

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
Georgia College & State University
Milledgeville, Georgia
April 17 and 18, 2001**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, April 17 and Wednesday, April 18, 2001 in the Maxwell Student Union Lounge on the campus of Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”). The Chair of the Board, Regent Glenn S. White, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair White, were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, J. Timothy Shelnut, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, April 17 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Juanita P. Baranco and Martin W. NeSmith had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on March 13 and 14, 2001 were unanimously approved as distributed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION ON GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

Chair White noted that this was the first time the Board had held a meeting at Georgia College & State University since 1982 and that the Regents were glad to be there again. He then called upon President Rosemary DePaolo to make a special presentation to the Board.

President DePaolo’s remarks were as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Board of Regents, Chancellor Portch, University System Office staff, visitors, and friends, welcome to Georgia College & State University.

Before anything else, because this is the state’s public liberal arts university, I feel an obligation to quote Shakespeare. You probably know that it has been twenty long years since the Board has held a meeting here, but as the bard said, “...when you seldom come, you wished for come,” and so it gives me great pleasure officially to welcome you back to Milledgeville and Baldwin County and to the historic campus of Georgia College & State University. *All* of us — faculty, staff, and especially students — are so delighted that you chose to have your April board meeting here.

I also want to welcome and recognize some of our local officials who are here supporting us. Will you please stand? We are very grateful for the outstanding

support we receive from our state and locally elected officials. And here in Milledgeville, our officials share with us the knowledge that we have the uncommon opportunity to create a rare town/gown environment that is mutually beneficial.

This university has a long proud history dating back to 1889, when we were founded as the sister institution to the Georgia Institute of Technology. We were a woman's college for 80 years, until the late '60s, when we became co-ed and more regional in focus. Then, in 1996, this Board, along with Chancellor Portch, gave us our sixth new name and a new mission as the state's designated public liberal arts university. This vision on your part was one of the best decisions that has happened to this university since our founding. Let me explain why.

The classic nineteenth century thinker, Cardinal Newman, in his great work, "The Idea of a University" approached the university as an ethical idea, concerned deeply with educating people in rigorous, powerful ways, with the sole purpose of equipping them for effective citizenship. "The practical end," he wrote, "of a university course... is that of training good members of society." And he believed that the most effective education to accomplish this end is a liberal education. As Newman wrote, "A habit of mind is formed which lasts through life, of which the attributes are freedom, equitableness, calmness, moderation, and wisdom." Their instruction, he believed, is dependent on a focus on the individual student.

Now you've probably already noticed that at GCSU, we have a picturesque campus. Chancellor, although this was before my time, I'm told that when you first stepped foot on this campus, you exclaimed, "Now this *looks* like a liberal arts college." And that's important; it's persuasive. But we're also able with complete honesty to tell prospective students and their families that what they see is what they'll get.

This is a transforming place—where each student as an individual, regardless of major, is challenged to develop the habits of mind and heart that distinguish an educated person from one who just "gets a degree." This type of education is intentional. It's a place where students cannot hide, cannot use energies to avoid the experiences and skills and exposures we want them to have.

When our graduates walk into that very first job, we *know* they will bring to it the skills that we've taught them: to think critically, ethically, and analytically; to communicate reasonably and persuasively both orally and in writing; to know how to respect others, to accept responsibility, to understand the complex implications of living in and *leading* a democracy.

Now, it's still early for us in achieving our new liberal arts mission, but this is the dream — to create a kind of education that I believe is close to what Cardinal Newman meant when he referred to the university as an ethical idea.

But I don't want you just to believe me. I have three students here today who want to tell you briefly about their experiences. April Whirley is a junior, a public relations major from Good Hope, Georgia. She will be followed by Clifton Leonard, a sophomore music major from College Park, and Heather Davis, President of the Student Government Association. Heather is from Snellville and is

a graduate history student. She was recently hired as the new Executive Director of Milledgeville Mainstreet/Downtown Development Authority. First, April Whirley. (The students each spoke briefly about their collegiate experiences at GCSU.)

Now you know why I am so passionate about our mission. These young people exemplify the amazing students we are now attracting for our outstanding programs, and when we get them here, we include them in our community and teach them about creating community.

We have developed a theme based on our version of the three 3 Rs – Reason, Respect, and Responsibility, which all of us take great pride in; and the students themselves are making those concepts a living reality, for instance, by deciding to develop their own honor code.

But all of this would not have been possible without stressing quality in everything we do. Here's a quick snapshot of some of our results:

- Over 95% of our freshman class is on HOPE.
- Our SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores have gone up 100 points since we began this mission. The average SAT score for this class is 1050 and rising for next year.
- As of last month, private giving had gone up 200% since we became the state's public liberal arts university. You've made a good investment.

Because of our distinct mission, these exciting students, and our accomplishments, we have sought membership in a national organization called COPLAC, the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges. This is a select group of colleges — 17 currently — around the country, such as the College of Charleston, Mary Washington in Virginia, Truman State in Missouri, St. Mary's College of Maryland — all with distinct public liberal arts missions. We had a recent visit by their representatives, who reviewed everything that we are doing to accomplish this mission. Some of you may recall that when we began implementing this mission, we actually started benchmarking ourselves against these other COPLAC schools. It is my sincere pleasure to announce that my academic vice president and I have been invited to COPLAC's June meeting at Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, where we expect to be officially extended an invitation to join this prestigious organization. After all, it would be awfully rude of them to invite us all the way to Washington state just to turn us down.

There are other very exciting developments in the works. Thanks in great measure to your support, the Governor and General Assembly funded this year a special \$1.5 million allocation for our mission, which will help us lower the student-faculty ratio to 17 to 1. We pledged to raise private money to help support this effort and we have fulfilled our part of the bargain.

You will recall that, thanks to you, the Governor, and the General Assembly, we are about to build a much needed \$20 million library and information technology center. This will triple the size of our existing library. But in order to bring this building to life, it will need something very important — books! Today, I am most honored to announce the largest private gift this university has ever received.

This gift is from the Watson Brown Foundation in the amount of \$3 million dollars. Proceeds from the gift will be used to create a mission-related endowment, and much of it will be focused particularly on improving our library. I sincerely thank the Watson Brown Foundation for this milestone gift for GCSU.

As we continue to recruit and graduate more bright students throughout this state and beyond, I am convinced that GCSU will produce graduates who go on to contribute and create something better than they inherited, and surely, if we believe that improving our society is what education is all about, then we must settle for nothing less.

I have no doubt that a recent editorial by Ed Corson in *The Macon Telegraph* was correct when he described what he called a "Revolution in Milledgeville." I hope that you are able to see it too.

Thank you again for allowing us this wonderful opportunity to serve as your host and for allowing me a chance to address you today. Please let me know if there is anything else we can do for you while you are here.

* * * * *

After President DePaolo's presentation to the Board, Chair White thanked her and the students for their comments. He remarked that it was easy to see President DePaolo's passion, energy level, and accomplishments in her tenure at GCSU and that they were very impressive.

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 called the meeting to order and announced that the topic of this meeting was the fiscal year 2002 budget. He remarked that the budget outcome had been very positive and that, contrary to press reports, the University System had received strong support from the Governor and the General Assembly on its key budget priorities. He thanked all of the Regents for their help in achieving this positive outcome. The members of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations had reviewed the allocations process and principles with the Chancellor and the University System Office budget staff, as well as the tuition and mandatory student fees requests and salary administration policy. The allocations recommendations reflect a very rigorous annual process that is ongoing and does not get any easier, he remarked. Chair Yancey then asked the Regents to hold their questions until the end of the budget presentation.

Chancellor Portch thanked the Regents for their advice and counsel over the past few months. He said that there were some new directions in the budget that had come out of those conversations. The Chancellor would discuss the fiscal year 2002 budget allocations; Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs Daniel S. Papp would discuss salaries and special initiatives; and Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes would discuss tuition and mandatory student fees. Then, they would be ready to respond to any questions. There were four action items that the Board would address as a Committee of the Whole at this meeting: the fiscal year 2002 budget allocations (Item 1, pages 20 to 25), fiscal year 2002 tuition (Item 2, pages 25 to 26),

fiscal year 2002 mandatory student fees (Item 3, page 27), and the salary and wage administration policy (Item 4, page 28).

In talking to a number of Regents over the past several months, the budget staff have concluded that there are some new budget directions that are appropriate for the University System to take, reported the Chancellor. He noted that the System has had a formula budget in place since the early 1980s, and that formula has served the System and the state well. However, the formula is probably approaching the end of its useful life in its current form. There was a major modification in this particular legislative session with which the Committee on Information and Instructional Technology is particularly pleased: the technology factor was permanently built into the funding formula. However, there may be other gaps in the formula that should be addressed over the next several years. The Governor and the Chancellor have had some conversations about this, and they agree that in an era of accountability and quality enhancements, there are some factors that probably need to be built into the formula in the long term. The staff have been working through the formula this year and will probably need to for a bit longer in terms of helping the University System through some of the credit loss it has experienced. The Regents would be learning more about this phenomenon at the Wednesday meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee. Nonetheless, the Chancellor anticipated that the fiscal year 2003 budget will be similar to the fiscal year 2002 formula budget.

For the short term and for the next few years, the University System is in reasonably good shape, explained the Chancellor, but there are some fundamental flaws going forward in the formula. For example, enrollment has grown since the mid-1980s and has largely continued, with the exception of the first year of semester conversion, in which many students graduated early to avoid the transition. Enrollment has stabilized, and the credit loss associated with semester conversion is also recovering.

Chancellor Portch used fiscal year 1990 in comparison with 2000 to illustrate an important point about funding. He noted that in 1990, the University System experienced a peak in acceleration of its growth. However, it was a down year for the average Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") score in the System, which at 950 was below the then national average of 1001. In 2000, the average SAT score in the University System was at an all-time high of 1021, which is now above the national average. The opposite side of the picture was that 1990 was an all-time high with regard to the proportion of University System students requiring remediation. Conversely, 2000 was the all-time low for remediation in the System. In 1990, retention rates were down, while in 2000, they were at an all-time high. The Chancellor explained that the relevance of these matters to the budget is that the funding driven by 1990 enrollment included an approximate \$40 million increase. However, the University System has barely received \$40 million in new budget funds over the last five years taken together. The disconnect, he said, is between quality rewards and growth rewards, because the formula is predominantly driven by growth. In this case, 1990 was a peak of enrollment for less well-prepared students, but it was also a peak of new funding. So, the staff are looking to rethink the formula structure with the Governor, the Office of Planning and Budget, and the legislature as a partnership to address this issue. It will take some time to properly address this concern, but as the Board is introducing its new accountability measures, there should also be a relationship between accountability, performance, and budget. The Chancellor stated that this is a long-term direction that the University System needs to take. While enrollment is obviously the dominant issue, there needs to be an element in the budget formula that rewards performance.

The Chancellor next discussed the budget allocation principles. He noted that the principles have not changed significantly, but he wanted to explain how the allocations are determined, particularly for the benefit of new Regents. The Chancellor stressed that this is not an easy process and that

the institutions often complain that it is unfair, but the System presidents understand that the first principle is to distribute enrollment-related formula funds with consideration to recent enrollment trends (50% based on share of budget and 50% based on three-year enrollment trends). The second principle is to maximize the distribution of funds to institutions, particularly with regard to technology funding. The institutions are where the focus of the budget lies, and the staff tried to maximize the funding allocated directly to them. The third principle is to address key institutional and System priorities within the amount of available funds. Without a great deal of new money, there was a limit to what the staff could do, and there were a few things to which they needed to respond that they were able to accommodate. The fourth principle is one that has been utilized for a number of years, which is to reduce the variation in funding per full-time equivalent (“FTE”) student within 15% of the mean in each sector. Considering economies of scale and different costs for different missions, Chancellor Portch stated, a rule of thumb is that there probably should not be much more variation on a cost per student than about plus or minus 15% of the mean. If institutions are a little above 15% of the mean for their sector, the staff try to make some modest adjustments to their budgets to bring them down. They have also looked to the benchmarking data to form some enhancement teams which have best practices in order to help those institutions that are significantly above 15% of the mean examine their enrollment, recruitment, retention, cost factors, program distribution, etc. This process is something that came out of the benchmarking and management review study that can be very helpful.

The third area the Chancellor discussed was the 2002 tuition recommendations. He explained that this year’s recommendation was a significant departure for the Board of Regents but that it was an outgrowth of benchmarking and Regent encouragement. First of all, he noted that Georgia is a low tuition state with a reasonably high state appropriation. However, low tuition is not evenly distributed across the sectors. The two-year colleges are toward the higher end of their peers’ tuition rates; the state and regional universities are in line with their peers; and the research universities are below their peers in many instances. Although the University System has had a variation in tuition among those sectors, the range of that variation has not been increased significantly over a number of years. Looking at benchmarking and market-driven factors, the staff were recommending no tuition increase at the two-year colleges, which is consistent with the Board’s strategic goals of increasing those institutions as points of access for students, especially geographically bound students. The staff were also recommending a 3% tuition increase at state and regional universities, in line with national averages, and a 5% tuition increase at research universities, where both the peer data and market forces suggest such an increase is appropriate. The final element in the tuition recommendation is that research universities be permitted to request out-of-state tuition rates to move to the level of peer or benchmark public universities. Five years ago, the staff discovered that the University System was subsidizing out-of-state students. At that time, the Board policy was changed such that out-of-state students should pay the full cost of their instruction, and the policy was phased in over the last three years. This recommendation would make a slight modification to that policy which would allow research institutions on the submission of the correct data to phase-in bringing their out-of-state tuition to their peer levels. The Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) has requested and the staff were recommending that it be able to bring its out-of-state tuition up to the market level, because it is currently approximately \$2,000 below the tuition of its benchmark peers. This tuition increase will be phased in over two years. This was being recommended to the Board with the full understanding that GIT will not increase its proportion of out-of-state students along with this change. This change will put the research university out-of-state tuition in the same policy realm as professional programs, where tuition is set based on the market and peer institutions. This represents a significant departure from previous Board practice, but the benchmarking process in particular has led the University System in these new directions. With that, Chancellor Portch called upon Mr. Bowes to continue the presentation.

Mr. Bowes thanked the Chancellor and said that the process of developing the budget allocations was a long one that involved many people. The budget staff had to prepare for meetings with presidents in January and February and then develop a great deal of analysis that went into the figures in the actual budget. He asked the following budget staff members to stand and be recognized for their hard work: Ms. Usha Ramachandran, Interim Budget Director; Mr. Gerald Vaughan, Assistant Budget Director; Ms. Josephine Pearson, Budget Systems Specialist; Susan E. Wright, Budget/ Policy Analyst; and Ms. Sharon R. Duhart, Administrative Coordinator for Fiscal Affairs. Mr. Bowes would be discussing the highlights of the budget allocations. He explained that this was a very good budget with \$1.77 billion in University System appropriations, comprised of three major pieces. The first piece is the money that is generated by the formula and the special funding initiatives, and this piece is \$1.49 billion, most of which will be allocated to the institutions using the formula and allocation principles the Chancellor had just discussed. The second piece goes to the University System "B" units, which include such activities as the agricultural experiment stations, cooperative extension services, the University System Office, and the Georgia Tech Research Institute, among others. Funding for the "B" units is \$267 million, an approximate \$10 million increase, or about 3%, over fiscal year 2001. The third piece is lottery funds of \$8.9 million, which is primarily for technology initiatives. Normally, the University System would also receive an allocation of about \$15 million for its Equipment, Technology, and Construction Trust ("ETACT"), which received funding instead as part of the fiscal year 2001 amended budget. In addition, part of the System's overall budget is comprised of funding raised through the tuition increases which the Chancellor had just discussed. The staff anticipate that fiscal year 2002 tuition revenues will approximate \$457.7 million. Mr. Bowes noted that the fiscal year 2002 state appropriation of \$1.77 billion represents an increase of approximately \$49.1 million, or 2.9%, over fiscal year 2001. Within this increase, there are many pluses and minuses. For example, the University System received funding for new facility maintenance and operations, health insurance, and major repairs and renovation ("MRR"). However, there were also some deductions, primarily one-time-only funds that were received in fiscal year 2001 appropriation but not in the fiscal year 2002 appropriation.

At this meeting, Mr. Bowes and Dr. Papp discussed three key budget elements in the fiscal year 2002 allocation: the technology factor that was added to the formula (\$22.6 million), salary increases (\$65.4 million), and special funding initiatives (\$34.1 million). First, Mr. Bowes discussed the technology factor. He explained that currently, technology initiatives are funded on a line item basis as special funding initiatives in the budget, including Connecting Teachers & Technology, Connecting Students & Services, Georgia Library Learning Online ("GALILEO"), instructional technology, professional development, Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education ("Georgia GLOBE"), Internet connectivity, and the desktop distance learning initiative, totaling \$17.2 million. The new technology factor will allow the Board to take this funding and move it into the permanent funding base. Otherwise, the University System would have to depend on funding for these initiatives on a year-to-year basis, which cannot always be guaranteed. The new funding model also enables the budget staff to reorder and redirect some of the technology funding to take advantage of new opportunities or priorities, which is what the staff did this year. Mr. Bowes explained that the 1.7% of the funding base generates about \$5.4 million in new funds. He reminded the Regents that one of the allocation principles is to maximize the distribution of funds to institutions. Within the current array of technology initiatives, about \$8.3 million had been going to the institutions, some of it for their general use and some for very specific purposes like GALILEO. The staff examined all of the initiatives and considered whether there were opportunities to do some redirection to get more money to the institutions. They did that and found that they could increase the institutional share of the technology funding by about \$1.2 million. So, in fiscal year 2002, instead of \$8.3 million, the staff were recommending that the institutions receive nearly \$9.6 million, an approximate 15% increase in technology funding.

The staff also examined Georgia GLOBE, which was initially established to help the University System create a portal to Web-based education, to do some marketing, and also to do course development, such as e-Core. For fiscal year 2002, the course development that had been done under Georgia GLOBE will be handled directly by the institutions. A third change will be a new kind of implementation for Banner®, the Georgia Banner® Enhanced System Team (“GeorgiaBEST”) project, which was discussed earlier in the day by the Committee on Information and Instructional Technology. Banner® will be standardized and possibly regionalized. The staff were therefore proposing putting \$700,000 to get started on the GeorgiaBEST project. This would also be supplemented with about \$600,000 in one-time-only lottery funding, so that the staff could meet those objectives. In fiscal year 2001, PeachNet received approximately \$3.2 million in appropriations, supplemented by about \$1.5 million in lottery funds. However, PeachNet was one of the top technology priorities for fiscal year 2002 because there is a very critical need to increase the bandwidth of PeachNet in order to ensure the continuation of very important activities, such as GALILEO, distance education programs, and many administrative systems applications. The staff were proposing that a significant portion of the fiscal year 2002 technology appropriation be applied toward supporting PeachNet. Finally, the staff found ways to reduce the cost of other System-level technology initiatives, such as Connecting Teachers & Technology, Connecting Students & Services, and the desktop distance learning initiative, from approximately \$4.2 million to \$3.5 million. In summary, \$22.6 million in appropriations and new funding will be distributed differently than the fiscal year 2001 information technology funding. Then, Mr. Bowes turned the floor over to Dr. Papp, who would be discussing salaries and special funding initiatives.

Dr. Papp explained that the University System was very fortunate to have received a recommendation for an average 4.5% salary increase for faculty and staff. This will go a long way toward helping maintain and perhaps improve the System’s competitiveness in attracting first-rate faculty and staff from throughout the state and around the country. He noted that according to the Southern Regional Education Board (“SREB”) statistics, the University System is currently in fifth place in the Southern region with regard to faculty salaries, and nationally, the System is slightly below average. So, it will be interesting to see how the 4.5% salary increase impacts the System’s overall competitiveness. The salary allocation totals approximately \$65.4 million. Raises will be implemented for faculty at the beginning of fall semester and for staff on October 1, 2001. The raises will be distributed based solely on merit, with the salary increases ranging from 0% to 10%. In very rare instances when an administrator believes an employee’s raise should be above 10%, a special request must be submitted to the University System Office for approval, which is consistent with prior year policies.

Dr. Papp reported that the University System did reasonably well in the fiscal year 2002 budget allocation with regard to special funding initiatives. Special initiatives that are already in place, such as the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP”), Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program (“PREP”), Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”), and the P-16 initiative, are funded for continuation at approximately \$26.8 million. The remainder of the special initiatives funding, which totals approximately \$34 million, constitutes increases to these programs as well as mission-related increases at Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) and Fort Valley State University, an eminent scholar at Dalton State College (“DSC”), and the Accountability Plus initiative. Dr. Papp reminded the Regents that the Accountability Plus initiative is the effort to create a data warehouse for the University System that will allow the System and its institutions to move toward standardization of data sets and interoperability of information across the University System. This will help the System ensure that its data are valid as it moves toward accountability under Governor Barnes’ programs. In closing, Dr. Papp turned the floor back to Mr. Bowes.

Mr. Bowes thanked Dr. Papp. He reiterated the Chancellor's comments on fiscal year 2002 tuition and noted that there is an additional element of the tuition policy that adds \$300 per semester to the tuition at GCSU. He explained that this was related to GCSU's unique mission as the state's only public liberal arts college. At the September 2000 Board meeting as part of its budget proposal process, there were three pieces related to GCSU. First, the institution requested more funding, and it had received \$1.5 million in state appropriations. Secondly, the institution had raised private funding. Thirdly, GCSU was requesting a differential tuition increase, which is part of the tuition request at this meeting. Mr. Bowes explained that overall, the tuition increases the Chancellor had discussed totaled \$0 per semester at two-year colleges, \$28 at regional and state universities, and \$63 at research universities. He mentioned that because of the different missions of DSC and Macon State College, the budget staff were recommending that there be no increase in tuition at the lower division and that the upper-division courses be increased by 3%. There is already a differential in those institutions' tuition rates, and this recommendation reflects that differential. Also included in the tuition recommendations is an implementation of the change in tuition terminology adopted by the Board in January 2001. Mr. Bowes reminded the Regents that they had eliminated the terms matriculation fee and nonresident fee in favor of the terms in-state tuition and out-of-state tuition. This was reflected in the allocation recommendations. The staff were also recommending a limited number of professional program tuition increases. As part of Board policy, institutions can request differential tuition rates for the graduate professional programs, and there were four programs for which the staff were recommending tuition increases. Finally, the staff were recommending that the Board maintain the policy-based differentials between undergraduate and graduate tuition rates and in-state and out-of-state tuition rates, except for the policy change with respect to out-of-state tuition at research universities, which the Chancellor had already discussed.

Next, Mr. Bowes discussed mandatory student fees. He noted that two years ago, the Board started a much more rigorous process in the evaluation of student fees. More documentation is now required from institutions, as well as financial statements justifying the need for student fee increases. This year, the budget staff were making recommendations which would limit increases to critical need based on salary and other cost increases. There are perhaps a few new programs included in those recommendations. The staff also examined the technology fees and were recommending that per semester fees be reduced from \$300 to \$38 at Clayton College & State University and from \$300 to \$75 at Floyd College. He reminded the Regents that part of the strategy of the fiscal year 2001 supplemental budget was to get some funding to help both of those institutions pay off the debt obligation on their information technology projects. A limited amount of supplemental funding was secured, and the staff found other sources of funds to help them pay off this debt. As a result of that effort, the staff feel that it is now time to lower the technology fees at those institutions. The staff were recommending that the current rates at all of the other institutions remain unchanged this year. Mr. Bowes also noted that part of this year's strategy was to review and affirm the new policy requiring student participation in the fee process. Every institution requesting a fee was asked to document their student participation and provide information about the composition of the fee committee. This information was provided by the institutions, and the process worked very well, remarked Mr. Bowes. Finally, part of the student fee strategy was to minimize the impact on HOPE Scholarship Program ("HOPE") funding. With all of the recommendations taken together, the impact on HOPE will be less than \$1 million for fiscal year 2002. The staff were recommending that 18 mandatory student fee requests be approved as submitted and that 21 be approved at reduced levels. Of the total 43 student fee requests submitted, only 4 were not being recommended for approval by the staff. Mr. Bowes then turned the floor back to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Portch stated that this marked the end of the presentation and thanked the Regents for

holding their questions until the end. He asked whether they had any questions or comments at this time.

Regent McMillan remarked that the Chancellor's introductory discussion of the formula budget was excellent and suggests a new paradigm for budget planning.

Chancellor Portch thanked Regent McMillan and said that he had shared this information with the Governor, who had a similar response.

Regent Carter noted that continuing education funds are lumped together with the formula funds when they are allocated to the institutions. He asked what is the possibility of separating them out before they are allocated and what were the benefits and drawbacks of that approach.

Chancellor Portch responded that there would likely be some advantages to separating out continuing education funds with today's increased emphasis on continuing education and lifelong learning. The Chancellor has asked Dr. David M. Morgan, Deputy to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, to examine continuing education very closely, as there are a number of issues that need some attention in this area. The Chancellor remarked that the idea is appealing because it puts continuing education on an entrepreneurial model, meaning the funding would stay with those institutions who have a lot of continuing education business. However, if the University System moves in that direction, the Chancellor would probably recommend that it be phased-in over time, because everything related to the budget formula has a two-year lag. Presidents would need time to change their approach to continuing education planning. First, however, this needs to be examined closely to ensure there will be no unintended consequences. Then, the plan should be phased in so that the rewards actually reflect informed institutional behavior. He asserted that philosophically, this seems like a good direction in which to go, particularly because it seems the University System is underperforming in the area of continuing education.

Regent Carter asked whether all of the institutions shared a similar philosophy as to what constitutes continuing education.

Chancellor Portch responded that this is one of the many aspects of continuing education that Dr. Morgan would be examining in the coming year, but continuing education has not previously been examined at the System level.

Regent Carter asked whether this implied that the Board was looking at a minimum of three years before continuing education is separated out in the formula.

The Chancellor responded that after the Board announces that it is going in a new direction, the presidents will need a year to respond, and then it would take a two-year phase-in. So, the process would take approximately three to four years.

Regent Leebern asked why the health fees at the University of Georgia ("UGA") are so high while the athletic fees are relatively low and whether there were requests this year to change either of these fees.

Chancellor Portch responded that UGA has a full-service health center and a residential campus. So, it provides more services than most other System institutions, and the students have supported having that level of services.

Mr. Bowes agreed that UGA has experienced a fairly recent growth in its health services operation and that the \$3 increase for health services was strongly supported by the students. There was no increase requested for the athletic fee at UGA, which is currently at \$38 per semester.

Regent Leebern asked Ms. Margaret Taylor, Deputy to the Senior Vice Chancellors, whether UGA could develop a cooperative agreement with the Medical College of Georgia to provide some health services.

Ms. Taylor responded that this was something the staff could examine.

Regent Leebern asserted that he would like the staff to consider this possibility.

Ms. Taylor responded that there are advantages to bringing populations together; however, access to services is as important as economics in the matter.

Chancellor Portch stated that this is something the staff can research.

Regent White asked why UGA's athletic fee seems low compared to other System institutions and whether it has to do with the revenue generated by UGA athletics.

Mr. Bowes responded that a few years ago, Coopers & Lybrand performed a study of the University System regarding mandatory student fees, because many Regents were asking these types of questions. The study revealed that the main driver of athletic fees is the number of students participating as well as the amount of revenue generated.

The Chancellor added that Mr. Henry M. Huckaby, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration at UGA was present at the meeting and could comment on this issue.

Mr. Huckaby stated that he chaired the campus committee on mandatory student fees and that a request was made that UGA examine where its athletic fee falls not only among University System institutions but also among other Southeastern Conference ("SEC") institutions. UGA will examine this issue and possibly present a new fee request to the Board next year.

Regent White asked whether the staff are trying to establish a percentage in the budget formula going forward for the technology initiatives.

Chancellor Portch responded that the state, in partnership with the University System, has built into the formula budget a permanent factor for technology.

Regent White asked whether that was the 1.7% presented in the budget document and whether that percentage was permanent.

The Chancellor responded that it was 1.7% for fiscal year 2002 and going forward. However, he stressed that factors can change, and that at some point in time, the factor may need to be increased. It is somewhat similar to the MRR factor, which is set at a certain percentage. He noted that this is a major step forward for the University System budget formula.

Regent Carter remarked that it seems only fair to allocate funds back to the institutions from which they are generated and asked whether the 50-50 setup of the institutional allocation process should be reconsidered to better reflect this.

Chancellor Portch responded that the Board would want to examine this proposition very carefully, because otherwise, it is moving away from the strategic decisions the Board might want to make. The 50-50 approach has only been in place two years and many other models were examined at the time it was adopted. However, at a meeting of the presidents, a broad consensus was reached that this approach would work well for the period while the University System is recovering its credit hours from semester conversion. When the credit hours have been recovered, the 50-50 will have to be reconsidered. So, it is not permanent and will have to be reexamined in the future, but for this particular year, it works well. The Chancellor stressed that the budget formula and appropriations must come out of the strategic plan. The Board had some strategic directions for the institutions and it funded them accordingly. It is important that the Board have the opportunity to give incentives to the institutions in their strategic directions.

Regent Carter agreed that the allocation process should not be 100% driven by the amount of revenues the institutions generate. However, in time, he believes the funding should be more toward the revenue generation.

Chancellor Portch responded that this issue will be revisited once the credit hours are back, possibly within a few years. However, the conditions have not changed dramatically from last year, which is why the staff are largely relying on the same allocation principles. When the conditions do change, it will be interesting to see whether the new budget formula has a performance base as well. How funding is earned at the institutions may change in the future as well. Ultimately, the allocations are considered on a year-to-year basis based on the circumstances of the institutions.

Chair Yancey asked for motion to approve all of the items on the agenda of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations. With motion properly made and seconded, the Board unanimously approved the following four items: the fiscal year 2002 budget allocations (Item 1, pages 20 to 25), fiscal year 2002 tuition (Item 2, pages 25 to 26), fiscal year 2002 mandatory student fees (Item 3, page 27), and the salary and wage administration policy (Item 4, page 28).

The Chancellor thanked Mr. Bowes and the University System Office budget staff for their hard work on the budget allocations. He noted that the staff cannot begin work on the allocations until the end of the legislative session and that they had worked hard to develop these recommendations for the Board's April meeting.

Chair Yancey also thanked the staff as well as the Chancellor, Mr. Bowes, and Dr. Papp for this presentation. Seeing that there were no further questions or comments, Chair Yancey asked for a motion to recess the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. Motion properly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned into its regular session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 2:20 p.m., following the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole, Chair White called for an Executive Session regarding 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 Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, 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. (Ms. Weber was asked to step out of the room for the discussion of her reappointment.) 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.

In Executive Session, the Board unanimously accepted the Chancellor's recommendations that Ms. Weber be reappointed as Secretary to the Board and that Interim Treasurer William R. Bowes be appointed as Treasurer to the Board for fiscal year 2001, per Board of Regents Bylaws IV.8 and IV.9. No action was taken in Executive Session with regard to the reappointment of presidents.

At approximately 2:40 p.m., Chair White reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that, in the Executive Session, the Secretary and Treasurer to the Board had been reappointed. Also in Executive Session, the Board had discussed the reappointment of University System presidents as well as the director of the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, as listed below. Chair White called for a motion to approve in open session all of these actions. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the above-referenced actions.

The approved presidential reappointments were as follows: Michael F. Adams, University of Georgia; Jeremiah J. Ashcroft, East Georgia College; Jacquelyn M. Belcher, Georgia Perimeter College; David A. Bell, Macon State College; William A. Bloodworth, Jr., Augusta State University; Clifford M. Brock, Bainbridge College; Carlton E. Brown, Savannah State University; Frank D. Brown, Columbus State University; James A. Burran, Dalton State College; G. Wayne Clough, Georgia Institute of Technology; Rosemary DePaolo, Georgia College & State University; Bruce F. Grube, Georgia Southern University; Michael L. Hanes, Georgia Southwestern State University; Nathaniel Hansford, North Georgia College & State University; Thomas K. Harden, Clayton College & State University; Edward D. Jackson, Jr., South Georgia College; Thomas Z. Jones, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Dorothy L. Lord, Coastal Georgia Community College; Barbara P. Losty, Waycross College; Martha T. Nesbitt, Gainesville College; Carl V. Patton, Georgia State University; Lisa A. Rossbacher, Southern Polytechnic State University; Beheruz N. Sethna, State University of West Georgia; Portia H. Shields, Albany State University; Betty L. Siegel, Kennesaw State University; Peter J. Sireno, Darton College; Harold E. Wade, Atlanta Metropolitan College; and Richard A. Skinner, Chief Executive Officer of Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education ("Georgia GLOBE"). Presidents Hugh C. Bailey, Valdosta State University, and Oscar L. Prater, Fort Valley State University, were reappointed until such time as new presidents take office at those institutions.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, April 18, 2001 in the Maxwell Student Union Lounge on the campus of Georgia College & State University. 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 Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, April 18 by Mr. Ryan Lesniak, a student at Georgia College & State University.

Chair White thanked Mr. Lesniak for his invocation. He then thanked President Rosemary DePaolo and the Georgia College & State University community for their hospitality the previous

night. He noted that the Jazz Band was extraordinary.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, April 18 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regent Juanita P. Baranco had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

The Committee on Information and Instructional Technology met on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 at approximately 11:15 a.m. in room 130 of the Maxwell Student Union on the campus of Georgia College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Michael J. Coles, and James D. Yancey. Regent Joel O. Wooten was also in attendance. Chair NeSmith reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which did not require action. That item was as follows:

1. Presentation on the Banner® Student Information System

Banner® software was purchased in 1994 for use by the individual institutions to manage their student and financial aid information and processing. This product was selected to replace the individually acquired or written software packages each institution operated. Currently, 31 System institutions are using Banner®, with Georgia State University in the process of implementing the product.

At this meeting, University System Office staff discussed the Georgia Banner® Enhanced System Team (“GeorgiaBEST”) project. The presenters were Dr. Barry A. Fullerton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Services; Ms. Beth P. Brigdon, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enterprise Systems and Services; and Ms. Tonya R. Lam, Senior Advisor, Student Enrollment and Information Services. Their presentation focused on the background, current status, and future plans for Banner® support and utilization throughout the University System. Some of the future deliverables of the GeorgiaBEST project include new electronic student services, a universal set of modifications to Banner®, and standardized processes across the University System.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met as a Committee of the Whole during the meeting of the full Board on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 in the Maxwell Student Union Lounge on the campus of Georgia College & State University. Chair Yancey reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee of the Whole had reviewed four 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 Budget Allocations

Approved: The Board approved the allocation of state appropriations for fiscal year 2002 among the institutions and operating units of the University System of Georgia, which are

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 6 to 16.)

The fiscal year 2002 budget recommendations approved by the Governor and General Assembly are responsive to the strategic priorities of the Board of Regents and the University System's efforts to promote and maintain access and quality. The University System of Georgia can be grateful to the Governor and General Assembly for recognizing the importance of retaining its competitive position with respect to salaries, one of the very critical components of the Board of Regents budget request for fiscal year 2002; for their willingness to address the issue of technology's role in the academic curriculum; and for their attention to many other initiatives that have helped the University System gain national recognition.

The University System also can be grateful for the Governor's commitment to maintain funding levels sufficient to support the University System's current enrollments, which continue to rebound in the wake of semester conversion. In the current fiscal year (2001), the University System had available \$48 million produced through institutional set-asides and matching funds recommended by the Governor and approved by the General Assembly in the fiscal year 2001 amended budget. This one-time-only appropriation and allocation of funds were critically needed by the University System to support its current enrollment demand. The Governor has agreed to seek additional supplemental funding in fiscal year 2002 to augment formula-generated funds, which are based on academic year 1999-2000 enrollments that were still below the pre-semester conversion level. This support is predicated on the University System's willingness to redirect funds to address part of the shortfall while undertaking a comprehensive evaluation of institutional administrative functions with the objective of increasing productivity and reducing cost. This support also assumes that supplemental state appropriations support for the formula will be reduced gradually over the next few years (until 2005), according to a plan that will be developed cooperatively by the Board of Regents and the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and with the approval of the General Assembly.

The Governor's requirement that the University System evaluate its administrative functions as part of his agreement to provide supplemental support for the formula dovetails with the Board's own efforts of the past year. The benchmarking and management review study completed in June 2000 and its subsequent review by the Board during the last year point to opportunities for the University System to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency in terms of both the comparative position of University System institutions to selected peer institutions across the country on academic and financial indicators and the specific administrative functions the study addressed. The principles which underlie these allocation recommendations will help move the System in the directions suggested by that study's findings and will lead to greater efficiencies. However, it is clear that one of the outcomes of the Board's review of the benchmarking and management review study — that each institution should perform a self-evaluation of its operations — must begin immediately. Therefore, it was recommended that a portion of major repair and renovation ("MRR") funds be redirected initially at a level of approximately \$24 million (the same level of savings achieved for fiscal year 2001 and allocated the same way). It was further recommended that a process be initiated at each institution to review administrative operations according to guidelines developed by the University System Office with the goal of reducing the amount of MRR funds that need to be redirected.

The general fund and lottery fund budget approved by the General Assembly for current University System of Georgia operations, including institutions and other organized activities, is \$1.77 billion, a \$49.1 million increase (2.9% increase) over fiscal year 2001 appropriations. This appropriation includes support for the state public library system, which was transferred to the

University System of Georgia last year, and the Georgia Cancer Coalition, which will receive \$6.7 million in tobacco settlement funds to establish new positions and programs. The Governor's Cancer Initiative was established with \$37 million in start-up funds in the fiscal year 2001 amended budget. University System institutions were recommended to receive a total state appropriation allocation of \$1.49 billion, which includes \$34 million in new and continuing allocations for special funding initiatives.

Other organized activities ("B" unit and non-teaching "A" activities), including the Georgia Tech Research Institute, the Agricultural Experiment Station, Cooperative Extension Service, the University System Office, and the state public library system, are recommended to receive \$267 million in state appropriations, an increase of \$10.5 million above current funding levels. Lottery funds comprise a total \$8.97 million in System resources for fiscal year 2002. As occurred last year, lottery funds for the Equipment, Technology, and Construction Trust Fund ("ETACT") are included in the fiscal year 2001 amended budget at a level of \$15 million. Institutions will be required to expend these funds in the current fiscal year but will have until the end of fiscal year 2002 to obtain private matching funds under the requirements established for that program.

Major provisions of the state appropriation budget approved by the Governor and General Assembly for the University System of Georgia are:

- \$65.4 million for a 4.5% merit-based salary increase for faculty and staff, including "A" and "B" unit budgets. Salary increases for staff become effective October 1, 2001, while increases for contract faculty become effective for the fall semester. This increase should assist institutions in remaining competitive regionally and nationally in attracting and retaining high-quality faculty, reversing downward trends of recent years.
- \$5.4 million in new funding for technology as a result of the introduction of a technology factor in the formula. The formula, which had been essentially unchanged since 1982, was revised this year to eliminate outdated elements and recognize the importance of technology in today's delivery of educational services. The technology factor, set at 1.7% of base funding, allows for the transfer of technology-based special funding initiatives to the formula, thus ensuring continuing support for key initiatives. The allocation recommendations proposed a restructuring of funding produced by this change in the formula to address critical bandwidth expansion requirements in the Peachnet network, to provide additional direct support to institutions for technology purposes, and to begin the standardization of student data elements for accountability and reporting purposes.
- A net \$12.2 million for new formula-related costs, including health insurance premiums, new facilities costs, increases for MRR funding, and other salary and fringe benefit costs. MRR funding for fiscal year 2002 will total to \$54.3 million, which will maintain funding at a level representing 1% of total building replacement cost. A reduction in funding for payments to the Teachers Retirement System ("TRS") for University System participants in the Optional Retirement Program ("ORP") is included to reflect a change in policy.

Within the total \$34 million approved for special funding initiatives, the Governor and General Assembly approved \$7.23 million in new funding. The major new items include:

- \$1.1 million to expand the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ("ICAPP") and

develop economic development incentives to Georgia companies seeking highly skilled, college-educated workers.

- \$1.5 million for Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) to help the institution meet its role as the state’s public liberal arts college. State appropriations will be matched by the institution through private fund raising. Additionally, GCSU’s undergraduate tuition rates were recommended to be increased above the general level recommended for regional and four-year institutions to assist the institution in meeting mission-related goals. (See Item 2 below.)
- \$1.15 million, to be matched by internal funding, to establish a biomedical services network as a collaboration between the University of Georgia and the Medical College of Georgia for recognizing, treating, curing, and preventing human disease.
- \$1 million to begin the development of a comprehensive accountability reporting program in cooperation with the Governor’s Office of Educational Accountability to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of University System of Georgia programs. Funds will be used for the initial development of a data warehouse; enhanced support to institutions need for staff to collect, analyze, and manage data; and the development of survey instruments as recommended in the recent benchmarking and management review study.
- \$600,000 to expand the Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program (“PREP”) to support middle and high school students in at-risk situations. Funds will go to institutional programs having the highest percentage of minority students.
- \$375,000 for Fort Valley State University to help the institution meet its federal United States Department of Agriculture match requirement as an 1890 land grant college. Funds will be used to expand research in agriculture.
- \$1 million to provide for additional faculty and operating expenses for the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”) in South Georgia, a collaborative program involving Georgia Southern University, Savannah State University, and Armstrong Atlantic State University.
- \$500,000 to establish an eminent scholar at Dalton State College.

Additionally, the Governor and General Assembly provided \$4.54 million for expansion of Yamacraw. These funds are included in the budget for the Georgia Research Alliance.

Allocation Process and Principles

During January and early February, the senior leadership group and budget staff in the University System Office held regional budget conferences across the state with each institutional president and senior staff. The purpose of the conferences was to share information regarding the Governor’s budget recommendations and General Assembly actions, particularly as they concerned issues relating to the formula, salary increases, and other major System-level priorities. The meetings centered on a few key institutional priorities and issues, institutional enrollment trends, tuition strategy, and mandatory student fee requests. Additionally, consultation regarding allocation issues took place with the Board of Regents Chair and Finance and Business Operations

Committee Chair. The outcome of these conferences has contributed to the development of budget and tuition and fee strategies for fiscal year 2002.

The guiding principles for budget allocations for fiscal year 2002 are as follows:

- To allocate enrollment-related formula funds with consideration to recent enrollment trends:

Enrollment trends and institutional enrollment related to targets are key factors in the allocations. The allocation methodology is based upon 50% of enrollment trends for the last three years and 50% share of the budget. This methodology, which was first used last year with a broad consensus from University System presidents, balances the impact of reduced enrollments on funding across the University System.

- To reduce variances in the appropriations allocations per FTE student for each category of institutions within a range 15% above or below the mean:

The recent benchmarking and management review study highlighted not only the fact that many University System institutions were on the high end of the range for state appropriations and tuition compared to peers but that significant variation in funding per full-time equivalent (“FTE”) student persisted within each institutional sector in the University System itself. The allocation recommendations call for reducing the variation to less than 15% except for those institutions whose funding per FTE student exceeds 20% of the mean for its group. For these few institutions, it is recommended that allocations be reduced by an equivalent to 5% of the difference and that, at the invitation of the respective presidents, an enhancement team assist in the review of institutional operations, enrollment patterns, and student recruitment and retention practices.

- To maximize the distribution of funds to institutions:

Formula funds related to new facilities, health insurance premiums, and other fringe benefits have been allocated according to actual need. Legislative adjustments are allocated according to intent. It is because of these targeted and specific additions that the percent increases in funding for each institution may vary considerably across the University System. Percent increases were therefore not included in the display of institutional allocations. In addition, a careful review of special funding initiatives, especially the technology initiatives that are now included in the formula, was undertaken to increase direct allocation to institutions. As a result, institutions will receive an increase in direct funding for technology of \$1.25 million, a 15% increase in the amount of funds currently received by institutions from technology initiatives.

- To reinforce institutional missions and support strategic initiatives of the Board of Regents within the limit of available funds:

Additional allocations are recommended, for example, for GTREP, the Gwinnett Center, the Regional Learning Disorders Programs, and research faculty for the Medical College of Georgia.

2. Approval of Fiscal Year 2002 Tuition

Approved: The Board approved the tuition rates and policy adjustments for fiscal year 2002 to

become effective in the fall semester 2001.

Undergraduate and Graduate Tuition

The approved tuition rates will be frozen at current levels for two-year colleges, increased 3% for regional and state universities, and increased 5% for research universities. These adjustments are designed to raise the minimum amount of tuition revenue required to meet the 25% share of formula-related costs that are borne by students, to meet increased salary costs of the 4.5% merit-based salary increase, and to provide funding in accordance with the findings of the recent benchmarking study with regard to state appropriations and tuition revenue for institutions in each sector. Undergraduate tuition rates for Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) will be increased by \$300 per semester above the recommended 3% increase for regional and state universities consistent with the budget recommendations approved by the Board at its September 2000 meeting. This increase will assist GCSU in reducing class sizes and fulfilling its role as the state’s public liberal arts college.

The increase has the full support of students at GCSU. Finally, research universities will have the option of increasing out-of-state tuition rates to levels of peer or benchmark institutions. The Georgia Institute of Technology has documented that it is \$2,000 a year below its public benchmark institutions. It has requested that it be permitted to raise out-of-state tuition by \$2,000, phasing this increase in at \$1,000 per year over the next two years. This request was included in the tuition recommendations with the understanding that the proportion of out-of-state students not be increased.

In accordance with Board policy, graduate tuition rates, excluding certain professional graduate programs, are set at a level 20% above undergraduate rates. Also in accordance with Board policy, out-of-state tuition rates are established at a level at least equal to four times the in-state tuition rates. The Board also approved the concept of setting out-of-state rates to match or compete with tuition rates at peer institutions, and this policy will be modified to reflect that decision.

Additionally, in January 2001, the Board approved a change in tuition terminology that eliminated use of the terms matriculation fee and non-resident fee to define tuition costs for resident and non-resident students. In accordance with that change in policy, tuition costs for resident students are expressed as in-state tuition, while tuition costs for non-resident students are expressed as out-of-state tuition. This change brings the University System of Georgia’s terminology in line with nationally used definitions, promotes better student understanding of costs, and facilitates the evaluation of policy changes based on comparisons of cost for different classes of students (i.e., resident versus non-resident, graduate versus undergraduate).

Professional Program Tuition

Board policy authorizes institutions to request separate tuition rate adjustments for select professional graduate programs. The purpose of this policy is to provide additional funds for program improvement while allowing programs to remain competitive with peer programs in public colleges and universities in other states. This year, five requests were submitted for the following programs: the Master of Science in Building Construction and Integrated Facilities Management at the Georgia Institute of Technology; two executive Master of Business Administration (“M.B.A.”) programs at Georgia State University, which have traditionally operated under Board-approved separate tuition schedules; the Doctor of Pharmacy program at the University of Georgia, which proposed a phase-in over four years to competitive tuition levels; and the executive M.B.A. program at Kennesaw State University, which also has operated for years

under a Board-approved separate tuition schedule. Additionally, the Medical College of Georgia proposed that it continue with its multi-year plan to raise medical program tuition to the mean level of comparative medical schools.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 6 to 16.)

3. Approval of Fiscal Year 2002 Mandatory Student Fees

Approved: The Board approved increases and/or adjustments in mandatory student fees for various institutions of the University System of Georgia.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 6 to 16.)

Background: To support its fee requests, each University System institution is required to submit financial statements and supporting justification for any proposed increase. The fee review process carefully considers only those requests that meet the minimum submission criteria, document fully all costs and revenues, and comply with business plan objectives. In accordance with the policy adopted by the Board in February 2000, each institution was required to establish committees comprised of at least 50% students to review fee increase requests. This requirement was met in all cases with documentation provided to the Board indicating the membership of institutional committees and actions taken.

Forty-three requests to adjust athletic fees, student activity fees, health services fees and transportation or parking fees were submitted. The staff recommended that the Board approve 18 of these requests as submitted and approve 21 requests at a reduced level. Four requests were not recommended for approval.

The staff also recommended that all technology fees approved last year remain at the fiscal year 2001 level. In two cases, however, it was recommended that technology fees be significantly reduced. The staff recommended that the technology fee at Clayton College & State University ("CCSU"), now established at \$300 per semester, be reduced to \$38 per semester. The staff also recommended that the technology fee at Floyd College ("FC") be reduced to \$75 per semester. (FC will continue to provide Internet service to students, which is not the case at CCSU.) Both FC and CCSU received funding this year from the fiscal year 2001 amended budget and other sources to eliminate debt obligations associated with their information technology projects with the intent to reduce the current technology fees. The request for funding in the fiscal year 2001 amended budget for this purpose was approved by the Board at its September 2000 meeting.

In reviewing fee requests, the University System Office budget staff have been mindful of both institutional needs and the impact on HOPE Scholarship Program ("HOPE") costs. These recommendations result in a projected cost to HOPE of approximately \$956,000.

4. Approval of Salary and Wage Administration Policy

Approved: The Board approved the statement of salary and wage administration as follows:

Salary and Wage Administration Policy Fiscal Year 2002

The Board of Regents allocated to each institution funds equivalent to a 4.5% salary increase for all employees. Salary increases must be provided on the basis of merit. With these funds, the institutions may grant salary increases to individual employees. It is expected that individual merit salary increases will be reasonably distributed among employees in amounts ranging from 0% to 10%. Salary increases may exceed 10% for employees exhibiting exceptionally meritorious performance. Salary increases that exceed 10% must be justified individually in writing when the budget is submitted. (This requirement shall be waived for information technology employees covered by the policy approved by the Board in November 1998 and extended in November 2000.) Salary increases for non-faculty employees and staff shall become effective October 1, 2001, and salary increases for faculty shall become effective with the commencement of fall semester 2001.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 6 to 16.)

EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

The Executive and Compensation Committee met in Executive Session on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 at approximately 11:20 a.m. in room 202 of Atkinson Hall on the campus of Georgia College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Glenn S. White, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Joe Frank Harris and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Also in attendance were Chancellor Stephen R. Portch and Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber. The Executive Session was adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m. Chair White reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had met in Executive Session to discuss personnel matters and that no actions were taken in Executive Session. 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.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 at approximately 2:45 p.m. in the Maxwell Student Union Lounge on the campus of Georgia College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Board Chair Glenn S. White was also in attendance. Chair Hunt reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 13 items, 11 of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Naming of Facility, Jack C. Stein House, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the Jack C. Stein House at the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT").

Understandings: This facility is one of four small apartment-style housing units built during the 1996 Olympics that are dedicated for use by groups of students who are studying complementary programs, such as a foreign language.

Mr. Stein was an alumnus who succeeded in many endeavors during his lifetime and who left a

gift of \$500,000 to GIT. Following discussions with his family about recognition of his gift, GIT proposes to name one of the apartment units for Mr. Stein.

2. Naming of Facility, U. A. Whitaker Building, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the U. A. Whitaker Building at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”).

Understandings: This building is being designed to house the GIT/Emory University Biomedical Engineering Department. Construction will begin this year if all approvals are obtained. The building will cost approximately \$23 million.

The Whitaker Foundation was created by Mr. U. A. Whitaker and has served as the principal source of private funding to help develop biomedical engineering initiatives around the nation. In 1993, The Whitaker Foundation made a grant of \$3 million to GIT to help develop its new bioengineering program. This past year, The Whitaker Foundation made a new grant to the GIT/Emory University biomedical engineering program of \$16 million, of which \$10 million will be used for the new building. In honor of this gift, GIT proposes to name the building for Mr. U. A. Whitaker.

3. Naming of Facility, Christopher W. Klaus Advanced Computing Building, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the Christopher W. Klaus Advanced Computing Building at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”).

Understandings: This building is currently in design and will be funded by a combination of state and private monies. Present cost estimates for the building are \$50 million.

Mr. Christopher W. Klaus made a donation of \$15 million toward the construction of the building to cover the private funding component needed. Mr. Klaus is a GIT alumnus and founder of the company Internet Security Systems, which is based in Atlanta. GIT proposes to name the building for him in honor of his gift.

4. Demolition at Alapaha Range Grazing Station, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board declared Building Number 4825 at the Range Grazing Station, University of Georgia (“UGA”), Berrien County, Alapaha, Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to UGA or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of this building.

The Board also requested that Governor Barnes issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of this building from the Alapaha location.

Understandings: Building 4825 is a wood-frame dwelling of approximately 2250 square feet built in 1937. Built as a superintendent’s residence, it was last renovated in 1954. It has been unoccupied for eight years and is in very poor structural condition.

The demolition will be conducted by UGA personnel at an estimated cost of \$2,000 using campus funds.

This building is on the site of proposed office complex and agricultural equipment storage buildings for the Range Grazing Station, which will be brought to the Board for approval.

5. Rental Agreement, Atlantic Investors, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of an Addendum to Rental Agreement between Atlantic Investors, Ltd. - Series V, Landlord, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Tenant, covering 48 apartment-type residential units for the period July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002, at a monthly rental of \$23,452.60 (\$281,029.72 per year/\$5,863.15 per unit per year) for the use of Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU").

The terms of this Addendum to Rental Agreement are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Understandings: In March 2001, the Board authorized a ground lease to a private developer to fund, construct, and operate a housing facility on campus that will house targeted groups of students comprising up to 5% of AASU's students. This housing is anticipated to be completed by spring 2002.

AASU has requested Board approval on the continued rental of 48 apartment-type residential units for use by AASU students. It is anticipated that this will be the last request to renew this rental agreement.

The rental rate for the renewal period is the same as the current monthly rental.

The facilities house approximately 175 students (fall occupancy). These students are primarily intercollegiate athletic students, health science students, international students, and students in the 13-county service area who are not within commuting distance. Students will be charged \$1,272 for double occupancy and \$1,622 for single occupancy per semester.

6. Authorization of Project, "Chiller and Boiler Plant, Health Sciences Building," Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-40-0102, "Chiller and Boiler Plant, Health Sciences Building," Medical College of Georgia ("MCG"), with a total project budget of \$1,054,200 to be funded from \$500,000 in unexpended project funds from other MCG projects and \$554,200 from institutional interest income.

Understandings: In June 1997, the Board approved the Health Sciences Building ("HSB"), a \$35 million facility that will house the School of Nursing and the School of Allied Health programs. The HSB is in the pre-planning phase with construction scheduled to start in spring 2002.

The interim mini-plant facility will provide utilities for the HSB and will be located adjacent to the HSB fronting on Laney-Walker Boulevard.

The mini-plant will serve the HSB until such time as a new satellite central plant ("SCP") is funded and constructed, which will permit the HSB to be taken off the mini-plant and connected to the SCP. The campus will reclaim the space occupied by the mini-plant for use as parking and will

reuse the chiller and boiler equipment.

The mini-plant will have approximately 3,200 square feet with a construction cost of \$900,000 (\$281.25 per square foot). The building will be a metal canopy structure to house the chiller and boiler equipment. This temporary structure will have decorative screening panels for campus aesthetic considerations and to provide noise attenuation from plant equipment.

Since this project was approved, the University System Office staff and MCG will proceed with the selection of appropriate professional consultants for the project.

7. Authorization of Project, “Renovations to Victor Hall,” Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board authorized Project, “Renovations to Victor Hall,” Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”), with a total budget of \$1,775,000 using fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002 major repair and renovation (“MRR”) funding and general operating funds.

Understandings: This renovation project includes heating ventilating and air conditioning (“HVAC”) upgrade, code compliance, and Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) upgrades; a new elevator; and architectural modifications to accommodate the new use of this 26,834-square-foot building. The construction cost is estimated at \$1,530,000 (\$57 per square foot).

The Department of Psychology, now located in Victor Hall, will relocate to the new Science Building when it is complete. The Instructional Media Center, the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Department of Economics, now located in Victor Hall, will relocate to the Science Building, University Hall, and Solms Hall.

Once the renovations are complete, admissions and registration, financial aid, academic and enrollment services, academic advisement and orientation, graduate studies, off-campus programs, international student support services, the tutorial center, and the testing center will be relocated to Victor Hall.

Victor Hall is one of four buildings that flank the campus quadrangle. Solms Hall and Hawes Hall, two of these buildings, are being renovated as a part of the Science Building project now under construction and anticipated to be completed in June 2001. The fourth building, Gamble Hall, was renovated in 1994.

Funding for the project consists of \$842,673 from fiscal year 2001 MRR, an estimated \$871,000 fiscal year 2002 MRR and an estimated \$61,327 from AASU’s general operating funds.

Since this project was authorized by the Board, the University System Office staff and AASU will proceed with the selection of appropriate professional consultants for the project.

8. Authorization of Project, “University Village Renovation,” University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized in concept “University Village (the ‘Village’) Renovation,” University of Georgia (“UGA”), with a total project budget of \$21,611,000.

The Board also authorized Project No. BR-10-0102, “Renovation of Building G (Family Housing),” with a total project budget of \$1,850,000.

Understandings: In February 2000, the Board approved “Restoration - Building H (Family Housing)” in the Village complex following a fire which damaged Building H. The restoration was completed in February 2001. This project for the Village proposes that each of the ten remaining family housing buildings be renovated, in turn, over a maximum ten-year period. The renovation of two- and one-bedroom units will update all finishes and systems to meet a broad student market with a wide range of unit offerings.

Building G will be the first building renovated at a construction cost of \$1,450,000 and a total budget of \$1,850,000. Each subsequent renovation has been estimated with a 4% annual inflation index for budgeting purposes.

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

Design and construction funding for the Village will utilize student affairs auxiliary funds. The pace of the renovation program will be dependent on the availability of sufficient financial resources generated from housing operations. Each project will be brought to the Board for approval.

Since this project was approved, the University System Office staff and UGA will proceed with the selection of appropriate professional consultants for the Renovation of Building G (Family Housing).

9. Authorization of Project, “Information Technology Building,” Georgia Southern University

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. I-88, “Information Technology Building,” for the School of Information Technology, Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”), with a total project budget of \$33,500,000 funded from state funds provided by the legislature.

The Board also authorized a fast-track delivery method for this project utilizing a program manager in association with architectural and engineering design professionals.

Understandings: The building will be located on the main pedestrian corridor across from the Business Administration Building and Technology Building and adjacent to the proposed academic classroom and multi-use academic building. This building will provide a home for the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”), Yamacraw, and GSOU’s information technology initiative.

The building will be planned and equipped with state-of-the-art information and instruction technology. Special features will include a high-bandwidth fiber LAN to provide access to a massive, high-speed direct Internet connection, computer connections at each classroom seat, specialized labs, and team study/project rooms.

The focus of the use of the building will be on teaching and learning and on regional economic development; for computer information systems program, which will soon outgrow its headquarters in the business administration building; and for the computer-engineering program offered under GTREP. The building will also include space for a professional/executive learning education center.

The building will be used to produce the trained workforce necessary to attract companies in a

variety of high-tech areas, driving economic development generally throughout the state and specifically to Southeast Georgia.

The building will have approximately 130,000 gross square feet with an estimated construction cost of \$25,000,000 (\$192.31 per square foot).

Since this project was approved, the University System Office staff and GSOU will proceed with the selection of a team consisting of a program manager in association with architectural and engineering design professionals. This approach will permit a fast-track delivery method that will expedite the completion of the project.

10. Authorization of Project, “Renovation of Nevins Hall Science Building,” Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board authorized “Renovation of Nevins Hall Science Building,” Valdosta State University (“VSU”), with a total project budget of \$4,500,000.

Understandings: The state legislature has provided \$240,000 for planning and design. Construction funds will be requested as part of the fiscal year 2003 (fiscal year 2002 amended) budget.

Completion of the Biology and Chemistry Building has vacated space within Nevins Hall for renovation. On completion of this project, the existing uses of Nevins Hall, including the Astronomy, Geography, Geology, Pre-engineering, Physics, Mathematics, and Computer Science programs and central computing, will be expanded. Additionally, the Philosophy and Religious Studies programs and the Office of Information Technology will relocate to Nevins Hall. Renovated spaces shall include offices, classrooms, lecture theater, Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”) room, teaching and research labs, cold room, planetarium, and exhibit areas.

An environmental evaluation of the building will be undertaken as part of the design process.

This project will renovate approximately 57,000 gross square feet of this 107,558-gross-square-foot building with an estimated construction cost of \$3,400,000 (\$59.65 per square foot).

Since this project was approved, the University System Office staff and VSU will proceed with the selection of an architectural consultant.

11. Intergovernmental Lease Agreement, Grady Memorial Hospital (Fulton-DeKalb Hospital Authority)

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of an intergovernmental agreement between Grady Memorial Hospital (Fulton-DeKalb Hospital Authority), Lessor, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Lessee, to lease the ninth and tenth floors of Grady Memorial Hospital for the benefit of a Tier 3 Cancer Center of Excellence (the “Center”), User, at the rent of \$1.00 per year for a period not to exceed 50 years.

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

The Board also authorized the use of the construction/program manager method of delivery for this

project.

Understandings: Governor Roy E. Barnes has announced an initiative to improve cancer prevention, screening, treatment, training, and clinical research in the State of Georgia. This Center is the first facility dedicated to support the Governor's initiative.

The Center will be a collaborative effort of the Board of Regents, the Georgia Research Alliance, the Georgia Cancer Coalition, and Grady Health Systems. Biotechnology, epidemiologic, education, and outcomes research will be accomplished through collaboration with colleges, research institutions, and agencies. There will also be significant opportunities for student nursing and other practical experiences. In addition to providing funding for the Center, the Governor has also earmarked funds to be used to attract distinguished scientists and clinicians in cancer to Georgia.

The Center will occupy approximately 63,000 square feet on the ninth and tenth floors of Grady Hospital and will include inpatient care, outpatient care, diagnostic investigational imaging, and biotechnology translational research spaces, along with support and ancillary facilities. The project requires extensive demolition and renovation of space.

The total project cost is \$28,350,341 from the state and tobacco fund appropriation, which will include medical and technology equipment and relocation costs for some existing offices.

Since this project was approved, University System Office staff will work with the Office of the Attorney General, the Georgia Research Alliance, the Georgia Cancer Coalition, and Grady Health Systems to develop a request for proposals for the selection of the construction/program manager. Staff will solicit proposals for the construction/program management agreement for the design/construction of the facility and return to the Board of Regents for authorization of the contract and approval of the firm.

12. Information Item: Master Plan, Georgia College & State University

Georgia College & State University and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the institution. President Rosemary DePaolo and the consultant, Mr. Darrell Fitzgerald, Managing Director of the architectural firm of Gensler, 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, Georgia College & State University's master plan recommendations included the following:

- Replace several campus buildings that are beyond cost-effective repair
- Create appropriate future facilities for the growing academic needs, community outreach activities, and economic development needs
- Renovate and preserve several existing historic buildings to provide modern facilities
- Upgrade campus utility infrastructure
- Relocate campus roads and parking to create a more pedestrian-oriented campus core

- Continue to preserve and enhance the campus environment and landscaping

13. Information Item: University System of Georgia Research Island at Skidaway

At the February 1998 Board meeting, the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities approved an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Board of Regents, Savannah Economic Development Authority (“SEDA”), and Georgia Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism to develop a portion of property on Skidaway Island as the University System of Georgia Research Island at Skidaway. Also authorized by the Board was an ongoing process for the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension to review recommendations of the Skidaway Advisory Committee to locate appropriate businesses at the University System of Georgia Research Island at Skidaway. At this same February 1998 meeting, the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension authorized that specific recommendations of the Skidaway Advisory Committee to locate appropriate businesses at the University System of Georgia Research Island at Skidaway be brought to the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension for review and approval.

At this meeting of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development & Economic Services Annie Hunt Burriss reported to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities that the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension was receiving information from Mr. Richard D. Knowlton, Jr., President and Chief Executive Officer of SEDA regarding a preliminary proposal for a company to locate on Skidaway Island. Mr. Knowlton updated that Committee on the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement and provided information about the preliminary proposal that a telecom company, currently proceeding through proposal stages, may be a participant in this agreement.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 at approximately 2:45 p.m. in room 130 of the Maxwell Student Union on the campus of Georgia College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joe Frank Harris, Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Martin W. NeSmith, and J. Timothy Shelnut. Chair Harris reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 11 items, 9 of which required action. Additionally, 135 regular faculty appointments, 369 awards of tenure, and 586 promotions were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Regents’ 1998 Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools, 2001 Refinements

Approved: The Board approved the Regents’ 1998 Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools, 2001 Refinements.

Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Coordinator Pre-school - Post-secondary Education (“P-16”) Initiative, provided a presentation of the University System’s progress on implementing the 1998 Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools and recommended additions to and revisions of these principles. Complete principles documents, including refinements, are on file with the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

However, a brief list of the approved refinements is as follows:

- *New Principle: The University System will ensure the success of teacher and leader candidates on certification examinations for all demographic groups.*
- *Revised Principle: Graduate programs for teachers who are already certified will focus on both strengthening their content knowledge and on deepening their understanding of teaching and learning. These programs will also adhere to the general principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.*
- *Revised Principle: The University System will encourage the institutions to develop new and innovative teacher preparation programs to respond to state need and to contribute to increased student learning and achievement in Georgia's public schools.*
- *No Change in Principle: The University System will assure that graduates of its programs for educational leaders and counselors are able to create learning environments that support teacher success in bringing students from diverse groups to high levels of learning.*

2. Establishment of the Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish a bachelor of science in biomedical engineering, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: GIT proposed to establish a bachelor of science in biomedical engineering that is to be offered through the existing joint GIT/Emory Department of Biomedical Engineering. The program was developed as an integration of biology and engineering in order to provide students with an understanding of biomedical systems throughout the curriculum and to use educational technology interventions appropriate to fostering biomedical engineering learning. Biomedical engineering commonly refers to bioengineering applied to the field of medicine. Biomedical engineers contribute to better healthcare by developing devices and procedures for diagnosis and therapy, completing research that quantifies biomedical systems and processes, and developing processes to effectively manage medical technology.

Need: In order for technological advances in biomedical sciences to be successfully implemented, cadres of well-trained biomedical engineers are needed. This increasing demand was documented in a 1990 National Research Council Report entitled "Interdisciplinary Research Promoting Collaboration Between the Life Sciences and Medicine and the Physical Sciences and Engineering." In addition, the need for additional graduates in this discipline can be inferred from calls for proposals by The Whitaker Foundation in 1988, 1993, 1995, and 1998 and plans by the U.S. Congress to double the National Institute of Health's budget in the next five years. According to the Georgia Department of Labor, in metropolitan Atlanta in 1999, there were 41 biomedical and biotechnology facilities with over 7,000 employees. Statewide, there are approximately 100 medical technology and biotechnology companies. This industry has experienced 50% growth over the past five years statewide. All indications are that the rate of growth will be even higher over the coming decade. A partial list of companies in the Atlanta area

that would be potential employers for graduates of the degree program include Atherogenics (Alpharetta), Cryolife (Kennesaw), Cytrx (Norcross), Immucor (Norcross), Neotonus (Marietta), Novoste (Norcross), Proxima Therapeutics (Alpharetta), Theragenics (Buford), Bard Urological Division (Covington), and SpectRx (Norcross).

Objectives: The objectives of the program are to position GIT to play a proactive role in meeting the biomedical engineering needs of the State of Georgia and at the international level and to educate undergraduate students who will be able to promote new developments in biomedical engineering and the field of biomedical technology. The degree program will produce highly qualified biomedical engineering graduates who may obtain positions in the biomedical industry and graduate studies in biomedical engineering.

Curriculum: The program incorporates a rigorous and innovative core curriculum that combines problem-based learning and new educational learning methods. The program will require 130 semester hours of courses. The curriculum comprises 55 semester hours of institutional core courses, 25 semester hours of breadth courses, 28 semester hours of biomedical engineering breadth courses, and 22 semester hours of biomedical engineering depth courses. The specific biomedical engineering courses consist of sensors and instrumentation, systems physiology, biotransport, and fundamentals of engineering science. Biomedical engineering depth courses consist of the senior projects and science electives.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 40, 60, and 140 for the first three years of the program.

Funding: The institution will redirect resources to establish and implement the program. GIT plans to construct a new building adjacent to the Bioengineering and Bioscience Building for the permanent home of the GIT/Emory Department of Biomedical Engineering on the GIT campus. Of the \$16 million awarded through The Whitaker Foundation Leadership Award, approximately \$10 million is earmarked for this new building. The building request was approved during the March 2001 Board meeting.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. In 2005, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the University System 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.

3. Establishment of the Master of Science in Criminal Justice and as an External Degree Program at Macon State College, Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Rosemary DePaolo that Georgia College & State University ("GCSU") be authorized to establish a master of science in criminal justice, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: The master of science in criminal justice program at GCSU was developed to educate in-service and pre-service criminal justice students for careers in law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies. The program is designed for mid-career working professionals and those who seek to enter the fields of corrections, juvenile justice, victim advocacy, court and offender services, and policing. The program will allow students to master the concepts, theories, and facts that underlie an understanding of the criminal justice system and to be able to apply their

knowledge to criminal justice policy and practice. It is projected that the State of Georgia would benefit by having current and future law enforcement, corrections, probation and parole officers, and administrators in Central Georgia who would be better equipped to implement the state's criminal justice policies more effectively and to advance the public interest.

Need: Survey data have indicated that crime and crime control are among the major concerns of the population. In Georgia, the crime rate has been well above the national rate. In 1996, Georgia reported 6,310 crimes per 100,000 people, compared to the national rate of 5,079 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, 1996). Nearly 1.2 million people were incarcerated in state or federal prisons in the United States in 1997. In that year, Georgia had nearly 36,000 inmates, an increase of more than 1,000 from the previous year (U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics). A major public concern has been the claim of unequal delivery of criminal justice services. A factor in these concerns is the lack of adequate training and education on the part of law enforcement personnel. There is an unmet demand for graduate education in criminal justice in the Central Georgia area. Data and projections prepared by the Georgia Department of Labor indicate that there will be a 30% increase from 42,680 individuals in the need for law enforcement personnel occupations between 1996 and 2006. At least ten correctional institutions are within 30 miles of Milledgeville, each of which has a staff of correctional officers and administrators with bachelor's degrees who are lacking a graduate education. There is no other master's program in criminal justice within a 90-mile radius of Milledgeville or within a 75-mile radius of Macon. The institution's existing master of public administration program has a criminal justice concentration that averages an enrollment of 20 to 30 students. Based on surveys, exit interviews, and informational forums over the past ten years, students have indicated that they would prefer a master of science in criminal justice in order to gain more extensive knowledge of justice administration.

Objectives: Specific objectives of the program are to prepare graduates to 1) be involved in the development and implementation of public policy areas that use current skills and techniques to manage and operate criminal justice agencies, 2) understand constitutional rights and values as they relate to the administration of justice within communities, 3) assess and understand criminal justice problems and issues, 4) conduct basic and applied research in criminal justice, such as evaluation research, 5) use computer technology to locate information and use statistics and software to analyze problems regarding criminal justice agencies, and 6) understand legal issues which affect criminal justice professionals.

Curriculum: The master of science in criminal justice will be a 36-semester-hour program comprising the following: 1) a basic curriculum of 17 semester hours, including courses in public service, administrative law, public finance and budgeting, the contemporary criminal justice system, privatization and managerial policy, policing, and corrections; 2) an advanced curriculum of 9 semester hours, including courses in criminological theory, quantitative techniques, and criminal law; 3) electives of 9 semester hours subscribed from other graduate-level criminal justice, political science, sociology, psychology, and management courses; and 4) a career assessment project or an internship of 1 semester hour. A thesis option comprising 7 semester hours will be available. Students in the thesis option would have 3 semester hours of electives (rather than 9) and would have a 1-hour thesis defense course in lieu of the career assessment project/internship.

The master of science in criminal justice will be delivered in Milledgeville and Macon. The Milledgeville site will be the Arts and Sciences Building on the campus of Georgia College & State University. The Macon site will be the campus of Macon State College, which will allow easy access to graduates of the collaborative Fort Valley State University and Macon State College bachelor of science in public service programs.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 15, 22, and 30 for the first three years of the program.

Funding: The institution will redirect resources to establish and implement the program.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. In 2005, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the University System 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.

4. Establishment of the Bachelor of Science in Marketing Systems, Dalton State College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President James A. Burran that Dalton State College ("DSC") be authorized to establish a bachelor of science in marketing systems, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: In keeping with the DSC's mission of providing a "limited number of baccalaureate programs designed to meet the economic development needs of the local area," the bachelor of science in marketing systems degree is designed to meet a high-priority need of business and industry in Northwest Georgia. The program is designed to give graduates a systems-based foundation in the marketing process, which will prepare them for positions in marketing, professional sales, market research, advertising, e-retailing, and e-commerce. The focus of the program involves the development of a sales and marketing professional who is able to employ current and emerging computer technologies to develop individual, interactive relationships with customers.

Need: The Northwest Georgia region is home to the largest concentration of carpet and rug manufacturing in the United States and the world. During the 1997 calendar year, the most recent for which figures are available, Georgia's carpet industry produced \$15.7 billion at retail, accounting for 74% of domestic carpet production and 45% of the world's carpet production. The Dalton area serves as corporate headquarters for Shaw Industries, Beaulieu of America, Mohawk, Collins & Aikman, J & J Industries, and the Dixie Group. These firms and others in the Dalton area together produce the majority of Georgia's carpet and rug output and employ over 40,000 workers. Global marketing and sales are important keys to the ongoing prosperity of the carpet and rug industry. The appeal for individuals with degrees in the field of marketing developed because the carpet industry is moving from mass marketing to brand marketing at the consumer level and into the electronic businesses-to-business mode with suppliers. According to an excerpt from an Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ("ICAPP®") bulletin, Electronic Commerce and the State of Georgia, "next year's e-commerce volume may exceed \$300 billion in the U.S. alone." ICAPP® notes that the rapid growth of e-commerce and information technology has had an impact on employment because of the lack of workers who are skilled in information technology. In addition, a survey developed by *InfoWorld* magazine noted that two-thirds of its respondents indicated that marketing, sales, and customer service departments were the driving forces for electronic commerce.

Objectives: Specific objectives of the marketing systems program include providing graduates who meet or exceed professional expectations for entry-level positions in marketing and sales departments, providing graduates who possess and can apply skills in marketing fundamentals

applicable to the area's industries, and providing graduates with an advanced knowledge of the uses of electronic technology in current and future marketing systems.

A Carpet and Rug Institute survey has placed annual demand for sales and marketing personnel within the carpet industry at 128 per year. Information gathered from the Georgia Department of Labor's Labor Market Information Division and the North Georgia Regional Development Center indicates that by the year 2005, annual openings in DSC's primary service area will exceed 100. Hence, it is estimated that the demand for persons trained in marketing and sales-related positions will annually exceed 200. The University System institution with the closest proximity to DSC with a marketing program is Kennesaw State University. The program is more than an hour's drive from Dalton and does not include the systems approach sought by Dalton-area employers.

Curriculum: The basic content areas in marketing systems include the following: marketing principles and practices, management principles and practices, sales, logistics and distribution, international marketing, e-commerce (including business-to-business and business-to-customer), marketing engineering, data systems development and management, and supply chain management. The program will be delivered in two formats: a full-time day schedule and a part-time evening schedule. The 120-semester-hour curriculum will address the systems approach by complementing traditional marketing subject matter with courses that are well founded in technology and in marketing approaches within manufacturing environments. Since the industry places much emphasis upon cooperative and/or internship experiences as part of the students' preparation, this program offers a three-semester-hour internship as part of the senior year.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 20 to 30, 30 to 40, and 30 to 40 for the first three years of the program.

Funding: The institution will redirect resources to establish and implement the program.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. In 2005, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the University System 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 Master of Internet Technology, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish a master of Internet technology, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: The master of Internet technology program was developed in response to current trends in the private and public sectors of the U.S. economy that require the need for skilled managers and designers of Internet applications. The multidisciplinary curriculum will provide the essential background knowledge of the tools and methods used to develop and manage Internet applications. Internet technology involves the delivery of content and services to businesses, organizations, and other individuals using the Internet and technologies of the World Wide Web. The study of Internet technology includes business strategy and management of technology as well as instruction in the use of the technologies. Electronic commerce ("e-commerce"), the term used to refer to business transactions on the Internet, will comprise one focus of the program as students learn how to establish, manage, and assess business-to-business and business-to-consumer transactions.

Need: Forrester Research estimates that business-to-business e-commerce sales will reach \$1.3 trillion by 2003 compared to \$108 billion for business-to-consumer revenues for the same time period. During the past decade, Georgia has been transforming itself into the high-tech capital of the Southeast. Various decisions by the legislature (for example, the establishment of centers such as Georgia Center for Advanced Telecommunications Technology [“GCATT”]) and private business (for example, Mindspring and Earthlink) have shown a commitment by business and civic leaders to move in this direction. Atlanta and the surrounding area have been successful in attracting leading-edge technology companies as well as other established companies that use such technologies such as UPS, CNN, and AOL/Time Warner.

Objectives: The degree is designed to enhance and extend undergraduate degrees and work experience in preparation for positions in Internet technology. It is anticipated that many graduates will work in Internet development or information technology departments. The graduate degree program will advance UGA’s strategic objectives of developing interdisciplinary programs and will provide graduates with an e-commerce background for a growing job market in Georgia. With the approval of the Master of Internet Technology, UGA aims to establish an outstanding interdisciplinary program in Internet technology, Web site development, and e-commerce; provide a source of employees for businesses specializing in electronic commerce and other organizations that wish to conduct business over the Internet; and provide a means for graduates who are currently in the workforce to obtain advanced training in electronic commerce and Web site development. The objective of the degree is to provide advanced knowledge and specialist skills on a broad range of Internet technologies and systems. Students will be equipped to develop and implement solutions for the evolving on-line economy, electronic commerce, and virtual communities and interest groups.

Curriculum: Because UGA projects that the program will attract graduating students and persons in the workforce, the curriculum will only be offered in a full-time format. Graduates from the Internet technology program can combine their undergraduate or previous career knowledge with the knowledge and skills gained from the curriculum to specialize in e-commerce applications in their chosen field. Students will be required to complete 32 semester hours of course work with 14 semester hours of required courses in two constituent areas, computer science and management information systems, plus a 3-semester-hour course in the telecommunications department. Nine semester hours of electives can be taken from a variety of departments to provide depth in a specific area, such as marketing, instructional technology, computer science, artificial intelligence, and telecommunications. The remaining six semester hours will come from a student project involving an electronic commerce application and resulting in an operational Web application and technical report. The established New Media Institute will also be used as a vehicle to explore the implications and applications of digital media in business and consumer transactions.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 30, 60, and 90 for the first three years of the program.

Funding: The institution will redirect resources to establish and implement the program.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. In 2005, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the University System 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 Master of Food Technology, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to establish a master of food technology, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: Food technology provides the means by which agricultural commodities are converted to safe and convenient foods demanded by consumers. The food industry needs personnel who have current knowledge of processing, packaging, quality control technologies, analytical instrumentation, and microbiological hazards. The degree is designed for students who want to upgrade and update their knowledge, those with new job responsibilities outside their degree area, and those looking to change careers in this industry. The projected students demanding the program are concentrated in the Atlanta metropolitan area and will be unable to attend classes in Athens; therefore, the program will only be offered at the Gwinnett Center. This location is conveniently located near the poultry, dairy, soft drink, and other food processing industries. Distance education formats will be used in addition to face-to-face delivery of instructional material.

Need: The food processing industry has adopted processing technologies that have increased in complexity. Consequently, there is a demand for food scientists and technologists with advanced degrees. Georgia’s food industry is the second-largest industry in the state, ranking below only forest products. The value of food products produced in Georgia is about \$12 billion. There are more than 1,000 licensed food processing facilities in Georgia employing over 71,000 employees with a payroll of more than \$2.37 billion. These increases are fueled by population growth and industry consolidation. Potential students for this program are working professionals who will pursue the degree on a part-time basis. These students desire additional education to improve their career opportunities, as food companies increasingly require an advanced degree for technical positions and advancement. The Master of Food Technology differs from the existing Master of Food Science degree because the former does not require a laboratory-based research thesis. The laboratory-based thesis was an impediment to persons working in the industry desirous of advancing their knowledge and skills. UGA mailed a survey to 520 members of the Dixie Section of the Institute of Food Technologists. There was a 14% response rate with more than 60 persons interested in off-campus instruction at the master’s level.

Objectives: Students who complete the requisite course work for the Master of Food Technology program will be able to 1) apply scientific principles to solve real-world food industry problems, 2) ensure smooth processing plant operations, 3) improve food product and process quality and safety, 4) implement quality manufacturing practices, 5) observe and implement technological issues facing the food industry, 6) implement and complete product development programs, and 7) use electronic communication and technologies in a food processing environment.

Curriculum: The Master of Food Technology program will consist of 30 semester hours of course work to include 3 semester hours for completion of a special topics research paper. Additional courses that comprise the curriculum include hazard analysis and critical control point systems, biotechnology for enhanced food processing, statistical control of food processing operations, minimally processed foods, food regulatory issues, seafood processing, and food product development. Within the first semester of the program, an advisory committee will approve a program of study that is designed for each student’s professional needs. The special topics research paper will require students to critically evaluate published research through an in-depth analysis of a specific topic. Each student will be required to take comprehensive final written and oral exams.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 25, 35, and 40 for the first three

years of the program.

Funding: The institution will redirect resources to establish and implement the program.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. In 2005, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the University System 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. Reorganization of Academic Units, Southern Polytechnic State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Lisa A. Rossbacher that Southern Polytechnic State University ("SPSU") be authorized to establish and implement a new organizational structure involving the reorganization of academic units, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: SPSU has an administration that has increased significantly over time. The university has become top-heavy in administration, a situation which is both expensive to maintain and inefficient in its function. The existing organizational structure creates barriers to students seeking academic and other support services; related services are currently housed in multiple different offices and locations on campus. Many of the administrative additions have followed the growth of SPSU from a two-year institution to a university where nearly one-third of the students at commencement are receiving masters' degrees. The result has been a high percentage of administrators relative to the number of faculty members. For example, in the 1999-2000 academic year, SPSU had 6 vice presidents, 4 academic deans, 11 academic department heads, and approximately 115 faculty members. The growth has produced anomalous situations. For example, one dean is currently responsible for six academic departments, while another is responsible for five full-time faculty members.

Implications: If the university's organizational structure does not change to address current needs, SPSU will increasingly be required to divert resources away from academic programs and student services. SPSU will continue to miss opportunities to develop innovative, interdisciplinary, collaborative programs that are hindered by the current structure. Review of the entire operation of the university began in September 2000 and has been driven by several goals. These goals include 1) developing the institution into a university, 2) improving student retention, 3) increasing efficiency, 4) redirecting budget resources, 5) coordinating student services, and 6) increasing collaboration and collegiality, particularly in the academic areas. All of these have the encapsulating goal of providing educational opportunities and services in the best possible manner for both traditional and non-traditional students.

Proposed Organizational Structure:

Office of the President

The recommended senior administration of SPSU includes the following positions reporting directly to the President: Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Business and Finance, Vice President for Student and Enrollment Services, Executive Director for Advancement, Chief Information Officer, Internal Auditor, Affirmative Action Officer, and Executive Assistant to the President. The reorganization plan addresses the three major divisions that are led by vice presidents.

Business and Finance

In Business and Finance, the Vice President has streamlined several processes in Fiscal Affairs that now allow for the realignment of people with jobs that need to be done. In addition, expansion of responsibilities in the physical plant and addition of staff to handle the new responsibilities has over time resulted in several positions that have become obsolete or redundant. The new organizational structure will eliminate these positions and create new ones that better address SPSU's needs.

Student and Enrollment Services

Services have become fragmented over time. For example, a student interested in exploring post-graduation opportunities, under the current structure, must first decide whether his or her concerns are about personal issues, employment opportunities, or graduate or professional school. Depending on the conclusion, the student will then go to the Counseling Center or Career Services or a faculty advisor. The new structure brings these services together in a unified Office of Career and Counseling Services. Better institutional planning will result from linking institutional data and research to the enrollment area.

Academic Affairs

In Academic Affairs, the reorganizational changes are designed to eliminate some barriers that have developed between programs over time. One example of how SPSU will provide better services to students is through the establishment of a center that will include advising (particularly for students who have not declared a major), testing, tutoring, and international services. This center will accommodate a range of student needs in one location, and it will have evening hours to accommodate non-traditional students. Additionally, the groupings of academic programs into schools are being reconfigured to remove barriers and to better address the current academic needs of SPSU's students. When the reorganization is fully implemented, the following groupings will exist, each led by an academic dean:

Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology, and Construction

Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology, and Construction will be grouped into one school. This change brings together disciplines that must coordinate closely in the workplace but which are currently in three different schools or colleges. Aligning Architecture and Construction more closely was recommended by the National Architecture Accrediting Board when the architecture program was reaccredited in February 2000.

Computing and Software Engineering

Computing and Software Engineering will move into a separate school. Currently, these programs are in the College of Arts and Sciences. Nearly one-quarter of all degree-seeking students are studying computer science, and the recent approval of baccalaureate degrees in information technology and software engineering will increase enrollments further.

School of Arts and Sciences

The new School of Arts and Sciences will include the following programs: Humanities and Technical Communication, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biological Sciences, and International Studies. An important near-term goal regarding new academic programs

focuses on strengthening the sciences, both in support of technology programs and in keeping with the mission of Southern Polytechnic State University.

School of Engineering Technology and Management

The Engineering Technology programs will be linked with the Management program into a School of Engineering Technology and Management. Linking the Management and Engineering Technology programs will reinforce the curricular linkages between the programs and produce some economies of scale.

Extended University

The Extended University represents the academic outreach arm of SPSU. The attention given to this unit of the institution will provide for a more coordinated presence in continuing education, distance education, industrial liaisons, and other outreach activities with the community.

Conclusion: It is anticipated that the recommended reorganization will help SPSU become a university by moving 1) from insular departments to collaborative and cooperative units, 2) from serving only segments of the student population to serving everyone, 3) from focusing on the use of resources with a department to broader sharing, 4) from having fixed organizational structures to flexible parts, 5) from raising funds for immediate expenditures to generating an endowment for the future, and 6) from responding to trends to setting them. While adjustments will be made within the major areas of the university, changes in positions and/or responsibilities will not necessitate the dismissal of any individuals. Everyone now employed will have an opportunity to serve the university in some capacity, though it may differ from current positions.

8. 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 Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

SUMMARY OF FULL-TIME FACULTY AND TENURED FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

<u>System Institution by Type</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	18
Georgia State University	5
Medical College of Georgia	2
University of Georgia	23
Total Research University Appointments	48
Georgia Southern University	5
Valdosta State University	8
Total Regional University Appointments	13

Albany State University	0
Armstrong Atlantic State University	3
Augusta State University	0
Clayton College & State University	0
Columbus State University	1
Fort Valley State University	0
Georgia College & State University	1
Georgia Southwestern State University	4
Kennesaw State University	14
North Georgia College & State University	5
Savannah State University	6
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	0
Total State University Appointments	34
Dalton State College	2
Macon State College	1
Total State College Appointments	3
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural 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	1
Georgia Perimeter College	0
Gordon College	4
Middle Georgia College	1
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	1
Total Two-Year College Appointments	7
TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS	105

GRANTING OF TENURE

<u>System Institution by Type</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	36
Georgia State University	29
Medical College of Georgia	13
University of Georgia	73
Total Research University Appointments	151

Georgia Southern University	23
Valdosta State University	26
Total Regional University Appointments	49
Albany State University	0
Armstrong Atlantic State University	7
Augusta State University	11
Clayton College & State University	2
Columbus State University	10
Fort Valley State University	5
Georgia College & State University	20
Georgia Southwestern State University	4
Kennesaw State University	12
North Georgia College & State University	5
Savannah State University	6
Southern Polytechnic State University	3
State University of West Georgia	30
Total State University Appointments	115
Dalton State College	9
Macon State College	3
Total State College Appointments	12
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	3
Atlanta Metropolitan College	1
Bainbridge College	0
Coastal Georgia Community College	1
Darton College	7
East Georgia College	0
Floyd College	9
Gainesville College	2
Georgia Perimeter College	12
Gordon College	2
Middle Georgia College	2
South Georgia College	2
Waycross College	1
Total Two-Year College Appointments	42
TOTAL GRANTING OF TENURE	369

PROMOTION OF FACULTY

<u>System Institution by Type</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	73
Georgia State University	40

Medical College of Georgia	37
University of Georgia	156
Total Research University Appointments	306
Georgia Southern University	25
Valdosta State University	31
Total Regional University Appointments	56
Albany State University	4
Armstrong Atlantic State University	8
Augusta State University	16
Clayton College & State University	7
Columbus State University	12
Fort Valley State University	4
Georgia College & State University	12
Georgia Southwestern State University	1
Kennesaw State University	26
North Georgia College & State University	9
Savannah State University	3
Southern Polytechnic State University	5
State University Of West Georgia	30
Total State University Appointments	137
Dalton State College	8
Macon State College	4
Total State College Appointments	12
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	8
Atlanta Metropolitan College	3
Bainbridge College	4
Coastal Georgia Community College	6
Darton College	9
East Georgia College	0
Floyd College	8
Gainesville College	7
Georgia Perimeter College	16
Gordon College	6
Middle Georgia College	4
South Georgia College	4
Waycross College	0
Total Two-Year College Appointments	76
TOTAL PROMOTION OF FACULTY	586

SUMMARY OF PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES

<u>System Institution by Type</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	4
Georgia State University	9
Medical College of Georgia	0
University of Georgia	10
Total Research University Appointments	23
Georgia Southern University	0
Valdosta State University	0
Total Regional University Appointments	0
Albany State University	0
Armstrong Atlantic State University	0
Augusta State University	0
Clayton College & State University	0
Columbus State University	0
Fort Valley State University	0
Georgia College & State University	0
Georgia Southwestern State University	0
Kennesaw State University	0
North Georgia College & State University	1
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	1
Total State University Appointments	2
Dalton State College	0
Macon State College	0
Total State College Appointments	0
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural 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	0
Georgia Perimeter College	0
Gordon College	0
Middle Georgia College	0
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	0
Total Two-Year College Appointments	0

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**Special Faculty Approvals:**

Rousseau, Ronald W.: Director Academic, School of Chemical Engineering, effective March 1, 2001.

Schuster, Gary B.: Dean Academic, College of Science, effective January 1, 2001.

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Clifton, David S., Jr.: Principal Research Scientist, Economic Development Institute, effective Apr 19, 2001.

Logan, Kathryn V.: Principal Research Engineer, School of Materials Science & Engineering, effective May 1, 2001.

Sigman, Robert K.: Sr Research Engineer, School of Aerospace Engineering, effective Apr 19, 2001.

Part-time Appointments of System Retirees:

Circeo, Louis J., Jr.: Principal Research Scientist, Electro-Optics Environment & Materials Laboratory, beginning Apr 2, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Hughey, W. Lee: Sr Research Associate, Georgia Tech Research Corporation, beginning Mar 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Mackie, Paul E. Jr.: Principal Research Scientist, Signature Technology Laboratory, beginning Mar 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Mullikin, Albert L.: Sr Research Engineer, Electro-Optics Environment & Materials Laboratory, beginning Apr 2, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Geronimo, Jeffrey: Professor, School of Mathematics, leave from Aug 16, 2001 through Jul 31, 2002, with pay.

Klein, Hans K.: Asst Professor, School of Public Policy, leave from Jan 1, 2000 through Jan 1, 2001, with pay.

Kubanek, Julia: Asst Professor, School of Biology, leave from Feb 26, 2001 through Aug 5, 2001, without pay.

Mykityshyn, Amy: Research Engineer I, Electronic Systems Laboratory, leave from Mar 21, 2001 through Mar 21, 2002, without pay.

Shapira, Philip: Assoc Professor, School of Public Policy, leave from Jan 1, 2001 through Mar 16, 2001, with pay.

Stickel, Robert E., Jr.: Research Scientist II, School of Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, leave from Apr 1, 2001 through Mar 31, 2002, without pay.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Ahearn, Donald G.: Research Professor, Department of Biology, effective Apr 2, 2001.

Bhada, Yezdi K.: Assoc Provost, Georgia State University, effective Mar 15, 2001.

Gaunt, Larry D.: Professor Emeritus, W. T. Beebe Institute of Personnel and Employment Relations, effective Mar 15, 2001.

Part-time Appointments of System Retirees:

Abbott, Martha S.: Professor, Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education, beginning Feb 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Burden, Charles A.: Professor Emeritus, Department of Management, beginning Jan 15, 2001 and ending Jan 14, 2002.

Gaunt, Larry D.: Professor Emeritus, W. T. Beebe Institute of Personnel and Employment Relations, beginning Jan 8, 2001 and ending Jan 7, 2002.

Hale, Marion F.: Assoc Professor Emeritus, School of Nursing, beginning May 11, 2001 and ending May 10, 2002.

Kempler, Bernhard: Assoc Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychology, beginning Feb 23, 2001 and ending May 10, 2001.

Richardson, William K.: Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychology, beginning May 11, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Sanders, Marilyn K.: Records Manager, beginning Mar 15, 2001 and ending Mar 14, 2002.

Vaughn, Judith: Business Manager II, Department of Public Administration & Urban Studies, beginning Sep 1, 2000 and ending Aug 31, 2001.

Williams, Charles M.: Professor Emeritus, Department of Computer Information Systems, beginning May 11, 2001 and ending May 10, 2002.

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Wilson, W. D.: Regents Professor, Department of Chemistry, leave from Jan 2, 2001

through May 10, 2001, with pay.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Jackson, William J.: Assoc Professor, Department of Physiology & Endocrinology, effective Apr 19, 2001.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Special Faculty Approvals:

Brook, George A.: Professor, Department of Geography, effective Jan 30, 2001.

Clutter, Michael Lee: Professor, School of Forest Resources, effective May 1, 2001.

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Davis, Katheryn B.: Director Academic, School of Social Work, effective May 1, 2001.

Firth, Gerald Richmond: Professor, School of Leadership & Lifelong Learning, Dept of Educational Leadership, effective Mar 1, 2001.

Gaudin, James M., Jr.: Professor, School of Social Work, effective May 1, 2001.

Heslep, Robert Durham: Professor, School of Leadership & Lifelong Learning, Dept of Educational Leadership, effective Mar 1, 2001.

Key, Joe Lynn: Vice President, Department of Botany, effective Apr 1, 2001.

Martin, Charles Lloyd: Professor, Department of Small Animal Medicine, effective Jun 1, 2001.

See, Letha A.: Professor, School of Social Work, effective May 1, 2001.

Younts, Sanford Eugene: Vice President, Department of Crop & Soil Sciences, effective Apr 20, 2001.

Part-time Appointments of System Retirees:

Brown, Glenda W.: Budget Analyst II, College of Education, beginning Apr 1, 2001 and ending May 31, 2001.

Ferree, Maurice Edgar: Professor Emeritus, Department of Horticulture, beginning Jul 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Gaudin, James M., Jr.: Professor, School of Social Work, beginning Apr 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Greenwood, Susan Kathleen: Part-Time Public Service Asst, College of Business Administration, beginning Jul 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Hale, William Harvey, Jr.: Part-Time Associate Professor, Carl Vinson Institute of Government, beginning Jun 13, 2001 and ending Jun 13, 2001.

Isaac, Robert Anthony: Professor Emeritus, Department of Crop & Soil Sciences, beginning Jul 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Kethley, T. William, Jr.: Information Analyst II, Sr VP for Acad Affairs & Provost, beginning Jul 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Lassiter, Virginia D.: Medical Records Librarian, College of Veterinary Medicine, beginning Apr 9, 2001 and ending Apr 9, 2002.

Reeves, Walter F.: Part-Time Public Service Assoc, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, beginning Jul 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Travick, Geneva L.: County Extension Prog Asst IV, College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, beginning Jul 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2002.

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Barsanti, Jeanne A.: Dept Head Academic, Department of Small Animal Medicine, leave from Jun 15, 2001 through Jul 27, 2001, with pay.

Condit, Celeste Michelle: Research Professor, Department of Speech Communication, leave from Aug 13, 2001 through May 15, 2002, with pay.

Greene, Craig Evan: Professor, Department of Small Animal Medicine, leave from Jun 15, 2001 through Jul 27, 2001, with pay.

Lieman, Daniel B.: Assoc Professor, Department of Mathematics, leave from Aug 15, 2001 through May 7, 2002, with pay.

Logan, B. Ikubolajeh: Assoc Professor, Department of Geography, leave from Feb 15, 2001 through May 8, 2001, with pay.

ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Garcia, Migdalia: Asst Professor, College of Education, leave from Apr 9, 2001 through Apr 8, 2002, without pay.

AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Callahan, Helen: Professor, Department of History & Anthropology, effective Jun 2, 2001.

Johnson, William Jackson: Professor, Department of Language & Literature & Communications, effective Jan 2, 2001.

CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Beliveau, Martha Oates: Assoc Professor, Department of Technical Studies, effective May 1, 2001.

Bowen, Frances F.: Assistant Professor, effective May 1, 2001.

Bright, James Ellis: Professor, Department of Mathematics, effective May 1, 2001.

Brown, Helen D.: Professor, Department of Natural Sciences, effective May 1, 2001.

Capell, Peggy: Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective May 1, 2001.

Crapps, E. Donald: Asst Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective May 1, 2001.

Daniel, Leonard Rupert: Director Administrative, effective Apr 1, 2001.

Holloway, Doris A.: Professor, Department of Music, effective May 1, 2001.

Key, Marion F.: Part-Time Assistant Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective May 1, 2001.

King, Barbara G.: Asst Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective Apr 1, 2001.

Perry, Miriam Patricia: Professor, Department of Natural Sciences, effective May 1, 2001.

Ricks, James Granger: Assoc Professor, Department of Social Sciences, effective May 1, 2001.

St. Romain, Madeleine D.: Assoc Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective May 1, 2001.

Wanstreet, Rheda Yvonne C.: Asst Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective May 1, 2001.

Wood, Martha M.: Professor, Department of Learning Support, effective May 1, 2001.

GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Jarvis, Peter M.: Assoc Professor, Department of Mathematics & Computer Science, leave from Aug 1, 2001 through Jul 31, 2002, without pay.

KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Anderson, Thomas C.: Assoc Professor, Department of Economics & Finance, effective Apr 1, 2001.

Straley, Tina H.: Asst Vice President, Department of Mathematics, effective Apr 2, 2001.

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

Part-time Appointments of System Retirees:

Smith, H. Verne: Consultant, Vice President for Academic Affairs, beginning Feb 1, 2001 and ending May 15, 2001.

SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Andrews, H. Robert: Assoc Professor, Department of Mathematics, effective Jul 1, 2001.

Wess, Robert C.: Professor, Department of Humanities and Technical Communication, effective Jul 1, 2001.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

Part-time Appointments of System Retirees:

Scherm, Nancy Carolyn: Asst Professor Emeritus, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, beginning Jan 5, 2001 and ending May 10, 2001.

ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Benefield, Leon Wilson, Jr.: Professor, Division of Science And Mathematics, effective Apr 19, 2001.

GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

Anderson, Thomas J.: Part-Time Instructor, Department of Fine Arts (Clarkston), effective May 1, 2001.

Herring, Hal M.: Assoc Professor, Department of Physical Education (Dunwoody), effective May 1, 2001.

Hinely, Mary B.: Part-Time Associate Professor, Department of Fine Arts (Clarkston), effective May 1, 2001.

Ross, Sharon C.: Part-Time Professor, Department of Mathematics/Computer Science/Engineering (Clarkston), effective May 1, 2001.

Tate, Faye R.: Asst to the Provost, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (Decatur), effective May 1, 2001.

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Coleman, D. Landon II: Asst Professor, Department of Fine Arts (Clarkston), leave from Aug 13, 2001 through May 11, 2002, with pay.

Fenster, Lori-Gene: Asst Professor, Department of Fine Arts (Clarkston), leave from Aug 13, 2001 through May 11, 2002, with pay.

Riggs, Jack C.: Asst Professor, Department of Humanities (Lawrenceville), leave from Aug 13, 2001 through May 11, 2002, with pay.

GORDON COLLEGE

Major Administrative and Faculty Approvals:

Tobin, Katrina Stricking: Vice President for Enrollment Services, effective Apr 19, 2001.

MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE

Conferral of Emeritus Approvals:

King, James P.: Professor, Division of Business Administration, effective Feb 1, 2001.

9. Establishment of the Hamilton Holmes Professorship, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish the Hamilton Holmes Professorship, effective April 18, 2001.

Abstract: The Hamilton Holmes Professorship will be the first endowed faculty position at the University of Georgia named for an African-American. The new professorship, which will be in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, will be used to bring an outstanding professor to join the faculty of a department in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences. The Hamilton Holmes Professorship will not be restricted to a specific academic department or discipline. An endowment of \$250,000 by the University of Georgia Foundation, Inc. has been established for the creation of the professorship.

Biosketch: Dr. Hamilton E. Holmes was one of the first two African-American students to enroll at UGA in 1961. A distinguished graduate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Holmes was an outstanding student academically, winning election to Phi Beta Kappa and graduating with honors. After graduating in 1963, he earned a medical degree at Emory University and had a successful orthopedics practice in Atlanta. In addition to his private orthopedics practice, Dr. Holmes served as Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs at Grady Hospital and as Associate Dean of the Emory School of Medicine. He was a member of the Emory National Council for Medicine and was on the Board of Directors of the Medical Association of Atlanta. He became a strong supporter of the University of Georgia and was a trustee of the University of Georgia Foundation, Inc. when he died in 1995 following heart surgery.

10. Information Item: Savannah Economic Development Authority Agreement

In February 1998, the Board entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Savannah Economic Development Authority (“SEDA”) and the Georgia Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism to develop 100 acres on Skidaway Island to support the economic interests of the state and the academic and research interests of the University System of Georgia. At this meeting, Mr. Richard D. Knowlton, Jr., President and Chief Executive Officer of SEDA spoke to the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension regarding a preliminary proposal for a company to locate on University System of Georgia Research Island at Skidaway. Mr. Knowlton updated the Committee members on the 1998 Intergovernmental Agreement and provided information about the preliminary proposal that a telecom company, currently proceeding through proposal stages, may be a participant in this agreement.

11. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Georgia State University			
Support Black Women’s Wellness Center	Georgia Dept. of Community Health	6/30/00 - 6/30/01	\$37,500
Conduct Georgia Teach Force program	Georgia Professional Standards Commission	8/3/00 - 8/1/01	\$22,000
University of Georgia			
Design and implement Better Hometown program	Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs	11/15/00 - 6/30/01	\$10,000

Design and implement vocational accountability systems	Georgia Dept. of Education	10/1/00 - 3/31/01	\$45,726
Implement Ware-WIC cooperative agreement	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	10/1/00 - 9/30/01	\$9,906
Conduct focus group on health needs of women over 45 in Georgia	Georgia Dept. of Medical Assistance	7/1/00 - 3/31/01	\$15,000
Prepare Georgia archaeological site files	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	7/1/01 - 6/30/01	\$30,000
Conduct research to improve quality of post-secondary technical education in Georgia	Georgia Dept. of Technical and Adult Education	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$183,000
Georgia Southern University			
Conduct state improvement grant	Georgia Dept. of Education	1/30/99 - 1/31/02	\$25,000
Georgia College & State University			
Provide educational support services	Georgia Independent School Association	36959	\$8,650
Provide housing for student nurse program	DeKalb Technical College	2/25/01 - 3/2/01	\$888

TOTAL AMOUNT –APRIL **\$ 386,670**
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2001 TO DATE **\$ 21,247,582**
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 (TO APRIL) **\$ 23,701,231**
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 **\$ 25,106,814**

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 at approximately 3:20 p.m. in room 130 of the Maxwell Student Union on the campus of Georgia College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Regents Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, and J. Timothy Shelnut. Regent McMillan reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had considered five applications for review. Of these, the Committee were recommending that one be granted and four be denied. The Committee were also recommending approval of a number of technical amendments to The Policy Manual. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

The following applications were discussed in Executive Session. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (Amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

- a. In the matter of Dr. James Sotiropoulos at Southern Polytechnic State University, concerning removal from position as Vice President for Academic Affairs June 2001, the application for review was denied.

- b. In the matter of Vernell D. Morgan at Augusta State University, concerning academic dishonesty, the application for review was denied.
- c. In the matter of Henry Preston Lake at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning readmission to dental school, the application for review was denied.
- d. In the matter of Robert L. Sudduth at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning reclassification of position (demotion), the application for review was granted.
- e. In the matter of Michelle L. Rister at the University of Georgia, concerning readmission to the university, the application for review was denied.

2. Policy Manual Changes

Approved: The Board of Regents approved the following technical amendments to The Policy Manual:

Summary of Technical Amendments to The Policy Manual

Sections Amendments

All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace outdated or nonexistent titles with appropriate, current titles • Change references to University System “institutions” rather than “units” • Adopt inclusive language • Correct grammar and punctuation
102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove reference to academic bodies “with legislative authority”
204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make presidents’ contractual delegation authority consistent with prior Board grant contained in section 700 • Remove requirement that Secretary report small settlements to Board
302.03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Require” rather than “request” filings of officers with faculty status
302.05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove requirement that Chancellor receive all minutes of faculty meetings
303.0302	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions to file academic reports “each semester” rather than “quarterly”
303.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add “baccalaureate” to types of degrees offered by University System
303.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete section on “Continuing Education,” which duplicates Section 500
305	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow grade of “CP,” which is already widely used in University System
409	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete this section, which is merely a reference to Section 704.0401
502.01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert correct name of the University of Georgia’s “College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences” • Include “family and consumer sciences” in the mission of the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences

- 503.02 • Correct the name of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools’ “Criteria for Accreditation”
- 704.0101 • Add provision previously passed by Board giving Chancellor authority to approve special pilot programs for waiving the tuition differential
- 707.01 • Add correct name of Georgia Department of Administrative Services
- 709.02 • Delete duplicate reference to Chancellor’s signatory authority contained in Section 102
- 802.0807 • Remove distinction between “selective service” and other military physical examinations
- 802.1005 • Extend COBRA coverage to disabled employees from 24 to 29 months, as mandated by federal law
- 802.17 • Remove duplicate reference to University System’s compliance with Title VI
- 802.19 • Remove the language relating to tuition reimbursement, which duplicates Section 803.1407
- 803.09(J) • Remove the section on notice of non-renewal which is duplicated in Section 803.06(B)(2)
- 803.1407 • Add language to this section on tuition reimbursement which emphasizes that the Board will reimburse only tuition and fees actually paid by the employee
 - Add Board policy which prohibits tuition reimbursement for dental, medical, pharmacy, veterinary, law, and executive programs
 - Add caveat that tuition will be reimbursed only at the in-state rate
- 804 • Add correct name of Board’s Business Procedures Manual, Volume 3A
- 907 • Add “cable and other communications lines” to the types of authorized utility license agreements
- 1001 • Replace specific titles with “Chancellor’s designee” regarding persons authorized to issue press releases
- 1002.01 • Delete the reference to specific job titles
- 1905 • Delete the section on “Civil Defense Program”
- 1907 • Add “Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services” as an additional agent for service of process

Need: These amendments were necessitated by new titles within the University System Office, changes in federal law, and other technical matters. A red-line copy of the revised Policy Manual is on file with the Office of Legal Affairs.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am so very pleased that we've had this opportunity to be at Georgia College & State University ("GCSU") the last two days. You can tell from both the substance and the visual of this place that the Board's selection of GCSU as the liberal arts university was a wise one indeed.

This journey began as I did my very first tour of the state talking to parents and others. What I learned was that Georgia was, in my view, losing too many students to out-of-state schools. And once a student is out-of-state for an education, your chances of having that student back as a contributing citizen to the state diminish significantly. I saw a recent study that showed the huge decline at institutions in our border states of Georgia students. HOPE has been a huge driver of that change, as has our increasing quality.

Back in 1994, I learned in particular that parents lamented not having a public liberal arts institution in the state. Their anguish was exacerbated by the price they had to pay to send their children to a liberal arts college.

So as I continued my tour of all 34 campuses in 100 days, I kept my eyes open for a campus that might have "the look." I thought I had found it when I came to Milledgeville, although I had to look beyond the columns held together by baler twine. Now I knew presidential strategy. Then President Speir was obviously making an MRR (major repairs and renovation) statement to the new Chancellor. So, out of that particular visit came our determination to improve MRR and to launch a public liberal arts institution. Again, then President Speir spotted the opportunity. And when we brought in an outside consulting team to help sharpen missions, GCSU was ready to make not just the pitch, but also to start taking the actions (like raising admission standards ahead of the System action.)

So the idea was born. And exactly at the right moment, this human dynamo flew into town, new President Rosemary DePaolo. Tremendous progress has been made in realizing the dream. The data speak for themselves. But not close to the eloquence of the students. And with their support of extra tuition, they also walked the talk.

Well exactly what are the liberal arts? They are liberalizing experiences. They are those activities that free the mind. As my favorite quotation about a college education is "It's what is left after you've forgotten everything you've been taught." It's the habits of the mind. The management guru Tom Peters put it another way: "In the brain-based global economy, victory will go to the perpetually curious." A true liberal arts education will create the perpetually curious.

I've always wondered why children seem to lose that sense of curiosity, that constant questioning. A true liberal arts student always has more questions than answers. Always has a healthy skepticism. Always has a rich appreciation for life, for the arts, and for ethical conduct.

And I by no means want to suggest Georgia College & State University has a monopoly on the liberal arts. Indeed, our core curriculum — a significant part of the first two years of a college education — is infused with the liberal arts. This System has a strong tradition of the core curriculum that goes back long before my time. For this reason, our two-year colleges are really, in significant part, mini-liberal arts colleges.

Elsewhere in the System, we also have areas of liberal arts emphasis. I'll just mention two: the honors programs at the University of Georgia and the State University of West Georgia. The former is nationally recognized and a wonderful way to make a large university feel smaller to its students. At the State University of West Georgia, not only do you have the honors college, but you also have related activities, such as the national champion debate team. Nothing was more important to me in my own education as the debate team. West Georgia's repeated national success is nothing short of remarkable.

I've been doing some consulting with a small, elite liberal arts college in New England. I'm struck by the intensity of the educational experience. It's a luxury that such colleges can indulge in because their students tend not to work while they go to college, at least not to the extent many of ours do. I sense here an increased intensity, as evidenced by visiting speakers and artists, by heavy involvement in the governance of the institution, and the myriad of opportunities for incidental learning.

The future challenge here, to my mind, is to make the professional programs, for example, business and nursing, so infused with the liberal arts — even in the courses in the major — that the graduates are entirely distinctive and, therefore, sought out by employers in the state and nation. (I noticed a number of you who are employers in your day jobs jotting down the names of the students who spoke yesterday!)

The challenge for us as a System is to encourage further distinctiveness in our colleges and universities. It is rather interesting to me that three of our most distinctive institutions have quite a mouthful for names:

- Georgia College & State University has a liberal arts college feel within a state university.
- North Georgia College & State University has a military college within a state university.
- And Clayton College & State University has a technical college within a state university.

It's funny how things work out sometimes. I hope distinctiveness continues to develop in the University System.

One other observation. At the heart of any form of education is the curriculum. I am very proud of the massive curriculum reform that occurred with semester conversion. Our faculty truly did a magnificent job under tremendous pressure.

But today I want to call for the beginning of phase II of curriculum reform. Because of time constraints, we largely converted our curriculum rather than transformed it. You're going to see some data in a few minutes that will suggest we rethink at least how we package our curriculum. As we do so, it will be our responsibility to remove the impediments that range from traditional notions of a course (3 credits, lasting 15 weeks) to computer systems that can't accept anything but the traditional to financial aid regulations to policies and procedures that inhibit innovation.

Let me cite just one example of the type of innovation I'm thinking about, and after Dan Papp's presentation I hope you'll see the connection.

Why can't we have, for example, a literature course for three credits — say to cover three women authors? And why couldn't each author unit last five weeks for one credit? Take all three for three credits or any combination. Say a student drops a course because he or she feels overloaded in the middle of the semester, but then later in the semester things settle down and you'd like to pick back up one credit — just take the last five-week unit. Or you're a single mother with a notoriously unreliable babysitter. You can't imagine signing up for 15 weeks, but you might for five and then, if all's well, another five and so on.

I also wonder — again because of the notions I've talked about with regard to intensity of experience — if we're offering our students sufficient independent study opportunities, that is, an individually supervised course for credit. We know the single greatest influence on students is personal contact with faculty who care. That's why Rosemary is intent on reducing the student-faculty ratio. That's why I've called for budget adjustments to be made in administration rather than instruction.

I've learned we have some great minds in our System and want to ask them to help us think how we can transform and liberate our curriculum.

Yes, I did say that there was quiet revolution going on in Milledgeville — and recognize it's not easy for an English-born person to applaud American revolutions. May we look back at our time in Milledgeville as a time we began a revolution in the University System of Georgia's curriculum.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Chair White next 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 welcomed the Regents to this meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee and called upon Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs Daniel S. Papp to deliver his presentation on graduation rates and credit hours.

Dr. Papp thanked Chair Leebern and explained that his presentation would have four parts. The first part would be old information from the benchmarking and management review study performed last year. As the University System Office staff delved deeper into this information, they began to discover some very interesting facts. So, the second part of the presentation would be these very interesting findings. The third part of the presentation would be a Regents' discussion to help the staff explain and understand what this new information means. The final part would be getting the Regents' feedback on what to do with this information. With that, Dr. Papp began the first part of the presentation with benchmarking data on graduation rates. He noted that the Board has already covered this material during its benchmarking initiative, but it would be useful to go over the highlights again. He noted that generally, University System graduation rates are lower than the Board would like them to be. Four-year rates are often in the normative range but at the low end of the range, and six-year rates are often below the low end of the range. Moreover, there is not much change in graduation rates over time. For example, the University of Georgia ("UGA") is far above its peer group with regard to four-year graduation rates, while Georgia State University ("GSU"), the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT"), and the regional and state universities fall within the normative range, but at the low end. However, the six-year graduation rates present a somewhat different picture. While GSU and the regional and state universities fall below their peer groups, UGA and GIT fall within the normative range. Over time, the graduation rates have stayed rather consistent. With the University System's new admissions standards, the graduation rates should begin improving, but in the past, they have been relatively consistent. The 12-year graduation rates do increase, but there is not that much growth between 6- and 12-year rates.

Dr. Papp next moved onto the second part of his presentation. He reported that the University System headcount in the 1990s started in the neighborhood of 190,000 and ended around 200,000 and that, this year, the University System has its second-highest headcount ever. However, the number of full-time equivalent ("FTE") students actually declined around 1997. He noted that there were circumstances in addition to semester conversion that caused this decline, which he would discuss more fully later. The staff realized that they needed to really examine how many hours students were actually taking. The numbers of students who were taking more than a full load — 16 or more credit hours — was rather consistent, approximately 30,000, in the early and mid-1990s. However, there was an extremely large drop to about 22,000 around 1997. Dr. Papp asked why students suddenly decided not to take more than a full load. They did not leave school, but they no longer took so many hours. Many of them — about 2,000 — dropped back to a regular load of 12 to 15 credit hours. Most of them — about 5,000 — are taking less than a full load but still a significant number of courses, between 6 and 11 credit hours. Finally, there has been a significant decline in the numbers of students taking five or fewer credit hours per term. Dr. Papp noted that these students are generally full-time employees and parents and that this phenomenon was also likely driven by a good economy.

Introducing part three of his presentation, Dr. Papp asked, "Why is this happening?"

Regent McMillan responded that this could be explained by semester conversion or by students' having difficulties keeping their HOPE Scholarships.

Dr. Papp stated with regard to semester conversion, perhaps some students could not commit to the time commitment and had to drop out. With regard to the HOPE Scholarship Program

(“HOPE”), many students are having a hard time keeping HOPE, so they drop courses that may cause them to lose the scholarship. He noted that a full-time student taking 15 credit hours per semester for a total of 30 hours a year who drops one 3-credit-hour course is losing 10% of his credit hours that year.

Chancellor Portch added that the student cannot then graduate in four years unless he takes an extra course in another semester or during a summer.

Regent White interjected that his own children have taught him that college students today do not think they have to graduate in four years. He asserted that many students have taken the opportunity of semester conversion to explain to their parents that they cannot take the extra load and perhaps their parents did not really understand what semester conversion meant.

Dr. Papp stated that he told his children that they had four years to graduate and, after that, they were on their own. He said that the Regents are not the only ones who are aware that only 18% of University System students graduate in four years. It is like an urban legend on System campuses that it takes more than four years to graduate, and the statistics support this belief. As a result of this belief, there is a push to move in that direction and take longer than four years to graduate.

Regent White noted that a strong economy luring students into the workforce certainly plays a factor in graduation rates. However, there is also the factor of having parents who, because of a good economy, may not be putting as much pressure on their children to graduate in four years. Considering recent turns in the economy, this may change, he said, but this is likely also an economic factor in the graduation rates.

Chancellor Portch added that today’s traditional college students have never lived in a bad economy, so the rush to get into the job market is not there. He said that life is not all bad on a college campus, and many students do not feel particularly eager to graduate.

Dr. Papp noted that the University System will be performing a student satisfaction survey next year. If student satisfaction is too high, there may be more 12-year students.

Regent McMillan asked whether admissions standards have an impact on graduation rates.

Dr. Papp replied that they may well have an impact, because as the University System gets better students, more of them may want to keep a really high grade point average (“GPA”) and be more willing to drop courses at midterm that risk lowering their GPAs.

Regent NeSmith asked how long can students receive the HOPE Scholarship.

Dr. Papp responded that, technically, a student can be on HOPE for 60 years, if he takes only one credit hour per semester for a total of two credit hours a year. That is because an undergraduate program is generally 120 semester hours. While he admitted to being a bit facetious, his key point was that HOPE does not have a time limitation nor require that students go to college full-time.

Regent Coles asked whether the information Dr. Papp had provided included both traditional and nontraditional students.

Dr. Papp responded that it did.

Regent Coles asked whether the proportions of traditional and nontraditional students have changed over time.

Dr. Papp responded that the staff do have data on the mix of traditional and nontraditional students. He called upon Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis Cathie Mayes Hudson to respond to the question.

Dr. Hudson responded that the proportion of nontraditional students has remained about the same over the last seven years.

Regent Hunt suggested that perhaps students have decided in semester conversion to continue to take nine courses a year instead of the full load of ten semester courses.

Dr. Papp agreed that structural issues certainly play a role in graduation rates. Full-time students in the quarter system took three courses of five credit hours each. Under the semester system, they now take five courses of three credit hours each. There is some very new data that shows that some students are now taking less than the full load of five courses per semester. Also, full-time as defined by the University System of Georgia is 15 credit hours. However, the federal student financial aid definition of full-time is 12 hours. Under the quarter system, students had to take three 5-hour courses to achieve 15 credit hours and maintain their federal financial aid. However, under the semester system, a student can only take four 3-hour courses and still achieve the 12 credit hours required to qualify for federal financial aid.

Regent White noted that President Michael F. Adams of UGA wanted to comment on this matter.

President Adams responded that a positive factor in achieving four-year graduation rates at UGA is that about one-third of entering freshman at UGA begin with advanced placement (“AP”) credits, which can put them anywhere from 3 to 32 semester hours ahead. The average AP student has between 12 and 15 credit hours when she enters GIT or UGA, giving her a semester’s head start on graduation.

Chancellor Portch noted that there is also a marketing factor. What does best in marketing is when something is offered for free. The price of higher education in the United States has traditionally been capped. In other words, institutions do not typically charge students more to take over 15 credits in one term. Students like to get something for free, so they will take 18 credits because they are getting 3 for free. However, for HOPE students, all credits are free, so there is no incentive for them to take extra hours to get something for free. This is an unintended outcome of HOPE.

Regent White remarked that it seems the University System has created some disincentives and should instead try to find some new incentives, and the Chancellor agreed.

Dr. Papp noted that there are some other factors impacting graduation rates. He noted that during the semester conversion process, the Board insisted that there be program review across the System to curb some of the “credit creep” that had occurred over the years. So, nearly all undergraduate programs are now at a standard 120 credit hours, which is attainable in four years, whereas some programs under the quarter system were no longer attainable in four years because of the gradual addition of more and more required courses. Another factor impacting graduation rates is transfer articulation. Dr. Papp reported that the transferability of courses across the System has been greatly improved in recent years, thereby reducing the number of duplicate courses that a student must take when he transfers from one System institution to another. So, there are many variables that impact graduation rates and reduced credit hours in the University System.

Regent Coles remarked that a student may enter college thinking that she will graduate in one thing and then decide somewhere along the line that she will major in something else. If she has already

used up her HOPE Scholarship allotment, he asked, will she have to pay for courses beyond 120 credit hours?

Dr. Papp responded that she would. He asked the staff how many credit hours HOPE would cover.

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Media and Publications Arlethia Perry-Johnson replied that HOPE covers a maximum of 127 semester hours.

Regent Coles asked whether there are many students who find themselves in this situation and have to go to work to earn the money to pay for the remainder of their college education.

Chancellor Portch responded that approximately three-quarters of college students change their majors at least once.

Dr. Papp noted that he started college as a chemistry major and changed to math to economics to international affairs.

Chancellor Portch stated that HOPE recently changed its rules for technical colleges such that students can now take additional courses and still maintain the scholarship.

Regent McMillan noted that there are a number of new degree programs in education that have more than 120 semester hours.

Dr. Papp stated that almost all education programs are at 120 semester hours; however, there are a few education programs with 126 required credit hours.

Regent McMillan asked whether the Board would continue to approve programs that were above 120 semester hours.

Dr. Papp called upon Dr. David M. Morgan, Deputy to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, to respond to this question.

Dr. Morgan responded that there have been some added credit hours in secondary education program in response to the 1998 Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools, which require that high school teachers have a full major in their teaching fields in addition to education courses.

Regent Cater asked whether students lose credit hours with they transfer from one System institution to another.

Dr. Papp responded that this happens sometimes, but it happens much less frequently than it occurred in the past. The transfer articulation of core curriculum courses is particularly good.

Chancellor Portch asked how many credit hours comprise the core curriculum.

Dr. Papp responded that the core is comprised of 60 semester hours.

The Chancellor remarked that the core usually transfers. However, if a student has taken six physical education ("PE") courses and the college she is transferring into only requires two, then she may lose some of those credits.

Dr. Papp noted that Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”) has no PE requirements, so it would be difficult to transfer any PE credits into SPSU.

Chair Leebern asked whether a student can transfer a course such as calculus from SPSU to GIT.

Chancellor Portch responded that the student could transfer the course, but not the grade.

Chair Leebern asked what becomes of the grade.

The Chancellor responded that transferred grades are not computed in a student’s final GPA at the institution from which he graduates. He noted that this is often to a student’s advantage, because often a student has a higher GPA in his last two years of college than in his first two years. In the final analysis, a student graduates with the GPA he earned at the institution from which he graduated.

In turning to the final part of his presentation, Dr. Papp asked the Regents what should be done to accelerate the time to graduation and improve graduation rates.

Chancellor Portch stressed that this is important to the Board as a public policy question. Statistics show that in the next three or four years, there will not be a rapid growth of the numbers of high school students in Georgia. However, in the four or five years after that, there will be tremendous growth. For every student taking a leisurely pace through college, resources such as residential space, library space, classroom space, faculty time, and staff resources are being used. Unfortunately, when there are large numbers of entering freshmen on the horizon, the University System may not be able to keep up with these kinds of resources. So, from a financial and public policy point of view, the Board needs to find ways to keep students moving through the System. Because of the decline in credit hours, the System is not seeing that right now.

Dr. Papp remarked that part of this also is a political culture issue at the campuses as well. The students believe it is natural to take five or six years to graduate from college.

Regent McMillan noted that during the previous day’s meeting of the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension, Regent Magill had mentioned the need to improve academic counseling, particularly on the K-12 level. He remarked that counseling has a strong bearing on this matter and that students get dismal counseling in public schools, but he did not know the Board’s responsibility or ability to improve counseling in high school so that students and their parents have a better understanding of these issues to have an impact on how the students think about college.

Dr. Papp added that this is not only true at high schools, but also in the University System. During the semester conversion process, the institutions did a great job of improving the quality of advising that took place. Nonetheless, it might be beneficial to look again at the quality of advising at System institutions.

Regent Coles remarked that different course structures and time frames actually increase the time that students attend college.

Chancellor Portch responded that he would like to get information on what percentage of University System courses are three credits versus four, for example. Perhaps there is some benefit to developing courses that have more credit hours.

Dr. Hudson responded that this is something the staff can research.

Regent NeSmith asked whether students found it easier to take three courses at five credit hours each.

Dr. Papp responded that this is one part of the structural issue that he had mentioned and part of the difference between the quarter and semester systems.

Regent Coles asked whether students now have to go to school every day of the week because of the structure of the semester system.

Dr. Papp responded that a student who is taking 15 credit hours whether under quarters or semesters will be in the classroom 15 hours per week.

Chair Leebern asked whether there were any further questions or comments.

Dr. Papp remarked that this should give the Regents a lot to consider. He noted that some System institutions are already thinking about these issues. For example, UGA just completed an internal study about graduation rates and credit hours, the results of which have been some very interesting findings and implications.

Regent Hunt asked whether the Board could provide some incentives to get students to graduate sooner. For example, if they were to graduate in 3.5 years, perhaps the Board could give them the other half a year in graduate school at no cost. Then, they would move through quicker and be enticed into graduate programs, too.

The Chancellor responded that the Regents need to do this kind of brainstorming to find incentives for the students to graduate on time.

Dr. Papp noted that this would provide a good foundation for the Board's May 2001 strategic planning retreat.

Seeing that there were no further questions or comments, Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Papp and the Regents for this discussion and asked for a motion to recess the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. Motion properly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned into its regular session.

Chair White thanked Regent Leebern and the other Regents for their input in this discussion.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 10:10 a.m., Chair White called for an Executive Session regarding 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 and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, 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 10:15 a.m., Chair White reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. In open session, Regent Hunt made a motion to appoint Dr. Michael F. Vollmer as President of Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, effective July 1, 2001. The motion was seconded by Regent Wooten and unanimously approved. Next, Regent Harris made a motion to appoint Dr. J. Randolph Pierce as President of Floyd College, effective June 15, 2001. The motion was seconded by Regent Yancey and unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair White called upon Secretary Gail S. Weber to present to the Board an honorary degree recommendation.

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the recommendation was from President Thomas Z. Jones of Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU") to award an honorary degree at the December 2001 graduation to Dr. Irving Victor. This recommendation comes with the unanimous support of a select faculty committee who evaluated Dr. Victor's academic, professional, and civic credentials. An alumnus of AASU (then Armstrong Junior College), the University of Georgia, and the Medical College of Georgia, Dr. Victor has served AASU in many capacities, offering both his talents and treasures. Victor Hall is named after his deceased wife.

On behalf of President Jones, Secretary Weber submitted this nomination for the Board's approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the honorary degree.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the Board would next meet on Tuesday, May 8 and Wednesday, May 9, 2001. On May 8, the Regents would attend an all-day strategic planning retreat at Jolley Lodge on the campus of Kennesaw State University. On May 9, the Regents would meet in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia. Committee meetings would be followed by a meeting of the full Board. More complete details would be mailed to the Regents in the coming week.

Chair White reminded the Regents that the May meeting represents the culmination of two years of the benchmarking and management review initiative. He encouraged all of the Regents to attend the retreat because the resulting strategic plan would be critical to the future of the University System of Georgia.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 a.m. on April 18, 2001.

s/

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

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