reported that out of a 66.3% return rate on a manpower survey, 69.8% indicated there were not enough practitioners available in their local area and 96.2% indicated a shortage in their geographic area. Based on the survey results, there are 1,420 openings available nationwide. A survey was conducted by AASU to determine the need for an online "bridge" program. To date, 201 technologists have indicated that they want to complete an online bachelor of science degree in radiologic science. In addition to the survey, individuals who log onto the department's Web site can fill out questionnaires indicating interest in an online program. To date, 82 individuals have inquired about information concerning an online degree option. In addition to the degree completion program, the online courses meet the continuing education needs of radiographers and radiation therapists in the state. All practitioners are required to earn 24 continuing education units biannually. Academic credit is one opportunity to earn the required units. The University System of Georgia offers two baccalaureate radiologic science programs located at

AASU and the Medical College of Georgia. The proposed program will assist radiographers and radiation therapists in educationally underserved areas of the state to complete a baccalaureate degree and/or enter into advanced clinical areas.

Objectives: The objectives of the radiologic sciences program are to 1) prepare empathetic, competent radiologic science professionals, 2) develop critical thinking practitioners who possess the knowledge and skills to function in a changing healthcare environment and shape practice through research and service, 3) increase professional awareness by developing new entry points for professional practice, and 4) expand the scope of practice in underserved communities.

Curriculum: The proposed online program will use the same curricular and graduation requirements as those that exist for professionally certified students matriculating through the on-campus program. “Bridge” admission requirements include professional certification in radiologic sciences, a minimum grade point average of 2.3 or higher for all college work, regular admission to the university, and completion of prescribed prerequisite courses. Because the “bridge” student holds a professional certification, the internship experiences are focused on advanced practice areas. Graduation requirements include completion of the published curriculum plus written and oral exit examinations. Each track in the program (e.g., radiography and radiation therapy) is accredited by the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology and adheres to its standards including educational outcomes assessment. Students will amass basic knowledge of radiation oncology, radiation physics, clinical patient care, treatment planning, and quality management in radiation therapy.

Delivery of the Program: Learning will take place from the student’s home or work site. Instruction will be provided via the Internet using WebCT. A WebCT student helpdesk has been developed and is staffed by full-time computer information system employees. One radiologic sciences faculty member is providing advisory support through participation on the University System of Georgia’s helpdesk pilot program. Mail deliveries will be used to support the distance courses through videotapes, CD-ROMs, and paper-based information. The program will be offered in collaboration with radiology facilities in the student’s local area that will serve as internship sites for advanced practice. The students will be under the tutelage of clinical staff members who have agreed to supervise advanced practice internships. Prior to accepting a student, a suitable internship site will be confirmed and a clinical affiliation agreement will be developed. For clinical instruction, a visit to each affiliation site will be arranged as necessary. Every semester, the clinical supervisor will be contacted with plans for the student’s activities and an evaluation of the student and the program.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student enrollment will be 16, 18, and 20.

Funding: The university intends to fund the proposed program through institutional redirection. No resources outside those already allocated by the university for online education are requested.

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

8. Establishment of the Master of Science in Crop and Soil Science, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia establish the master of crop and soil science, effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: Technological changes occurring in agriculture in areas such as precision farming, biotechnology, pest management, laboratory analysis, and geographic information systems precipitated the need to establish the master of science in crop and soil science. Crop and soil science agricultural scientists study the chemical, physical, biological, and mineralogical composition of soils as they relate to plant or crop growth. Students in the program will study, among other issues, the responses of soil types to fertilizers, tillage practices, and crop rotation. Graduates of the program may be employed to conduct soil surveys and provide recommendations to farmers and landowners on how to best use land and avoid or remediate erosion. Graduates of the program may also consult with technical personnel involved in construction projects to ensure environmental quality and effective land use.

Need: The Georgia Professional Soil Scientists Association has indicated that there are new certification requirements for soil scientists working in the state as environmental consultants. This certification requires 15 semester hours of coursework in the area of environmental soils. Many consultants have undergraduate degrees in areas that do not have this coursework and would be interested in obtaining a professional master's degree at the same time that requirements are satisfied for professional certification. An article in *Careers in the Environment: Trends and Issues* (1996) states, "Education and training requirements for environmental workers are changing. A technical background is required of most environmentalists. Science and engineering continue to be at the core of 'green' occupations." Support for the program has been garnered from such agencies as the South Central Georgia Gin Company, the Georgia Plant Food Educational Society, Traylor Chemical & Supply Co., Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, and the Franklin, Lamar, Walker, and Jackson County Cooperative Extension Services.

Objectives: The objective of the program is to provide advanced training beyond the undergraduate level for students seeking jobs outside of academe in the area of crop and soil sciences. Emphasis will be placed on advanced training in the basic sciences to prepare students for the following: 1) an in-depth understanding of the scientific principles underlying crop and soil science; 2) critical evaluation of research relevant to problem solving; 3) effective communication with farmers, managers, scientists, professionals, and the public; 4) competency in electronic communications and technology; 5) understanding of the ethical and legal perspectives of agricultural and environmental activities; 6) understanding of global developments in sustainable agriculture, biotechnology, and environmental sciences; and 7) an understanding of basic business and economic principles.

Curriculum: The program will consist of a minimum of 33 semester hours of coursework, including three hours of internship or special problem. The internship or special problem will be designed to provide students with experience in research and problem solving. For example, county agents enrolling in this program might spend the internship working a summer with an extension specialist, commercial consultant, or researcher. In addition to the internship or special problem course, students will be required to take one graduate course in technology, one graduate course in statistics, and a total of three graduate courses from two or more core-knowledge areas in soil or crop sciences. Students will also be required to complete a graduate seminar course for developing communication skills. Students will take courses in

such areas as soil physics, hydrology, soil fertility, crop ecology, plant nutrition, soil mineralogy, insect/plant interactions, crop production and management, and the physiology of herbicide action.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 7, 11, and 15.

Funding: The university intends to fully fund the proposed program through campus fiscal redirection.

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

9. Conversion of the Existing Doctor of Education Program to a Doctor of Philosophy Program in Recreation and Leisure Studies, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to offer a doctor of philosophy ("Ph.D.") program in recreation and leisure studies to replace the existing doctor of education ("Ed.D.") program in this field, effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: UGA proposed to convert the Ed.D. program in recreation and leisure studies to a Ph.D. program. The degree inscription will be "doctor of philosophy in recreation and leisure studies." The major objective of the program is to prepare scholars capable of independent and original research and effective university instruction. Over the years, the requirements for the Ed.D. have become very similar to those of the Ph.D. At the time the Ed.D. was originally approved (1969), establishing a Ph.D. program was not an option. The change in degree for the major is a more accurate reflection of current emphases in this program and will make the program more competitive with similar programs at other research universities.

Need: There are currently 430 undergraduate programs in the field of recreation and leisure studies. These programs prepare graduates for positions as public recreation directors, recreation therapists, park managers, recreation program coordinators, outdoor recreation leaders, etc. There is an increasing demand and expectation for professionalism in these roles, and most of the positions in the field now have academic pathways for professional certification. Related to this pattern is the expectation that university faculty who prepare individuals for careers in recreation and leisure studies have a sophisticated understanding of leisure behavior and leisure service delivery. Thus, the 19 doctoral programs in the field emphasize scholarly research on these subjects. Of those 19 programs (18 in the United States and one in Canada), all but UGA offer the Ph.D.

Because of the growing interest in the field of recreation and leisure studies, numbers of undergraduates continue to grow. In a recent nationwide survey of student projections and faculty needs in the field, close to 30% of the respondents reported difficulty finding enough faculty members for programs in recreation and leisure studies. There are 12 students in the current Ed.D. program at UGA in various stages of completion. The marketplace for faculty in this field is now predominantly for Ph.D.s, reducing the marketability of UGA Ed.D. graduates in these fields.

Objectives: The objectives of the program are 1) to generate knowledge about the nature of leisure behavior; 2) to determine the impact of recreation and leisure activity and services on communities, on the environment, and on society; 3) to enhance understanding of the factors necessary for the effective management of leisure services and resources; and 4) to apply knowledge about recreation and leisure studies to issues and problems facing the state, nation, and world.

Curriculum: The curriculum will consist of three strands of courses, plus the dissertation. The courses include at least 12 semester hours on leisure theory and research, 12 semester hours in statistics and research methodology, and 9 semester hours in a correlated area that reflects the student's area of interest. A faculty advisory committee will work with each student to plan the program of study. The committee must approve the program, arrange for comprehensive examinations, approve the subject of the dissertation, and approve the student's defense of his/her research.

Faculty: The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies within the College of Education will administer the program. There are five faculty members in the department who will work with students in the doctoral program. All have established research records. They all serve on editorial boards and hold, or have held, positions of responsibility in professional associations.

Projected Enrollment: It is estimated that three to five new students will be admitted to the proposed program each year.

Funding: No new state allocation has been requested.

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

10. Establishment of the New Media Institute, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") establish the New Media Institute (the "Institute"), effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: The Institute will be an interdisciplinary unit concerned with the commercial, critical, and creative implications of digital media technologies. New media, as a field, explores the connection between digital technologies and the content carried by technology. The Institute will offer courses in new media and collaborate in research and service undertakings with private new media companies and such organizations as the Georgia Research Alliance.

Mission: The Institute will become a teaching, research, and service resource concerned with the commercial, critical, and creative aspects of digital media technologies. The following principles will guide UGA in fulfilling the mission of the Institute:

- Student-Centric: Students will be the focus of all activities of the Institute.

- Interdisciplinary: Faculty and staff from many departments of the university will be involved in all undertakings of the Institute.
- Inclusive: Any individual interested in studying and learning about new media may participate in the activities of the Institute.
- Industry-Relevant: The Institute will include representatives of industry in its decision making and will develop new media programming in response to the needs of Georgia's industries.
- Georgia-Focused: The Institute will have a favorable economic impact in the State by preparing students for careers in technology-related fields, providing continuing education for technology professionals and encouraging new media companies to locate in Georgia.

Objectives: The Institute will provide opportunities for instruction, public programming, public service and outreach, partnerships, and new media affiliates. The Institute will offer specialized courses to students in all majors of the university. Concurrently, the Institute will sponsor annual events to share new media productions and application concepts. A New Media Service Bureau will be established to connect students matriculating through new media courses to work with organizations that need guidance in their use of new media. The Institute will offer workshops for professionals in business and in government to promote the implementation of new media technologies. The Institute will partner with the New Media Consortium and the Athens Area New Media Synergy Center to provide growth opportunities for students.

Governance and Funding: The Institute will be established as an independent unit under the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. A board of directors and an advisory board will govern it. Each academic unit participating in the Institute may apply for a seat on the board of directors. The advisory board will consist of new media professionals and executives representing industry, government, nonprofit organizations, and other educational institutions. The institution intends to establish and implement the initiatives of the proposed Institute with allocated funds and external grants.

11. Reestablishment of the Department of Physics, State University of West Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Beheruz N. Sethna of State University of West Georgia ("SUWG") to reestablish the Department of Physics, effective September 13, 2000.

Abstract: The Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of the College, and the Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs have recommended the reestablishment of a Department of Physics. Four years ago, the department was reorganized to become part of the Department of Mathematics/Physics. There were some minor financial benefits at the time.

The primary reason for the change is due to a perceived need for a strategic focus in physics. The success of the current physics faculty to provide that focus and the need for an independent department to recruit and retain physics faculty are considered to be essential to undergraduate research efforts in the sciences.

Currently, five full-time and two part-time faculty members teach courses in the bachelor of

science program with a major in physics at SUWG. An average of 51 students have selected the physics major since 1996. Degrees conferred in the major for the past four years range from four to six students per year. The faculty members and students are involved in a myriad number of projects that consist of research concerning “Voltage-Current Characteristics of Superconducting Bismuth,” “Tunneling in Quantum Mechanics with Transfer Matrices,” understanding the electronic resistivity in metals, analyzing the variability in superconducting transition temperatures, and researching the voltage-current characteristics of superconducting bismuth (2223) in silver tapes.

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

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

Summary of Full-Time Faculty Appointments

<u>System Institutions by Type:</u>	<u>Totals:</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	27
Georgia State University	33
Medical College of Georgia	6
University of Georgia	53
<i>Total Research Universities Appointments</i>	<i>119</i>
Georgia Southern University	25
Valdosta State University	12
<i>Total Regional Universities Appointments</i>	<i>37</i>
Albany State University	4
Armstrong Atlantic State University	5
Augusta State University	3
Clayton College & State University	4
Columbus State University	0
Fort Valley State University	14
Georgia College & State University	5
Georgia Southwestern State University	4
Kennesaw State University	18
North Georgia College & State Univ.	9
Savannah State University	6
Southern Polytechnic State University	1
State University of West Georgia	15
<i>Total State Universities Appointments</i>	<i>88</i>
Dalton State College	2
Macon State College	2
<i>Total State Colleges Appointments</i>	<i>4</i>

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	2
Atlanta Metropolitan College	6
Bainbridge College	0
Coastal Georgia Community College	0
Darton College	2
East Georgia College	4
Floyd College	3
Gainesville College	4
Georgia Perimeter College	21
Gordon College	3
Middle Georgia College	4
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	3

***Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments* 52**

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS 300

Summary of Part-Time Retiree Appointments

<u>System Institutions by Type:</u>	<u>Totals:</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	8
Georgia State University	12
Medical College of Georgia	0
University of Georgia	25

***Total Research Universities Appointments* 45**

Georgia Southern University	2
Valdosta State University	5

***Total Regional Universities Appointments* 7**

Albany State University	0
Armstrong Atlantic State University	0
Augusta State University	0
Clayton College & State University	0
Columbus State University	1
Fort Valley State University	1
Georgia College & State University	0
Georgia Southwestern State University	0
Kennesaw State University	1
North Georgia College & State Univ.	0
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	0

***Total State Universities Appointments* 3**

Dalton State College	1
Macon State College	0

Total State Colleges Appointments **1**

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	0
Atlanta Metropolitan College	0
Bainbridge College	0
Coastal Georgia Community College	0
Darton College	0
East Georgia College	0
Floyd College	0
Gainesville College	2
Georgia Perimeter College	3
Gordon College	0
Middle Georgia College	0
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	0

Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments **5**

TOTAL PART-TIME RETIREE APPOINTMENTS **61**

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ADLER, PHILIP JR.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DUPREE COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 13, 2000.

ENSLOW, PHILIP H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, COLLEGE OF COMPUTING, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 13, 2000.

MULIAK, STANLEY A.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 13, 2000.

TINCHER, WAYNE C.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF TEXTILE AND FIBER ENGINEERING, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 13, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

FROELICH, PHILIP N.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2000, WITH PAY.

HODGES, LARRY: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 16, 2001, WITH PAY.

LIU, SHAW C.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH JULY 31, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BOYKIN, DAVID: REGENTS PROFESSOR EMERITUS, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:

MCGEHEE, LINDA ANN: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 14, 2000.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ABNEY, THOMAS O.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PHYSIOLOGY, MOLECULAR BIOLOGY AND GRADUATE SCHOOL, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSIOLOGY, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

KEMP, VIRGINIA H.: ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITA, PROFESSOR EMERITA OF PARENT CHILD NURSING AND GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF NURSING, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

YAGHMAI, FARIVAR: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL MEDICINE, DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 14, 2000.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

DEBS, PIERRE: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ART, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

FARLOWE, HORACE L.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ART, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

LEGLER, JOHN B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BANKING AND FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND FINANCE, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

NICOLAI, RALF R.: PROFESSOR AND DEPARTMENT HEAD EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC AND SLAVIC LANGUAGES, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

HOWARD, GEORGE E.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

JOHANSEN, WILLIAM R.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ART, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

OLSEN, RICHARD J.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ART, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

RATNAYAKA, SHANTA: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

GANTS, DAVID L.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITH PAY.

HATHAWAY, ROSEMARY MYERS: INSTRUCTOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 15, 2000 THROUGH MAY 14, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

HOLMAN, JILL ANN: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

LEONARD, SAMUEL DAVID: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM MAY 10, 2000 THROUGH DECEMBER 12, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

WHITE, LAWRENCE H.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

ZHANG, GUO-QIANG: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

MURRAY, REBECCA M.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM OCTOBER 17, 2000 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

MCKINNEY, JAMES: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS, ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

GEORGIA COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

YANNEY, DONNA SUE: LIBRARIAN INSTRUCTOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH JULY 31, 2000, WITH PAY.

KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

INGRAM, VIRGINIA C.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM JANUARY 6, 2001 THROUGH MAY 10, 2002, WITHOUT PAY.

KINNICK, KATHERINE N.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM SEPTEMBER 22, 2000 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

MOSELEY, SYLVIA A.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 15, 2000 THROUGH MAY 31, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

FISCHER, ROBERT: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

STONE, ERNEST R.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

TROEMEL, HANS A.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

WESS, ROBERT C.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, HUMANITIES AND TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

DALTON STATE COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

HAY, DAVID F.: VICE PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF ADMISSIONS AND RECORDS, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

OTTINGER, MELVYN L.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND CHAIR EMERITUS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

SPRADLIN, DIANNA SPRAYBERRY: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 15, 2000 THROUGH MAY 11, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

FREEMAN, MARY G.: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF ENGLISH, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

FLOYD COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

WHITLOW, HUBERT H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, LIBRARY, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 12, 2000.

SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

SWILLEY, MONROE F., III: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, DIVISION OF BUSINESS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 15, 2000.

HARRINGTON, TERRY L.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BIOLOGY, DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 15, 2000.

13. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training

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

Georgia State University

Educ. Psychology	2
Georgia Hospital Assoc.	2
Health & Human Services	1R
Kinesiology & Health	6
Nursing	6
Nutrition	1
Physical Therapy	2

Medical College of Georgia

Allied Health	11, 31R
Dentistry	2
Medicine	5, 27R

Hospitals & Clinics	4R
MCG Research	5
Nursing	4, 1R
University of Georgia	
Child & Family Developmt.	2
Communication Sciences	1R
Pharmacy	1, 10R
Recreation & Leisure	3
Social Work	4, 51R
Georgia Southern University	
Family & Consumer Sci.	7
Health & Kinesiology	7
Nursing	3
Recreation & Sport Mgmt.	2
Armstrong Atlantic State University	
Education	3R
Nursing	3
Augusta State University	
Psychology	1
Clayton College & State University	
Health Sciences	5, 1R
Georgia College & State University	
Health Sciences	4
Kennesaw State University	
Nursing	8, 1R
North Georgia College & State University	
Nursing	2, 2R
Physical Therapy	1
Dalton State College	
Health Professions	37R
Coastal Georgia Community College	
Emergency Med. Tech.	1
Nursing	5R
Darton College	
Dental Health	1
Occupational Therapy Asst.	1
Physical Therapy Asst.	2
Floyd College	
Health Professionals	5R

Total

284

R = Renewal

14. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Georgia State University			
Conduct Alpine Psychology Program	Pioneer RESA	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$62,080
Coordinate Georgia Staff Development Council	North Georgia RESA	3/31/00 - 6/30/01	\$55,000
Evaluate Georgia Fatherhood Program	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	6/30/00 - 6/30/01	\$194,271
Monitor traffic volume	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	6/15/00 - 6/31/01	\$33,617
Conduct pre-admission screening program	Georgia Dept. of Community Health	5/15/00 - 11/30/00	\$121,434
University of Georgia			
Conduct state judicial education program	Admin. Office of the Courts	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$475,349
Conduct Empowering Girls for Success	Children and Youth Coordinating Council	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$30,980
Study peanut response to preplant applications	Georgia Commodity Comm. for Peanuts	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$3,000
Study peanut response to row pattern and seeding	“ ” “	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$3,000
Support county agents meeting	“ ” “	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$3,500
Develop curriculum for local government code enforcement officials	Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$30,000

Evaluate Georgia Kindergarten Assessment program	Georgia Dept. of Education	6/26/00 - 6/30/01	\$75,000
Score results Georgia high school graduation tests	Georgia Dept. of Education	6/26/00 - 6/30/01	\$294,000
Provide technical assistance of newborn screening	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	6/20/00 - 6/29/01	\$103,000
Train Georgia's family service case managers	“ ” “	6/30/00 - 6/30/01	\$1,574,960
Conduct workshop for mental illness educators	“ ” “	5/05/00 - 4/30/01	\$5,000
Provide training services	“ ” “	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$216,768
Conduct certification program	“ ” “	7/16/00 - 6/30/01	\$12,825
Coordinate training on violence in workplace	Georgia Emergency Management Agency	2/15/00 - 9/30/00	\$60,000
Assess lead-contaminated hazardous sites	Georgia Environmental Protection Division	5/15/00 - 7/31/00	\$12,000
Provide reapportionment services	Georgia General Assembly	6/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$590,757
Provide legislative services	“ ” “	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$139,349
Provide finance training	Georgia Office of Planning and Budget	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$200,000
Provide training for state	“ ” “	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$250,000
Conduct Police Academy	Georgia Public Safety Training Center	7/1/99 - 7/15/00	\$18,614
Assist with Elections 2000	Georgia Secretary of State	7/01/00 - 6/30/01	\$140,000
Evaluate Georgia Gain and 1996 civil service reform	Georgia State Merit System	5/1/00 - 12/31/00	\$22,500
Assist with recruitment	Georgia Bureau of Investigation	6/1/00 - 10/01/00	\$33,388
Georgia Southern University			
Provide training for adult protective services	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	6/30/00 - 6/30/01	\$143,543
Floyd College			
Provide computer training	Bartow County	7/11/00 - 7/27/00	\$2,400

TOTAL AMOUNT - SEPTEMBER	\$ 4,906,335
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2001 TO DATE	\$ 5,595,218
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 (TO SEPTEMBER)	\$ 11,196,397
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000	\$ 25,106,814

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, September 12, 2000 at approximately 4:00 p.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Juanita P. Baranco, Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins, and Regent Hugh A. Carter, Jr. Chair Baranco reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had nine applications for review. Of these, three were continued, five were denied, and one was remanded to the president. The Committee also recommended for approval an item regarding changes to the standing Committees of the Board of Regents. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

- a. In the matter of Bryan Carr at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was continued.
- b. In the matter of Leonard Smith at Fort Valley State University, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was denied.
- c. In the matter of David Butler at Valdosta State University, concerning housing refund, the application for review was remanded to the president.
- d. In the matter of Richard Chard at Georgia State University, concerning nonrenewal of his contract, the application for review was denied.
- e. In the matter of Beatrice Odoom at Clayton College & State University, concerning dismissal from the Nursing Program, the application for review was denied.
- f. In the matter of Vince Bethel at Georgia State University, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was denied.
- g. In the matter of Joe McCorvey at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning termination of employment, the application for review was denied.
- h. In the matter of thirteen Gordon College faculty members, concerning changes to the faculty handbook, the application for review was continued.
- i. In the matter of Theodore Hill at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning grievance of June 2, 1999, the application for review was continued.

2. Bylaw Amendments: Standing Committees of the Board

Approved: The Board approved two amendments to Bylaw V.3 of the Board's Bylaws, which lists the standing Committees of the Board of Regents. This section was amended to 1) add a standing committee to oversee University System information technology matters and 2) change the name of the Executive Committee to the Executive and Compensation Committee.

Background: The creation of a standing Committee on Information and Instructional Technology was necessitated by the growing number of technological, pedagogical, and financial issues raised by the use of new technologies in higher education.

The renaming of the Board's Executive and Compensation Committee more accurately reflects this Committee's role in making recommendations to the Board regarding the Chancellor's compensation and in reviewing recommendations regarding the compensation of the presidents and the officers of the Board.

Because Bylaw IX requires all Bylaw amendments to be considered for one month, this matter was presented to the Board at its August 2000 meeting and was approved at this meeting.

CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS

After the Committee meeting reports, Chancellor Portch gave his State of the System address, which was as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's the campaign season. In my remarks today, I will follow the lead of the presidential candidates. I promise to be plainspoken, but I will remember that the mic is "on."

Perhaps my plainspokenness is precipitated by just having passed a watershed birthday that prematurely brings you an AARP card. Or perhaps by entering a seventh year as your Chancellor, I feel the itch for even more progress.

I want to do three things today. First, I want to revert to my teaching days and give a series of "highly personal" grades: to the System, to the state, and to the nation. Second, it is important as we begin a new academic year that we remind ourselves: who are our students? It is important to put that human face on the students we seek to serve. Third, I want us to spend some time on a big issue: values. What are our values? What are we doing about promoting our values?

It is important to be honest about both our achievements and our environment. As I looked at these areas, I came up with set of "highly personal" grades — to the System regarding our achievements and to the state and nation reflecting the environment in which we operate.

Let me start with the best marks. I give the System an "A" for effort and progress. In terms of effort, I honestly can give nothing but high marks for the work of faculty, staff, presidents, and Regents. Faculty has gone the extra mile over the past years. They have undertaken curriculum revision, developed new academic programs, and demonstrated a willingness to engage in economic development activities. They have done so with grace and ease. Our faculty deserves an "A" for their hard work. And our staff deserves an "A" for their tremendous support efforts for our academic enterprises. Our presidents receive an "A" for having

shown strong leadership over these years. And the Regents get an “A+” for having demonstrated dedication, determination, and focus.

Beyond the good efforts, which always are nice to see but often don’t mean anything, the System earns an “A” for progress that has been made. Let’s look at one set of data reflecting progress: enrollment. We don’t have final numbers for this fall yet. But I am confident that when the numbers are in, they will show the strongest class academically yet for the System and larger than last year. We continue to get better and bigger, but we must be careful about the order here.

Another key sign of progress is SAT scores. Last year, I noted how the System average SATs for entering freshmen increased: fall 1999 saw a System average of 1016, the first time above the national average. I hope to see these numbers move up again this fall – and expect to see a record number of campuses over 1000 for the incoming class. I expect to see Georgia Southern University and Georgia Southwestern State University — and maybe others — break that 1000 barrier this fall.

Here are just a couple of preliminary highlights: UGA’s fall 2000 freshmen class arrived on campus with – according to an Aug. 15 *Atlanta Constitution* story – “the best academic credentials ever seen.” The average high school GPA for UGA’s freshman class is 3.66; the average SAT is 1203. Georgia Tech had 12 freshmen with perfect SATs (6 of them were from Georgia). Let me provide some perspective: this year, only 17 Georgia students had a perfect score, and there were only 521 nationally to score a perfect 1600.

On the other end, we see another sign of progress: we continue to see a drop in the number of students who arrive on campus needing learning support – from 43.2% in fall 1994 to 30.2% in fall 1999. But this includes both traditional and nontraditional students. Any of us returning to college after a few years out of high school would need a “refresher” course to be ready to do college-level work. I’ve always said the focus of learning support needs to be on our freshmen just out of high school. These new college students should not need remediation. Looking just at new high school graduates entering the System, the drop in the numbers requiring learning support is even more promising: from 38.3% in fall ‘94 to 26.1% in fall ‘99. But these percentages need to go down even further.

Here are some more progress indicators: the percentage of new high school graduates enrolling as first-time freshmen with a full college preparatory curriculum (“CPC”) is up from 76% in fall 1996 to 88% in fall 1999. These are very, very promising trends.

Your policies tied to improving student preparation are working. Higher admissions requirements are having an impact. I thank the students, the parents, the teachers, the counselors, and the schools for heeding our calls for better preparation – but it’s not yet enough.

Finally, a sign of progress: we all love to complain about those annual national rankings, but we like them when they are good to us. So, I’m going to brag on them. *U.S. News & World Report*’s latest list of “top national public universities” has Georgia Tech ranked eighth and UGA twentieth. UGA moved up from twenty-second on last year’s list. Only three other states had two or more institutions in this prestigious list (California had six. Virginia had two. Texas had two. North

Carolina had only one – the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill).

And in the 2001 *Kaplan/Newsweek College Catalog*, Georgia College & State University was cited as a “top university” in two areas: “schools that are academically competitive” and “schools that offer a high level of individual academic attention.”

So I give us an “A” on effort and progress.

The next grade I give is a “B” for progress in implementing our strategic plan. Back in '94 when I became Chancellor, I talked about our “window of opportunity.” The Board adopted a dizzying array of policy directives – most aimed at implementation by 2001. Some of you on the Board were instrumental from the beginning in these policy directives; all of you have been instrumental in continuing their implementation. I have kept track. Several years ago, I put together a “Where We Are” document to gauge our progress. Honestly, at this point – one year out – I would give us a “B” for our efforts and progress. Let me give some examples of why I think we deserve a “B.”

In our admissions policy, we are not where we need to be at this point at all institutions. Some institutions have done extremely well. Last fall, eight institutions saw the freshman SAT average top 1000: Georgia College & State University, Georgia State University, Georgia Tech, Kennesaw State University, North Georgia College & State University, Southern Polytechnic State University, the University of Georgia, and Valdosta State University. Others need to do much work. Quite frankly, some of our institutions have left it to the last year to fully implement new admissions policies.

Mission review – again, some institutions have done well in defining and communicating missions. Georgia College & State University has defined its mission as “Georgia’s liberal arts college.” North Georgia College & State University is known for its military mission as well as its leadership in all programs. Clayton College & State University has done a remarkable job on technology and workforce development. Columbus State University has defined its mission in the areas of music and computer science. Macon State College offers specialized baccalaureates for economic development. But many of our institutions are still struggling to establish distinctiveness. These institutions have to make some tough decisions regarding focus and then articulating and communicating a message of distinctiveness in mission. I want it to be such that whenever you say a specific college’s name in this state, you can immediately rattle off two or three things for which that institution is known.

Our post-tenure review policy is coming to the end of the first cycle of tenured faculty peer review. We have made a good start, but must look for a little more consistency and even more focus on professional development. We need to do an assessment of how it has been implemented. Overall, I am well satisfied with our progress in this area.

In the critical area of collaboration, we have made good progress in initiating new collaborations – between System institutions, with educational partners and with other state agencies, and with the business community. In particular, we have

worked well with the Department of Community Health. Commissioner Russ Toal is over here at the Regents' office as much as I am. And in the years since I became Chancellor, we have witnessed a watershed in terms of our relations with the business community. But I must return to the concern I voiced last year about "turf." I still see a strong tendency to protect turf. There are still too many examples where people seek to create mischief instead of producing results. The issue of turf protection has not disappeared.

Our teacher preparation initiative is now a key part of the Governor's reform agenda. This fall sees the first class in the System's colleges of education who will come under the Board's teacher education "guarantee." When they graduate in spring 2002, they will reflect the new standards we have implemented. The Governor and the news media have a laser focus on the issue of teachers and teacher preparation. We have good support on this area from the Governor's Education Reform Commission. We have received additional multi-million dollar Department of Education grants for our work in this area – among the largest federal grants in nation. We are getting these grants thanks to people being aggressive about securing funding. But there will continue to be teacher shortages. There will continue to be out-of-field teaching. There will continue to be disappointment on Praxis test results. All these factors tell me that the issues of producing both better and more teachers will challenge all of us. It would be easy to do one or the other, but to produce more and better teachers will be an enormous challenge. We are not done with our work on teacher preparation.

Our new study abroad policy said we would have 2% of our students in study abroad programs by 2000. When you passed this policy, those of our students who did study abroad tended to be white, female, and rich – and they tended to go to Europe. With this policy, we wanted to change that. And while the percentage of undergraduate students who studied abroad jumped last year, we are not yet at our goal. We are close – 1.63% (up from .5% when we started and above the national average) – but still not there. And thanks to help from the Coca-Cola and AIFS [American Institute for Foreign Study] Foundations, we have broadened the diversity of students who get a chance to study abroad. Today, we have a more diverse student body studying all over the world, not just in Europe.

In the area of business partnerships, we have made good progress here. GeorgiaHire is a good example. Another area of progress is in the many successful ICAPP [Intellectual Capital Partnership Program] advantage partnerships with major companies, for example: Total Systems in Columbus, Core Management and Computer Logic in Macon, and Checkfree in Atlanta – these are real accomplishments. Our studies to assess workforce needs, our program responses to identified needs in the state for engineering, for information technology workers, and for the North Georgia carpet industry show our flexibility and our nimbleness in meeting state needs. Now, we are a key partner with the Governor in major initiatives such as Yamacraw. We are humming in this area, and it is just beginning.

I am feeling reasonably good about our progress on the strategic plan. I hope by the end of next year to have an "A" in our strategic plan progress, but under a different grading scale right now, I'd give it a "B" or an "I" – incomplete right now. We need a big push this year to turn that "B" into an "A."

While I don't believe in giving a "plus" or "minus" grade, when it comes to the overall performance of the System and our institutions, I have to make an exception. Here I'd guess we earn a "C+." I reserve the right to re-code this grade once we have spent the year on benchmarking. I may be a little harsh on my assessment here. But right now, I will stick with C+. We're within range on most indicators: high on some, low on others, about in the middle of yet more. This grade reflects our aspirations, and frankly I could cheat on this one – we could have a higher grade if I were selective on comparison. I could choose only to compare within the region or to select the institutions with which to compare us. But we don't want to be compared regionally. If we want to improve, to aspire to highest levels of achievement, we must compare ourselves nationally – to the best.

Now, let me move to grades on environment. It is important to remember we don't operate in a vacuum. We operate in a society and in an environment that has many challenges. On culture, I grade a "D." This is not unique to Georgia. We continue – in my mind – to have a pervasive, anti-intellectual culture in this country.

When Sherita Denson, a bright young African-American student at South Atlanta High School, writes an op-ed piece in the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* and describes how she must endure being called a "nerd" and a "loser" to succeed academically, we have a grade D culture.

When a basketball player with a troubled past gets more ink than the number of new freshmen with perfect SATs, we have a grade D culture.

When I see more emotion generated over UGA's weekend football parking than their Rhodes Scholar output, we have a grade D culture.

When we have too many young people who dream of playing in the NFL and NBA – and who have a better chance at winning the Georgia Lottery – we have a grade D culture.

When almost 90% of Georgia eighth graders watch TV two hours or more daily, we have a grade D culture.

When we have a culture where too many school boards spend time debating the need to doctor "evolution" out of science books, rather than focusing on preparing young people to face a technologically and scientifically-oriented society, we have a grade D culture.

When we can come up with the perfect plan to produce talented teachers, but when they graduate they choose the \$80,000 non-teaching job with stock options over the \$25,000 teaching post with long hours and metal detectors, we have a grade D culture.

When the front-page story on most newspapers on Monday was about the firing of Bobby Knight and not on the Mideast peace negotiations or even the presidential race, then we have a grade D culture.

And it is this culture that leads me to my final, failing grade of "F" – for educational

attainment in Georgia.

Let me be clear. “Attainment” simply means how *many* people have how *much* education. It is different from “achievement.” Attainment is raw data – the numbers of people you educate. In that regard (on my grading scale), if you’re in the bottom 20% in the nation, you earn an “F.” If you are in the thirty-fifth to fortieth percentile nationally, that is a failing grade.

I’m not pointing fingers or, if I am, we include ourselves. We’re all culpable.

We get some great students out of some fine schools who’ve been taught by inspiring teachers. It’s just we simply don’t get enough of them, and of those we do get, we don’t graduate enough of them.

Let’s start with high school, because that is the pipeline, not only for the University System, but also for the technical colleges, Georgia’s businesses and continuing education. The public high school graduation rates in Georgia continue to lag the nation in distressing proportion. The most recent reports show 55% compared to 68% nationally. But more disturbing, the public high school graduation rate has dropped; between 1983 and 1996, it dropped almost 6% nationally and almost 11% (10.9%) in Georgia. Only three states did worse on high school graduation rates than Georgia. That’s not progress – that’s failure.

Let’s move on up the pipeline. Georgia continues to lag the nation seriously in its college participation rate. The percentage of persons 25 years old and over enrolled in postsecondary education in fall 1996 (including technical schools) in Georgia was 6.85%, forty-seventh nationally.

And if you are from a low-income family in Georgia, your chances of making it to college are just above 17% (we rank fortieth). If you come from that bottom quartile of family income (below about \$25,000), your chances of earning a bachelor’s degree — compared to those from the highest-income families — are not good. By age 24, only one student in 24 from low-income groups will have a degree, compared to over half of those from top-income families. That is not education equity.

But even looking at overall college completion, Georgia continues to earn a failing grade. The percentage of Georgians 25 years old and over who held a bachelor’s degree or more in 1998 was 21%, thirty-seventh nationally. The U.S. average is 24.4%.

This is a challenge on many levels. Let me give you just one example in my honest assessment today: to date, we have not yet fully realized the potential of our two-year colleges in being a bridge for more students and in increasing the numbers of Georgians with bachelor’s degrees (even though benchmarking shows a stellar performance). They can and should play an even more vital role, and we need to consider some new ways for that to happen.

Partly due to its low educational attainment rates, Georgia continues to be the nation’s largest net importer of workers with a college degree. Between 1989 and 1996, Georgia added 171,506 persons with a bachelor’s degree from other states.

How do we keep Georgia's economy booming? We do it on the backs of imports and not on the backs of those we educate here in Georgia. And as anyone will tell you, it is dangerous to become addicted to imports.

We can't continue to be the number one importer of college degrees. We can't continue to be forty-seventh in the nation in the number of 18- to 22-year-olds in college. I don't give a hoot if we are forty-ninth or fiftieth in the nation in SAT scores. I *do* care that Georgia students don't take the right courses. This is not rocket science. If students don't take the right courses in high school, they won't do well on SATs; they won't do well in college.

Georgia SAT-takers still take fewer college preparatory courses than the national average. For example: only 7% of Georgia SAT-takers have more than four years of math (the national average is 14 percent) and only five percent have four-plus years of science (the national average is 9%). Twenty-six percent of Georgia's SAT-takers had pre-calculus, compared to 44% nationally.

Still another telling point: too often, low-income or minority students are directed into less challenging courses simply because of preconceptions about their ability to succeed academically. I know this. I've been told this. I believe this. How many potential doctors or engineers or computer analysts were nipped in the bud because someone made the decision based on income or race or geography that they couldn't cut it? So, I call again for a single high school diploma, both more rigorous academically and more creatively applied. Let's take the role of decision-making out of the hands of others. So, I call again for every eighth grader to take a real college-prep algebra class. Of all the classes you can take in high school, the one that most determines whether or not you can get out of college is algebra. And it is courses like algebra that – when it comes to academic performance – neutralize the factors of race and income.

If somewhere between 30% and 40% (it depends who is counting) of K-12 students drop out before they complete high school, Georgia *always* will have low educational attainment. If those who remain in K-12 don't take the right courses, Georgia *always* will have low educational attainment. If those who come to us can't and don't graduate, Georgia *always* will have low educational attainment.

And while nationally, about 55% of students complete bachelor's degree programs within six years at the same institution where they first enrolled, in Georgia the rate is 39%. We have got to change this.

Some might argue if we are trying to increase Georgia's educational attainment rates, then stiffening admissions requirements is counterproductive: a paradox. I disagree — strongly. The greatest long-term contribution to the state we can make is to increase the numbers of students who show up at our doors prepared to do college work on day one – it is our duty to play a key role in that. This increases their odds of earning a degree exponentially, rather than flowing through a revolving door. Access without a reasonable chance for success is perpetuating a fraud on our students.

The trend lines are, overall, encouraging, but the pace of improvement is glacial when compared to the volcanic nature of our economy. We need an educational

earthquake if we are going to make it work.

Next year – fall 2001 – is a big date. Our new admissions requirements go into effect. We cannot back off. And we are asked to back off – every day.

I'm frankly shocked that I get calls every week from some superintendents asking me to count keyboarding as a core academic course. While anyone who has received an e-mail from me knows that keyboarding is an essential skill, it is not a key academic skill. This ties back to our anti-intellectual culture. I cannot stress this more strongly – due in part to this culture – the senior year of high school is the most wasted intellectual year in anyone's life. Some call it the "waiting-for-the-prom year."

In Europe, you see a very different attitude. There, senior year is the most intense – very rigorous. In England, I've watched young people anxiously crowding boards to check academic results to see what university they are getting into. And this is in August. In this country, too many high school seniors' main concern is finishing their academic schedule by 11:00 a.m. And then when they arrive at college and discover the higher expectations, they are shocked to find the transition from high school to college so rough.

So when I get those arguments about new admissions policies and what a burden the 16 CPC requirement places on students, I am not moved one whit. The truth is that 16 CPC units – or 18 or 20 – out of 24 leave plenty of room in the schedule for keyboarding and band. Students on block schedules have 32 possible units. Students who start taking algebra and other courses in eighth grade – a move that I'm suggesting – have even more flexibility. Don't let people fool you when they say we are driving out music and other subjects. The only thing we are driving out of high schools with our new admissions requirements is wasted time: nothing else.

This attitude is indicative. We are not performing at the level that is needed. Look at National Assessment of Educational Progress ("NAEP") 1996 performance standards of our fourth and eighth graders in math – the subject proven to be the greatest single predictor of future college success. Georgia falls below the national average on most areas. Just a mental note: on these NAEP scores, when we discuss percentages of students who score below "basic" (what is considered the ground floor for knowledge and comprehension), the higher the number, the worse you do. Whether you look at math scores for fourth or eighth graders, a high percentage of Georgia test-takers score below basic: 47% of fourth graders (compared to 36% nationally) and 49% of eighth graders (compared to 38% nationally) score below basic.

We must challenge our students to more rigorous academic application and higher levels of performance, especially in math and science. In this new economy, math and science are critical. All of our efforts in ICAPP and in Yamacraw and in biotechnology won't be worth *anything* if we don't have the students – and workers – academically prepared to take those jobs throughout the state. Right now, we are masking the fact by importing our workforce. The pipeline is nearly empty. And for the future, it is empty for the high-tech jobs in this state.

And we must accept our part of the responsibility in the preparation of teachers. We

have to be honest about the challenges of ensuring skilled, prepared teachers for our students. We must be determined to put a well-qualified teacher in every classroom. We have to stay committed as a state and nation to the goal of ending out-of-field teaching. It's a call in the wilderness, but I'll call for it again: let's publish the degrees of every teacher teaching a child in this nation. Let every parent know the academic credentials of the teachers who instruct their kids. Our students deserve and expect no less – just as we expect more from them.

So, we will only improve from an “F” if we all pull together. Students, teachers, parents, policy makers, corporate and foundation leaders, college presidents, and faculty must admit our failures and work together on solutions.

Let me now move to my second point: our students. We look at data as public policy makers to help us understand who our students are.

When we went to college, the vast majority of students were male, white, full-time, 18 to 22 years old, and living in a dorm run by the college. That is a tiny minority today of the college students in America. The reality today is that 56% of college students are female and 27% are minorities. Of the 14.5 million college students today in the United States, only 4.7 million – 32% – are 18- to 22-year-old, full-time students. We have to remember that as we set policy and do accountability.

And of those 18-year-olds that are on our campuses this fall, it is interesting to take note of what they know and what they don't. Beloit College produces annual “mindset list” to help professors think about what new students have experienced and never experienced. Here are a few facts from the current list:

- Elvis Presley has always been dead.
- Somebody named George Bush has been on every national ticket, except one, since they were born.
- They have always bought telephones, rather than renting them.
- There have always been automated teller machines for our current students.
- Watergate is as relevant to their lives as the Teapot Dome scandal.
- There has always been a national holiday honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
- Bear Bryant has never coached at Alabama.
- If they remember the night the Berlin Wall fell, they are probably not sure why it was up in the first place.
- They feel more danger from having sex and being in school than from possible nuclear attack.

And these facts from “*The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1999*”:

- Thirty percent felt overwhelmed by all they have to do – which is probably excellent preparation for the rest of their life.
- Seventy three percent are in college to – surprise! – get a better job.
- And very troubling to me – a child of the 60's – only 32% believe that “realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in society.”

And, like most 18-year-olds, they are in the process of establishing an identity: their core values. And as mature leaders, as policy-makers, we should help them develop those values and model them ourselves.

Which brings me to my third point. It's good to stop and restate our values. And I want to do this personally at this point. Our core value remains the same: create a more educated Georgia. This is why I've been so brutally honest today. If we are to achieve this goal, we have to honestly address significant issues that either help or hinder us in our efforts.

And when we talk about this goal, this means education for *all* Georgians. Today's economy demands no less. While reasonable people can and should debate whether we ought to pursue clarity on legal issues related to the admission of minority students, I believe we have a historic obligation to resolve this issue, not just for Georgia, but for the nation. What an example of symmetry it would be for a state that – in the living memory of many people in this room today – spent so much time and resources to deny access to a Charlayne Hunter-Gault should now spend equal time and resources to maintain and ensure full access to public higher education. I would like to think that we are as committed today to that expenditure of resources as we were 39 years ago.

In a recent editorial in the *Macon Telegraph*, Metro Editor Charles Richardson laid out the terrifying racial history of Athens and UGA. This is a history repeated throughout this region. I quote directly from Richardson's editorial: "It is against this historical backdrop that UGA fights for affirmative action. You decide if the school and Athens have an interest in changing its 150-year history of exclusion. You decide if 39 years is enough to make the university and the city a bastion of diversity."

But it would be a tragic mistake if *all* of our efforts rested on the legal outcomes. We are an educational board. We need to make every effort to expand access. We must be aggressive in our pursuit and development of innovative ways to ensure all Georgians have the needed academic preparation to pursue a college education. We must be committed to pursue those academic goals that will one day make moot the issue of race-based admissions policies. That's why our PREP [Post-Secondary Readiness Enrichment Program] program is so important to us.

Something is out of wack when the percentage of non-white male inmates under the age of 21 in Georgia prisons is 73%, yet only 12% of the System's fall '99 freshmen class were non-white males. Despite the rhetoric and the emotion, data cannot be disputed. And the data shows that, overwhelmingly, the playing field is not yet level.

And if we truly believe that diversity has a positive educational value for students – as I do, deeply – this must be a consistently applied philosophy at *all* of our 34 campuses. I am concerned that it is not just our students at UGA who see a campus that doesn't reflect what they will experience in the real world. The same can be said for our students at our historically black colleges and universities – their minority student body still doesn't give the majority of their students a diverse campus experience.

When Georgia holds the distinction of the state that imports the most college-educated workers, the economic imperative to ensure diversity on the campus and in the workplace cannot be ignored. Nor can the changing face of that diversity that increasingly includes Hispanics and others. We cannot afford to rely on other states to meet our workplace needs. We need the brainpower of *all* Georgians. We need to stretch that brainpower, to motivate that brainpower, to push it to its limits. That's why we must stay focused on our goal of creating a more educated Georgia.

When it comes time for us to reinvent our strategic plan – which we must do this year – we will still have an obligation to the state to build a more educated Georgia. Only by laying out our frailties and weaknesses and dealing honestly with the issues will we ever be able to achieve that.

And that's why the coming year will be critical. It leads up to a watershed point in this evolution – fall 2001. This year is our opportunity to examine critically our efforts, to gauge how to move ahead, and to assess how well we are doing as we approach this watershed point.

It will be an intense year for all of us. More than ever before, the state *needs* your leadership. We *must* rise to the challenge of a more educated Georgia for *all* Georgians.

Thank you.

* * * * *

Chancellor Portch received a standing ovation for his address.

Regent McMillan remarked that he would give the Chancellor an A+. He has done masterfully what all Chancellors should do: use their position as a pulpit to articulate directions in education for the state. The Chancellor had articulated a new paradigm, and it is exactly what the state is crying out for, said Regent McMillan. Many people will not agree with all of the points he has made, but the paradigm he has proscribed extends from prekindergarten through college. Georgia needs to begin looking at some of the initiatives the Chancellor has articulated, asserted Regent McMillan. If it does not, he warned, ten years from now, another Chancellor will also be lamenting the “grades” of the state. In closing, Regent McMillan stated that Chancellor Portch is setting the course for education in the state.

Chair White agreed with Regent McMillan and thanked the Chancellor for his blunt, thought-provoking, and challenging words. He said the Chancellor had given the Regents a great deal to think about, and they have a lot of work to do in the coming year.

Regent Cannestra and others expressed an interest in getting copies of the State of the System Address, and Chair White asked Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber to send copies to all of the Regents.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Due to the resignation of Dr. Lindsay Desrochers, Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources and Treasurer to the Board, Chair White made a motion to appoint Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes as Interim Treasurer to the Board with all of the power and authority that position holds. Regent Baranco seconded the motion. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board of Regents appointed Mr. Bowes as Interim Treasurer to the Board.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber thanked Georgia Southern University and President Bruce F. Grube for the art collection displayed in the Board Room and hallways.

Secretary Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, October 10 and Wednesday, October 11, 2000 on the campus of South Georgia College in Douglas, Georgia.

Next, Secretary Weber read a letter from Robert L. Allgood regarding the Chancellor's remarks upon the deaths of his father, Regent Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., and Mrs. Thelma ("T") Allgood.

Chair White noted that the Chancellor had recently turned 50 and that Regent Leebern had also had a birthday. He then turned the floor over to Chancellor Portch for a special presentation.

Chancellor Portch asked Chair White to join him at the podium to present the following resolution to Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Lindsay Ann Desrochers served with distinction as the University System of Georgia's Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources and Treasurer of the Board of Regents from August 1995 until September 2000; and

WHEREAS, this pert, feisty, red-headed "dynamo" championed the System through a \$4 billion budget and 140 major capital outlay projects; and

WHEREAS, her Ph.D. in Political Science from Berkeley and her cogent thinking have challenged Regents, Presidents, Auditors, and Budget Analysts to her point of view and enabled her to "filibuster" her way through any issue; and

WHEREAS, her unstoppable energy and determination and her grasp of the big picture have been instrumental in implementing a Systemwide Financial Information System, creating MCG Health, Inc., and developing comprehensive master planning for thirty-four institutions; and

WHEREAS, throughout her service, her charm has permeated the Board Room and the Central Office and her jaunty appearance has been evident through long-working days and endless meetings; and

WHEREAS, she has served as a role model to many, but particularly to women in the field of higher education,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that we the members of the Board of Regents, her friends and colleagues, wish to express our good wishes to Lindsay Ann Desrochers as she undertakes a new assignment in California; let our admiration, respect, and good wishes be recorded in this resolution as a lasting reminder to Lindsay of our appreciation for her excellent work and a token of our friendship.

ORDERED this 13th day of September, 2000.

s/GLENN S. WHITE
Chair, Board of Regents

s/STEPHEN R. PORTCH
Chancellor, University System of Georgia

After the Chancellor read the resolution, he asked for a motion to adopt it. Regent Leebern made the motion, and Regent Baranco seconded it. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously approved, the Board adopted the resolution. Then, Dr. Desrochers approached the Board.

Dr. Desrochers thanked the Regents for the opportunity to serve them and for the opportunity to tell them how much she had enjoyed serving them. She asked the staff of the Office of Capital Resources to stand. She explained that these are the people who actually do the job and asked for a round of applause. In particular, she thanked Mr. William K. Chatham, Vice Chancellor for Facilities; Mr. William R. Bowes, Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs; Ms. Margaret Taylor, Deputy to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources; and Mr. Ronald B. Stark, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit. Dr. Desrochers then introduced and welcomed a new staff member: Mr. Gerald Vaughan, Assistant Budget Director.

Dr. Desrochers remarked that she was deeply touched by everything the Board had done for her over the years and for their expressions of support, particularly in the last several weeks. She stated that the Regents are a fine group of public servants, the best with whom she has worked. The most important thing, she said, is that the Regents believe that education elevates all. In particular, Dr. Desrochers thanked Regent Leebern, who was Chair of the Board when she was selected to be Senior Vice Chancellor. She said that he understands that a woman can be a lady but still have the character that makes it possible for her to be a leader.

Dr. Desrochers next thanked Chancellor Portch. She said that he is passionate and can engender passion about education, and that is why he is a great leader. She thanked the Chancellor for the opportunity to serve with him. In conclusion, she quoted late President John F. Kennedy who said, "There are three things that are real: God, human folly, and laughter. The first two are beyond comprehension, so we must do what we can with the third." In closing, she presented to the Chancellor a caricature she had drawn of him playing basketball with the Runnin' Regents. She asked him to come forward and receive the framed drawing which read, "To Steve from Lindsay: The Ultimate Coach."

Chancellor Portch thanked Dr. Desrochers.

Chair White thanked Dr. Desrochers. He stated that the Regents would miss her and hope that she will keep in touch.

At approximately 10:30 a.m., Chair White recessed the meeting so the Regents could attend the

swearing-in of Regent Shelnut at the Governor's Office.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Chair White reconvened the meeting at approximately 11:10 a.m. He then convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern thanked Regent White and introduced Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Daniel S. Papp, who would lead the discussion about the benchmarking/management review study and the options of the Board with regard to its work plan for the coming year.

Dr. Papp thanked Chair Leebern. He reminded the Regents that when they were young, the word used to describe something learned and intellectually valuable was *academic*. Now, if something is described as *academic*, the term is irrelevant; it does not have any value. Dr. Papp stated that he hopes that this year's benchmarking effort will make *academic* relevant and valuable again. For the past year, the Board and its consultants have been working on the benchmarking/management review study. Over the course of the past few Board meetings, the benchmarking report was finalized. Dr. Papp reported that the Regents now had the 1,000-page report in front of them. During the course of this year, the Regents will be digging into the depths of the meaning of the data the report presents. There are 31 separate indicators with 7,099 data points. The 31 indicators can be grouped into three categories: 1) academics, 2) financial/administrative, and 3) economic development/research. Within the academic indicators, there are three very broad groupings as well: 1) who our students are, 2) how the University System serves them, and 3) how successful and satisfied they are. The first of those academic indicators has a number of different specific points in it, including enrollment by level and race/ethnicity, percentage of students who are part-time, average standardized test scores, etc. Likewise, the second of the academic indicators also has a number of specific points in it, such as freshman to sophomore retention rates and graduation rates by race/ethnicity. The third academic indicator also had specific points, such as the percentage of entering freshmen who complete associate's degrees or transfer to four-year programs. Dr. Papp noted that the consultants have provided an immense amount of data with a good overview of what that data means, and the Regents will be moving into the depths of it via a work plan the Board would choose later in the meeting. The second major category of indicators is financial/administrative, which includes various subcategories as well, all related to how much the University System spends on educating students and where the funds come from and go to. The third category of indicators, economic development/research, concerns how the University System and its resources, students, and faculty help economic development and research in the state.

Dr. Papp explained that the Board's task is to decide how to look at the different indicators and how to develop an understanding of what they really mean. No single indicator tells the whole story; rather, the indicators are interrelated. For example, at one institution within the University System of Georgia, there is a four-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen of approximately 10%, which is not very good. However, when one considers the fact that 45% of students at that particular institution are part-time students, it sheds a different light on what that 10% means. The six-year graduation rate at the same institution is approximately 26%. Dr. Papp noted that while this university is not alone, that percentage should still be much higher. Still, one needs to understand what the disparate data points mean. Dr. Papp stressed that there are no simple solutions to many of the issues the University System faces without some very complex and unintended consequences. For example, he asked, "What could we do to raise graduation rates?"

He asked whether any of the Regents had an answer.

Regent Cannestra asked why the graduation rates are low. He remarked that the institution must first understand why the rates are low before it can address how to solve the problem.

Dr. Papp responded that Regent Cannestra was correct, and that is what the Regents are going to be doing this year.

Regent Cannestra noted that the reason why the graduation rates are low may actually justify the low rates, making them acceptable. However, if the problem is poor instruction or courses, then the institution will have to address that.

Dr. Papp agreed.

Regent Howell noted that an institution also needs to consider its target graduation rates and by what standards it can measure itself.

Dan Papp responded that this was a very good insight and another of the issues the Board will have to consider. He noted that the data warehouse, which was discussed during the previous day's meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole, will help the Regents and staff get a better understanding of graduation rates, even eight-year graduation rates. In fact, an eight-year graduation rate for an institution that has a very large number of part-time students might be something to consider. The development of the work plan over the course of the year will help the Regents get deeper into such data.

Regent Jenkins asked whether the Regents will consider freshman-to-sophomore retention rates as well as changes in majors, which might play into this.

Dan Papp responded that they will, and he noted that he himself changed majors three times before he graduated from college. He said that sometimes, changing majors is a good thing, if the major is not a good match for the student. However, if students are changing majors because they have not had effective academic advisement, it could be indicative of a flaw in the advisement system.

Regent Carter asked whether a good graduation rate for one institution may not be good for another institution.

Dr. Papp replied that this is very true. He noted that ivy league institutions consider it a disaster if they have a graduation rate of less than 85%. However, they have students who can afford tuition or have scholarships, and of course, they have incredibly selective entrance requirements. The University System wants to raise admissions standards, as it is in the process of doing, but not so high that they are exclusionary. He remarked that the Regents have some very difficult questions like this to examine.

Chair Leebern asked Dr. Papp what is the standard measure of graduation rates.

Dr. Papp responded that the standard measure is the four-year graduation rate.

Chair Leebern noted that if high school graduates were better prepared for college, the retention and graduation rates would improve.

Dr. Papp responded that Governor Barnes is concerned with seamless education and this is exactly why. He then explained that this year's Strategic Planning Committee focus will be the following major issues:

- Which institutions are outside the range?
- Why?
- What can we learn — inside and outside the System — about best practices?
- How else could we improve performance?

Dr. Papp noted that the Board discussions might include presentations of indicator data, identification of outliers, discussions of reasons for outlier status, presentations on best practices from national experts or University System institution representatives, and discussions of necessary further study or possible action items. Dr. Papp explained that there were a couple of options for how to approach the year's work plan. The first option, which he called the "logical" approach, begins with a thorough examination of the academic indicators in October, November, and January. Then, it moves on to the management review report in February, economic development/research indicators in March, and financial/administrative indicators in April. In May, the Board would have a retreat to develop plans for further study and action, and in June, the Board would finalize and approve the action plans. The second option, which Dr. Papp called the "rational" approach, mixes the types of indicators together because they relate to each other and should work very closely together. In the rational approach, the topics for discussion would be as follows:

October -	Who our students are/how states fund higher education
November -	Retention and graduation/financial data
January -	How institutions function/management review
February -	Graduate/professional school, employment, and beyond
March -	Economic development
April -	Research
May -	Board retreat/developing plans for further study and action
June -	Finalize and approve action plans

Dr. Papp said that these are two different options for approaching the large amount of data in the benchmarking/management review report. He asked which of these made better sense to the Regents.

Regent Baranco moved to adopt the rational approach to the work plan. The motion was seconded, and unanimously approved.

Regent McMillan asked whether Dr. Papp will advise the Regents on what portions of the report to read for each meeting.

Dr. Papp replied that the staff will provide to the Regents which pages and indicators are relevant to the particular month's discussion.

Chancellor Portch stated that the data points do not make much sense in isolation without context. So, at each meeting, the staff will extract a group of data and concentrate on just those data that relate to a given topic. Those data will also be included in the Regents' monthly Board meeting materials. He advised that the Regents not read the report from cover to cover because it will not make much sense that way. He also noted that if the 1,000-page reports were too unwieldy for the

Regents to carry, they could be mailed out.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Papp and remarked that he looked forward to this year's strategic planning focus. There being no further business to come before the Committee, he adjourned the Board into its regular session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:30 a.m., Chair White called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair White, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Kenneth W. Cannestra, Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance were Chancellor Stephen R. Portch and Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (Amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 12:10 p.m., Chair White reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m. on September 13, 2000.

Gail S. Weber

s/

Secretary, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia

s/

Glenn S. White
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia