

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
January 9 and 10, 2001**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, January 9 and Wednesday, January 10, 2001 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Glenn S. White, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 9. 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., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, J. Timothy Shelnut, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

Chair White welcomed Regent Coles, who replaced former Regent Kenneth W. Canestra. Regent Coles had been legally sworn-in at approximately 9:15 a.m. that morning in an abbreviated ceremony in the office of Robert S. "Bobby" Kahn, Chief of Staff. Chair White noted that in February 2001, there would be a full swearing-in of both Regent Coles and the Board's other newest member, Regent Allene H. Magill, who replaced former Regent Edgar L. Jenkins.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, January 9 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent Juanita P. Baranco had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day. Regent Charles H. Jones was also absent.

Chair White congratulated Vice Chair Howell on the recent birth of his twin daughters.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on November 14 and 15, 2000 were unanimously approved as distributed.

UPDATE ON ADMISSIONS STANDARDS IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Chair White called upon Chancellor Portch to make some special introductions to the Board.

Chancellor Portch introduced Representative DuBose Porter (District 143), Chair of House Higher Education Committee. Representative Porter is from Dublin and was responsible for the transfer of the public library system to the University System of Georgia. The Chancellor next introduced Representative A. Richard Royal (District 164), Chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee. Representative Royal is from Camilla. Finally, Chancellor Portch introduced Representative Butch J. Parrish (District 144) of Swainsboro. Representative Parrish is a good friend to East Georgia College. The Chancellor said that these Representatives are friends of the University System and encouraged the Regents to get to know them.

Chair White next called upon Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs Daniel S. Papp to update the Board on the admissions standards of the University System.

Dr. Papp thanked Chair White and greeted the Board. He explained that in 1996, the Board of Regents approved a set of policies that would raise admissions standards in the University System of Georgia. The purpose of the increased admissions standards is to improve student success in the University System of Georgia, particularly for traditional students. The implementation of the new standards was phased in from 1997 through 2000, with the full implementation to be in place by summer 2001. Previously, many students who were admitted as traditional freshmen into the University System were under-prepared in a number of areas. Many of them required learning support (“LS”), and many of them did not have a sufficient number of courses in the college preparatory curriculum (“CPC”). The University System’s graduation rate was declining, and in many cases, institutional missions were not driving admissions policies. A specific goal of the new admissions policies is to increase the average Scholastic Aptitude Test (“SAT”) score, a goal which Dr. Papp’s presentation to the Strategic Planning Committee in October 2000 demonstrated is being attained. Another goal is to increase the rates of students with proper CPC preparation. A third goal is to reduce the percentage of traditional freshmen requiring LS. Other admissions goals are to better match students with institutions, to concentrate LS programs at the two-year college level, and to continue to serve a diverse student body. The final goal is to ease the transfer of students and credits between institutions, from institution to institution both within a sector and between sectors, with particular attention focused on helping students move from two-year institutions into four-year institutions.

Dr. Papp explained that beginning in summer 2001, the University System will require a minimum of 16 CPC courses for each high school graduate entering the System. Freshmen will be admitted on the basis of the freshman index, which takes into consideration both their high school grade point average (“GPA”) and either their SAT or American College Testing exam (“ACT”) scores. The freshman index provides a balance between grades and test scores in the admissions selection process. The University System also has minimum SAT and ACT scores in place. The minimum scores vary depending on the sector of the institution to which a student applies. The University System also has a target for each sector to reduce by 5% each year the percentage of LS students attending those institutions with the target being 0%. There were different ways the universities went about achieving this objective. In 1995, Georgia State University (“GSU”) had 42% of its entering traditional freshmen in LS. GSU dropped to 6.3% and is nearing 0% at this time. Fort Valley State University (“FVSU”) began with 62% of its traditional freshmen in LS and is now down to 30.4%. Valdosta State University (“VSU”) started at slightly over 30% and is now down to 0%. Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) is down to 4.1%. At the same time, even as the University System was moving toward its objectives, it sought to leave in place a degree of flexibility. There were a number of ways that the policies adopted in 1996 intended to ensure that flexibility. For instance, the improved standards apply only to traditional students, not nontraditional students who have been out of high school for more than five years. Additionally, limited admissions ensure that the standards can be relaxed for small numbers of students. Also, a very small number of students at each institution can be admitted as presidential exceptions due to their unique capabilities in certain areas. There are also a number of pilot programs in cities such as Augusta, Columbus, Valdosta, Statesboro, and Americus in which students who are geographically bound can be admitted in special programs. Finally, the phase-in period for the increased admissions standards and the reduction in LS would be determined by the particular institution’s starting point. There were a number of institutions that had very high percentages of students in LS when the program was implemented; therefore, the number of years provided for phasing-in the LS reductions at those institutions was based on their starting points.

“How are we doing?” asked Dr. Papp. He noted that in fall 1995, 3 of the 18 research, regional, and state universities had over 50% of their traditional entering freshmen in LS. Six had somewhere between 35% and 50% in LS; four had between 20% and 35%; two had between 5% and 20%; and only three had under 5%. Currently, only one of these universities still has over

50% in LS; only one has between 35% and 50%; only one has between 20% and 35%; five have between 5% and 20%; and ten have less than 5%. Dr. Papp remarked that this was great progress. Next, he discussed the institutions that have over the course of the last four years averaged over 7.5% per year in reductions of LS. Those institutions include GSU, FVSU, VSU, Georgia Southwestern State University ("GSSU"), Clayton College & State University ("CCSU"), and Armstrong Atlantic State University. Those who reduced LS by 5% to 7.5% include Savannah State University ("SSU"), Augusta State University ("AUSU"), Columbus State University ("CSU"), and Kennesaw State University ("KSU"). Those who are already below 5% are AASU, Georgia College & State University, GSOU, GSSU, GSU, Georgia Institute of Technology, KSU, Southern Polytechnic State University, University of Georgia, and VSU. He noted that those who are still above 5% include the University System's three historically black colleges and universities, Albany State University, FVSU, and SSU, all of which have nevertheless significantly reduced the percentages of students they have in LS. LS is also still above 5% at AUSU and CSU, where special pilot programs have been launched to give geographically constrained persons access to the University System. Other institutions, such as CCSU, North Georgia College & State University, and State University of West Georgia, are close to having made the required reductions and anticipate being close to or at 0% by fall 2001.

However, there are some uncertainties about the overall impact that the increased admissions standards will have on enrollment within the University System of Georgia, said Dr. Papp. One uncertainty is how successful the Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program ("PREP") will be. Several years ago, the System implemented PREP, which is designed to help high school students, particularly African-American students, improve their chances of success in college. The first group of PREP students to have gone all the way through the program will be graduating from high school this spring. How many of them will go to college is unknown at this time. How many of them will go to college in Georgia is also unknown. So, the success of PREP is yet to be determined. Another uncertainty is whether the System's admissions coordination efforts will succeed. Dr. Papp reported that the System is in the process of implementing an effort to encourage prospective students who were denied admission to a research university to apply to a state university or two-year college. The success of this effort is also unknown at this time. Yet another uncertainty is whether the six pilot programs across the System will succeed. Dr. Papp stated that the staff are in the midst of an assessment of those pilot programs at this time. He then addressed presidential exceptions, stressing that the intention is to have very limited numbers of such exceptions. He noted that there is uncertainty whether the marketing efforts to attract nontraditional students will increase the number of students in the System. The University System has roughly half the national average of nontraditional students. So, these uncertainties make it extremely difficult to answer the question of what the overall impact of the increased admissions standards will be as they are fully implemented.

Having addressed the uncertainties of the increased admissions standards, Dr. Papp turned his attention to what is certain. He noted that in fall 1995, the number of traditional freshmen in the University System was 27,570. In fall 2000, there were 29,829. So despite the increased admissions standards, the System has increased the number of traditional students. Moreover, in fall 2000, the average SAT score of traditional entering freshmen was 1029, an increase of 31 points from 1995. In fall 1995, the overall percentage of entering traditional freshmen requiring LS in the University System was 27%; the percentage is now down to 16%. Finally, the percentage of students who had finished the CPC in fall 1995 was 76%; now, it is up to 91%. So, there has been progress across the board, stated Dr. Papp.

In closing, Dr. Papp remarked that the emphasis the System has placed on increasing admissions standards is beginning to succeed. He stated that this should be reflected in future increased

graduation rates of students entering under the improved standards. After all, the purpose of raising standards is to increase the likelihood of student success. Dr. Papp asserted that the System is moving in the right direction.

Chair White thanked Dr. Papp and asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent Coles asked whether the close to 30,000 traditional freshmen were in just the 18 four-year institutions.

Dr. Papp responded that the figure was for all System institutions, except the Medical College of Georgia.

Regent Coles noted that the data regarding the increased admissions standards was for the 18 four-year institutions. He asked whether the staff were able to measure the success of the remaining institutions.

Dr. Papp responded that the System is raising admissions standards at all 33 institutions with undergraduate populations.

Chancellor Portch noted that the last data presented, comparing fall 1995 data with data from fall 2000, reflected all 33 institutions.

Dr. Papp agreed.

Chancellor Portch stated that the 18 four-year institutions were required to reduce LS needs. The two-year institutions are not phasing out LS, although they too are raising admissions standards.

Regent Cater asked how the staff will determine the success of PREP.

Dr. Papp replied that there are very good data available with regard to PREP. He called upon Dr. Jacqueline R. Michael, Director of Pre-College Programs, to elaborate.

Dr. Michael responded that over the last five years, 33,400 students have participated in PREP and information about them is recorded in a database. During that time, there have been three external evaluations. Last year, 5,025 teachers, students, and parents were interviewed and surveyed. Approximately 2,500 of them were students, and they indicated that they are very aware of the increased admissions standards.

Dr. Papp reiterated that it is uncertain what percentage of those students will decide to go on to college and, within that, what percentage of those students will go to college in Georgia.

Regent NeSmith noted that a few institutions lost enrollments in the transition to the increased admissions standards. However, he believed that the increased standards will improve retention and graduation rates.

Dr. Papp agreed and noted that there were multiple factors in the temporary decrease in overall enrollment within the University System. However, in fall 2000, enrollments were back up to the second-highest total in System history for headcount enrollments.

Chancellor Portch added that Valdosta State University would be a good example. VSU had significant enrollment declines two years ago, but it has already seen an increased retention rate at a

higher percentage than the reduction in new freshmen. Of course, there are many variables and only time will tell, but all the trend lines are exactly where they were expected to be.

Regent Cater remarked that the pilot programs seem to be working and could be expanded.

Dr. Papp responded that this is one possibility on the horizon. Soon, the staff will know better whether the programs are having a significant impact.

Regent Hunt asked how the two-year college retention rates are responding to this initiative.

Dr. Papp replied that this is a difficult question. The two-year colleges are maintaining about the same levels of retention, but at the same time, they too are generally seeing a reduction of students needing LS.

Regent Leebern asked whether LS is a new term for remedial studies.

Dr. Papp responded that it is.

Regent Leebern asked whether the K-12 system has received the message that the standards have been raised and it is their mission to bring the students up to those standards.

Chancellor Portch responded that he was pleased with the increase in the percentage of entering traditional freshman who have taken the CPC. The CPC units are those courses that national research demonstrates prepare students to succeed in college. So, the increased numbers of students having taken the CPC should result in more students having a better chance of succeeding in college.

Dr. Papp noted that there was a 15% increase in a four-year period in the percentage of traditional freshman who had completed the CPC.

Regent McMillan interjected that the challenge remains for secondary schools to ensure that what students learn in CPC courses is in fact CPC material. He asserted that some schools that offer CPC courses do not actually teach CPC material.

Chancellor Portch agreed that this is a critical issue. He noted that the Governor is now very much focused on the issue of out-of-field teaching, which is a closely related issue. He added that if there were a single diploma such that students were not be channeled into certain tracks and if all courses were taught by qualified teachers, there would be even more dramatic numbers of students adequately prepared for college and much more equity in those numbers. The Governor fully understands this.

Regent White asked what courses qualify as part of the CPC and how those courses are determined.

Dr. Papp responded that there are many CPC courses. Moreover, there is a committee in place to review courses that currently do not fall within the CPC. He stressed that the core 16 CPC courses have been very carefully delineated, and there is not much debate about those 16 courses. The debate is generated by the fact that to enter a state or regional university, a student is required to take those 16 courses plus 2 other academic courses. In order to get into a research university, a student must take the 16 courses plus 4 other academic courses. Most high school curricula are not limited to 20 courses. Most have somewhere between 24 and 32 academic courses available to

students. So, in some respects, the debate is a miscast debate. Even students who want to go to a research university have between 4 and 12 optional units to take. Dr. Papp reiterated that there is a committee in place to review particular courses as they are brought forward.

Regent White asked who was on the committee.

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

Dr. Morgan explained that the 2001 Admissions Committee was charged with advising the Central Office staff on the implementation of the 2001 admissions policies. The committee was scheduling meetings with various individuals who had requested that the System expand the high school coursework that could be used to satisfy the additional academic units requirements for university-level admission. The committee is composed of representatives from admissions, registrars, and Department of Education (“DOE”) personnel, as well as staff from the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

Chancellor Portch stressed that the committee is working in consultation with the DOE and the Department of Technical and Adult Education on this issue. He noted that not every student in the state takes every course available to him or her in high school. Many complete their minimum required courses so that they can work part-time and not take too many courses in their senior year. If every student took every course available to them, they would easily be able to do 20 CPC units, play in the band, participate in ROTC, and a number of other things, but other choices are being made. That is why the total number of units is a relevant issue.

Dr. Papp stated that the focus has been on the additional two to four CPC courses, when there are many other courses available to choose. Dr. Papp noted that there are a variety of different courses available to fulfil the CPC electives.

Vice Chair Howell asked what the CPC core itself includes.

Dr. Papp responded that it includes 16 courses.

Vice Chair Howell stated that students could take many other courses and that he did not understand their concern.

Dr. Papp explained that the requirement is 16 CPC units for admission to a two-year college. For admission to a state or regional university, a student must take the 16 CPC units, plus 2 academic courses. For admission to a research university, a student must take the 16 CPC units, plus 4 academic courses. There are some who are concerned that students will not take a course such as ROTC if it is not specifically identified as one of the additional CPC courses.

Regent Howell asked what options are available as academic courses.

Dr. Papp responded that the list is very extensive and is available on the Georgia Application and Electronic Advisement System (“GA EASY”) Web site.

Regent Hunt commented that students basically want courses like ROTC to count as academic courses.

Chancellor Porch added that if a course is designated as an academic course, then it is assumed

more students will take it. So, there are enrollment concerns at the high school level as well.

Dr. Papp reiterated that there are generally a number of academic elective courses available to students.

Chancellor Portch explained that additional courses such as a foreign language or math would count. That is not to say that other kinds of courses are not very important for preparing students for employment and life, but the thrust of this is to provide students with the type of courses that best prepare them for success in college. While the list of academic courses may not be perfect, there is a theoretical basis for it and a committee is involved in its continuous review. He noted that the reason Regents are getting letters about this now is because the increased standards will soon be fully implemented. So, the stakes are higher.

Chair White thanked Dr. Papp for his informative report. He remarked that it is good to see that the System is making progress in admissions and that the Board's actions are making a difference in the System.

Chancellor Portch remarked that the report was a compliment to the System institutions and to the entering freshmen who have responded to the increased standards.

Chair White next asked the Chancellor to introduce another special guest who had joined the Board meeting.

Chancellor Portch introduced Senator Jack Hill (District 4), Chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee for many years. The Chancellor remarked that Senator Hill knows how to ask the tough questions and also when to ask those questions. He has been a great advocate for the System.

Senator Hill approached the Board and remarked that there is a great communication system between the legislature and the Board, which is represented by Mr. Thomas E. Daniel, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities. He said that anytime he can help shore up support for the System to let him know, and the legislators will call upon the Board if they have any questions or concerns. He remarked that the legislature and Board have a great partnership, the results of which will be more apparent as the state enters into a period in which the economy is in need of boost. He said that perhaps the research and investments made over the last ten years may help Georgia have a softer landing. He thanked the Regents for the relationship they have with the legislators and asked that they let the legislature know how together they can serve all the citizens of Georgia.

Chair White then adjourned the Board into its regular Committee meetings. He noted that Regent Baranco was unable to chair the Committee on Organization and Law this month, so he asked Vice Chair Howell to attend the Committee meeting and Regent McMillan to chair the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, January 10, 2001 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Glenn S. White, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair White, were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater,, Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith,, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, January 10 by Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr..

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, January 10 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent Juanita P. Baranco had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day. Regent Charles H. Jones was also absent. Regents Michael J. Coles and J. Timothy Shelnut arrived shortly.

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

The Committee on Information and Instructional Technology met on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at 10:30 a.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Martin W. NeSmith and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr. and James D. Yancey. Regents Glenn S. White and Joel O. Wooten were also in attendance. Chair NeSmith reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed five items, one of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Presentation Item: GALILEO/One Statewide Library

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Library & Customer Information Services Jayne Williams made a presentation to the Committee on Georgia Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”). The presentation covered three phases of the initiative: GALILEO, GALILEO Interconnected Libraries (“GIL”) and the Digital Library. Ms. Williams explained that GALILEO serves library communities throughout Georgia, equalizing access to information across the state. She discussed the history of the development of GALILEO as well as the various communities that collaborated in that development. She also explained GALILEO’s governance structure, which is very complicated and also collaborative. Other topics covered included behind-the-scenes activities, the impact GALILEO has made on the state and the nation, and planned expansion of the program. Ms. Williams noted that GALILEO was among the first programs of its kind and has been a model program for other states. GALILEO has received national recognition and awards for excellence and continues to be increasingly beneficial to anytime, anywhere library services.

2. Operationalization of the Technology Master Plan

Approved: The Board approved the revised request of the Office of Information and Instructional Technology (“OIIT”) to operationalize the Master Plan for Information and Instructional Technology (the “Technology Master Plan”). The Committee originally considered this item at its November 2000 meeting but did not approve it. Instead, the Committee instructed that the request be modified to include specific deliverables and a reevaluation of the recommended consulting partner for this project and then reintroduced for consideration at the January 2001 meeting. The revised request is as follows.

Deliverables:

Strengthen the strategic component of the Technology Master Plan that is consistent with and supportive of the System’s strategic plan, “Access to Academic Excellence for the New Millennium and the report to the Board entitled Educational Technology and the Age of Learning,” with following attributes:

- Develop a list of what information and instructional technology services are the most strategically important to the University System.
- Select which of those strategic services listed are the responsibility of the System versus those that are the responsibility of the campuses.
- Select the best strategy for delivering those services that are the responsibility of the Central Office.
- Provide a list of specific measurable action items to be incorporated into the next cycle of the budget building process for the System.
- Establish process for continuing examination of the Technology Master Plan on an ongoing basis to include consideration of the campus master plans for information and instructional technology as they become available.
- Establish ongoing integration of the Technology Master Plan with academic and administrative programming and fiscal and facilities planning.

Consulting Partner Selection - Process and Recommendation:

An existing list of pre-approved planning consultants developed for the use of state agencies by the Georgia Technology Authority was the basis of selection process. Each vendor on the list was requested to furnish references to recent engagements with higher education organizations. Following interviews with the three vendors with the most higher education experience and checks with references supplied, OIIT will recommend a vendor to assist the Central Office staff in obtaining the deliverables cited above.

Specifically, the vendor will furnish a project plan that will ensure that the list of deliverables is obtained, will assist OIIT staff in the management of the project, and will ensure knowledge transfer to the recently created Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development within OIIT. The project will last for six months with a total cost not to exceed \$100,000.

3. Information Item: Advisory Committee Status Report

A progress report was furnished to the Committee on the creation of the Information and Instructional Technology Advisory Committee (the “Advisory Committee”). Included in the report was a listing of the Advisory Committee’s roles and responsibilities along with the membership to date. Chair NeSmith again asked for recommendations for potential Advisory Committee members and requested that the Advisory Committee membership be finalized by the February 2001 meeting.

4. Information Item: Athens Space Update

Mr. Randall A. Thursby, Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology and Chief Information Officer, presented this item to the Committee. He reported that the University of Georgia Foundation, Inc. had approved the exploration of building several buildings on the University of Georgia (“UGA”) campus. UGA is considering housing the Board of Regents Office of Information and Instructional Technology (“OIIT”)/ Advanced Learning Technologies (“ALT”) operations in one facility and moving its own information technology staff into adjacent facilities for increased synergy. When a recommendation is fully developed, it will be brought before the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities. Chair NeSmith stated that he had recently

visited the current OIIT facilities in Athens and noted the cramped quarters; he encouraged other Regents to also visit. Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham noted that building facilities on the UGA campus would result in cost savings of rent monies.

5. Information Item: Report on the Activities of the Task Force on Facilities Guidelines for Instructional Technology

President Clifford M. Brock of Bainbridge College, Chair of the Task Force on Facilities Guidelines for Instructional Technology (the “Task Force”), presented this item to the Committee. He noted that the charge to the Task Force was three-fold: 1) to review issues associated with the physical provision of instructional technology (“IT”) in University System facilities, 2) to recommend standards or guidelines that could serve as a baseline for instructional and instructional support spaces, and 3) to consider the differences between the campuses in terms of mission, location, size, and staffing requirements to ensure that the baseline standards provide reasonable access capabilities to all System institutions, including cost and flexibility. The benefits to the institutions are that such standards will reduce time to complete a building’s programming and design, increase future adaptability, reduce maintenance requirements, and improve consistency of classroom technology. Task Force members include Don Alexander, Manager, Engineering Services, Georgia Institute of Technology; Tom Archibald, Assistant to the President for Information Technology, Valdosta State University; William K. Chatham, Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Board of Regents; V. Hal Gibson, Jr., Director of Plant Operations, Columbus State University; Gita Hendessi, Director of Facilities Planning, Board of Regents; Kris E. Turnbull, Director of Center for Technology Training, Kennesaw State University; David Sims, Director of Plant Operations, Macon State College; and Dr. James Wolfgang, Chief Information Officer, Georgia College & State University.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at approximately 11:15 a.m. in room 7005. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Vice Chair Connie Cater, and Regents Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Martin W. NeSmith. Regents Michael J. Coles, George M. D. (John) Hunt, James D. Yancey, and Glenn S. White were also in attendance. Chair Wooten reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed three items, none of which required action. Those items were as follows:

1. Information Item: Internal Audit Process at Georgia Institute of Technology

Mr. Robert N. Clark, CIA, Director for Internal Auditing at Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) presented to the Committee GIT’s newly implemented audit process, which addresses departmental and information technology audits. He reported that the role of internal audit at GIT is to help faculty and administration do the right thing, identify areas of risk, assess processes in place to mitigate those risks, and recommend solutions to better manage areas of risk. He also discussed various areas of departmental and information technology audits, as well as an action plan to address audit findings.

2. Information Item: Status of Internal Audit of Construction at Gordon College

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ronald B. Stark and Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham presented this item to the Committee. Mr. Chatham discussed Board construction processes as well as the delegated authority to the institutions. Mr. Stark then

presented a preliminary report on construction at Gordon College (“GOC”), which highlighted numerous violations of the Board policies and construction processes. President Jerry M. Williamson of GOC was present at the Committee meeting. Mr. Stark noted that the final report on the internal audit of construction at GOC is not yet complete.

3. Executive Session

The Committee voted to add an item to its agenda concerning a personnel matter, which required an Executive Session. The following Committee members voted to go into Executive Session: Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Vice Chair Connie Cater, and Regents Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Martin W. NeSmith. In attendance for all or part of the meeting, in addition to the Committee members, were Regents Michael J. Coles, George M. D. (John) Hunt, James D. Yancey, and Glenn S. White, as well as Chancellor Stephen R. Portch, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services Corlis Cummings, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ronald B. Stark, Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham, and President Jerry M. Williamson of Gordon College. When the Committee returned to its regular session, Chair Wooten reported that no action had been 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 FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at approximately 2:05 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair James D. Yancey, Vice Chair Connie Cater, and Regents Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Regent Michael J. Coles also attended the meeting. Chair Yancey reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed three items, two of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Change in Tuition Terminology

Approved: The Board approved a change in tuition terminology by eliminating the separation of out-of-state tuition into “matriculation” and “non-resident fee” components and establishing the use of “matriculation” to designate in-state tuition to become effective with the fall semester 2001. The Board also directed the staff to adjust all tuition policy provisions to be consistent with this change in terminology.

Background: Under current policy, tuition charged to non-resident students consists of two components: a matriculation fee that is charged to all students and a non-resident fee that is added to the matriculation fee. The total amount paid by non-resident students is established at four times the total amount paid by resident students under a policy adopted by the Board of Regents in April 1995.

The use of “out-of-state” tuition to designate charges to non-resident students and “in-state” tuition to designate charges to resident students reflects national patterns in the use of tuition terminology. This change in policy will therefore simplify the ability of potential resident and non-resident students to compare costs of attending University System of Georgia institutions with competing regional and national institutions. Additionally, the change will make it easier to evaluate the effect of rate changes on different student populations and to understand the impact of changes on tuition revenues.

Adoption of this new terminology will require adjustments to other tuition policy provisions, primarily those concerning waivers of “non-resident fees.” This change will not affect amounts currently paid by resident and non-resident students based on tuition rates approved by the Board of Regents in April 2000. The policy requiring that out-of-state tuition reflects four times the amount of in-state tuition will be retained subject to any future action by the Board.

2. Acceptance of Gifts for the Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology gifts-in-kind from the following corporations:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Department</u>
Nortel Networks	\$479,053	Computer Networking Equipment including Routers, Switches, Hubs and Maintenance Contracts	College of Computing Network Instruction Lab
Honeywell International	\$771,390	Miscellaneous Equipment Including Coaxial Piping, Slit Dies, and Spin Plates	School of Textile and Fiber Engineering

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

3. First Quarter Financial Report, Fiscal Year 2001

Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes presented to the Committee the first quarter financial report for the University System of Georgia for the period ending September 30, 2000, which is on file with the Office of Capital Resources. The report provides tables which compare actual and budgeted revenues and expenditures through September 30, 2000 for educational and general funds, auxiliary enterprise funds, and student activity funds. In addition, the report contains charts which compare first quarter data for the current and previous fiscal year.

Departmental sales and services for other organized activities is only 6.2% of the budgeted revenue on the consolidated report. The spinoff of the hospital and the loss of those related sales have caused a significant decrease in sales revenue from fiscal year 2000 to this fiscal year.

Significant changes in the areas of institutional support and research are predominantly caused by a change in reporting at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”). The Georgia Tech Research Institute (“GTRI”) administration was previously reported in institutional support but has since been moved to research.

Changes in sponsored projects are also largely attributed to reporting changes at GIT. GTRI activity is broken out, but some of the other organized activities are temporarily being reported in resident instruction. GTRI is currently reviewing these accounts and hopes to have them in their appropriate fund groups by mid-January. They have approximately 6,000 accounts of this type.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at approximately 2:10 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Board Chair Glenn S. White and Regent Martin W. NeSmith were also in attendance. Chair Hunt reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 11 items, 8 of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Conveyance of Property, Non-Exclusive Easement, and Acceptance of Property, Macon State College

Approved: The Board declared the following three parcels of land on the campus of Macon State College ("MSC"), Macon, Georgia to be no longer advantageously useful to MSC or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing the conveyance of this property to Bibb County for the construction and maintenance of roadways to benefit MSC:

- Approximately .099 acres of land (4,308 sq. ft.) adjacent to the east right-of-way of Ivey Drive
- Approximately 3.77 acres of land (164,343 sq. ft.) north of Eisenhower Parkway
- Approximately 1.3 acres (56,508.18 sq. ft.) south of Columbus Road and west of College Station Road

The Board also authorized the conveyance of the above-referenced property to Bibb County, Georgia in exchange for construction and maintenance of a roadway.

The Board also authorized temporary construction easements for the period of construction required to construct roadways on the above-referenced property.

Additionally, the Board declared approximately 4.34 acres of land (189,050 sq. ft.) on the campus of MSC, Macon, Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to MSC or the University System of Georgia but only for the purpose of allowing this land to be used under the terms of a non-exclusive easement by Bibb County for the construction of a roadway.

The Board authorized the execution of a non-exclusive easement with Bibb County covering the above-referenced tract of land for construction of a roadway.

The Board also accept title to the two parcels of property totaling approximately 1.47 acres (64,030 sq. ft.) located at MSC, Macon, Georgia, for the use and benefit of MSC and the University System of Georgia.

The legal details of the above-referenced transactions are subject to the review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: This redesign of the north and south entrances to the campus and realignment of several roadways will enhance vehicle circulation on campus by providing a loop road to connect the east and west sides of the campus enabling the campus to realize several aspects of the recently completed master plan.

The total cost of the project is \$800,000, of which 75% is funded by the county, 25% is funded by the institution. The county will bid and perform all work associated with the roads.

2. Easement to the City of Atlanta, Atlanta Metropolitan College

Approved: The Board declared an approximately 25 ft. by 576 ft. strip of land on the campus of Atlanta Metropolitan College (“AMC”) to be no longer advantageously useful to AMC or the University System of Georgia but only for the purpose of allowing this land to be used under the terms of a non-exclusive easement by the City of Atlanta for a sanitary sewer line.

The Board also declared two approximately 15 ft. by 576 ft. strips of land on either side of the above-referenced strip of land on the campus of AMC to be no longer advantageously useful to AMC or the University System of Georgia but only for the purpose of allowing this land to be used under the terms of a non-exclusive construction easement by the City of Atlanta for a sanitary sewer.

Additionally, the Board authorized the execution of a non-exclusive easement and a temporary non-exclusive construction easement with the City of Atlanta covering the above-referenced tracts of land.

The terms of this non-exclusive easement and temporary non-exclusive construction easement are subject to review and legal approval by the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: The proposed easement is across the property at 1724 Metropolitan Parkway that was approved for acquisition by the Board in June 2000.

Granting this easement would not adversely affect use of the property in accordance with the Master Plan for Atlanta Metropolitan College.

Consideration for granting this easement is \$9,900.

The city desires additional easements for this sewer line area, which will be brought to the Board for consideration when negotiations with the city are finalized.

3. Authorization of Project “Student Athletic Complex” and Lease Agreement, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board modified the June 1999 authorization of project “Student Athletic Complex, Georgia Institute of Technology” as follows:

- A. Declare approximately 9.965 acres of land instead of 10.67 acres of land adjacent to the existing Student Athletic Complex no longer advantageously useful to Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) or other units of the University System of Georgia, but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this land to be leased to the Georgia Tech Real Estate Holding Corporation, Inc. instead of Georgia Tech Foundation Facilities, Inc.
- B. Lease approximately 9.965 acres of land instead of 10.67 acres of land (including 257,000 gross square feet (“gsf”) of existing Student Athletic Complex facilities instead of 217,000 gsf) to the Georgia Tech Real Estate Holding Corporation, Inc. instead of Georgia Tech Foundation Facilities,

Inc.

C. Increase the total project budget from \$41.4 million to \$44 million.

D. Decrease the project size from 510,000 gsf to 450,000 gsf.

The Board also authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Georgia Tech Real Estate Holding Corporation, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for the Student Athletic Complex for the period beginning February 7, 2001 and ending June 30, 2001 at an annual rent not to exceed \$4 million with the option to renew on a year-to-year basis for 30 consecutive years.

Additionally, the Board declared the Fuller E. Callaway III Student Athletic Complex and Bubble Pool (Building Number B122 and B122B) located on the campus of GIT, Atlanta, Georgia to be no longer advantageously useful to GIT or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorize the demolition and removal of these buildings.

Further, the Board requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of these buildings from the campus of GIT.

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

Background: In June 1999, the Board authorized the Student Athletic Complex project (Board of Regents Minutes 1998-1999, pages 594-595).

The requested revision to the named party is a result of new Georgia Tech Foundation Corporate arrangements. Further revision will be made from the Georgia Tech Real Estate Holding Corporation, Inc. to the Georgia Tech Foundation Funding Corporation upon legal creation.

A new design team has made an assessment of existing facilities and has established updated programmatic requirements. This has resulted in a project with better functionality and utility for GIT. The project will include renovation of existing space, demolition of outdated facilities and construction of new facilities.

During the period of construction, GIT will occupy portions of the facility under the terms of a rental agreement. Total occupancy of the project is anticipated in June 2004.

4. Authorization of Project, "Student Health Center," Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-30-0103, "Student Health Center," Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") with a total project budget of approximately \$7 million from private donations for construction and auxiliary funds for equipment, contingent on obtaining fee simple title to the proposed site.

The Board also granted a site license to Georgia Tech Facilities, Incorporated for the construction of this project.

The legal details involved with the granting of the site license are subject to the review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: The proposed project involves construction of approximately 30,200 gross square feet (“gsf”) for a new Student Health Center building. Current Student Health Center services include outpatient care, pharmacy, clinical examinations, and health/wellness education. In addition to these current services, GIT has identified dentistry and psychiatry as two new services to be provided by the Student Health Center. The new Student Health Center will accommodate all of these services.

The building will be constructed just south of the existing Callaway Student Athletic Complex within an existing parking lot. The project is in compliance with the GIT master plan.

The existing Student Health Center, located along Ferst Drive, contains approximately 21,000 gsf. Constructed in 1960, the existing building is inefficient in its current layout and will not be able to accommodate future growth and new services. The existing Student Health Center is located on the site of the proposed Advanced Computing Technology Building. The Advanced Computing Technology Building, number 15 on the Board of Regents major capital projects list, should begin construction within two years. Both the existing Student Health Center and the former Naval ROTC Building will need to be demolished to accommodate this new building, requiring expedited construction of this project for the Student Health Center.

The site proposed for the Student Health Center contains an abandoned city street named Ponders Avenue. Acquisition of the abandoned street will be presented to the Board for consideration when negotiations with the city are finalized.

5. Authorization of Project, “505 Tenth Street, Phase II,” Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-30-0101, “505 Tenth Street, Phase II,” with a total project budget of \$4,600,000. The design and construction of the project will be paid for by private funding. The estimated construction cost is \$3,539,000 (\$138/gsf for building addition and \$14/gsf for new parking level).

The Board also declared approximately .78 acres of property at 505 Tenth Street no longer advantageously useful to Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this land to be leased to the Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc. for the purpose of constructing a new building addition and parking deck adjacent to the existing building occupying this site.

Further, the Board authorized the execution of a lease agreement to Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc. for .78 acres (including 11,971 gsf of existing building on the site) on the GIT campus for the purpose of constructing a new building addition and parking deck.

The Board also authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 11,971 square feet of office space known as 505 Tenth Street, Atlanta, Georgia for the period beginning April 2001 and ending January 2003 at a monthly rental of \$1 with the option to renew on a year-to-year basis for the duration of the lease to Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc.

The above-referenced approvals are subject to the Board of Regents’ obtaining fee simple title to the above .78 acres of property at 505 Tenth Street.

Further, the terms of the above-referenced lease agreements are subject to review and legal

approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: 505 Tenth Street was approved for acquisition by the Board in September 2000. Prior to acquisition, Phase I renovation of the existing building was completed.

This project was approved as an addition to the existing building occupying a portion of the existing building's lot and adjacent lot totaling approximately .78 acres.

The project involves construction of approximately 21,400 gsf of new building and a parking level adjacent to the existing building. The design and scale of the new addition will be similar to the existing building's configuration with three stories and one basement/garden level. The project will include the installation of an elevator and new HVAC equipment.

The primary use of this building will be to provide office space for Georgia Tech Research Center ("GTRC") and elements of the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and GIT's Grant and Contracts Accounting, Office of Sponsored Programs, the Research Administration Compliance Technology & Training ("ReACTT"), the Office of Industry Contracting, the Office of Technology Licensing, and the Office of Grant and Contracts.

When the project construction is complete, the lease to Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc. will terminate and the property, including improvements, will be vested in the Board of Regents.

GTRC will lease a portion of this renovated and expanded building from the Board of Regents.

6. Sale of Property, 1531 Augusta Avenue, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board declared approximately 4.47 acres of land at 1411 Steiner Avenue, Augusta, Georgia to be no longer advantageously useful to the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent for purpose of allowing the sale of this property for the benefit of the MCG and the University System of Georgia.

The Board authorized the sale of the above-referenced property to Macuch Steel Products Inc. for \$70,000.

The legal details of the above-referenced transaction will be handled by the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: The property, also known as 1531 Augusta Avenue, was acquired as a gift in December 1989. It is located approximately three miles southwest of the campus. The property has most recently been used for storage area for construction materials and trailers and is adjacent to the receiving warehouse (114,235 sf) on 9.03 acres. The property is located adjacent to property owned by Macuch Steel Products, Inc., which intends to use the property for storage of steel materials.

A Georgia Environmental Protection Act assessment has been conducted, showing no significant environmental effects from this sale.

The purchaser has agreed to pay \$70,000 for the property. Three appraisals were performed in November 1998 and have been adjusted by a Consumer Price Index increase of 5.3% for an adjusted value of \$69,800.

Three independent appraisals of the property have been conducted as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
William E. Hollingsworth, MAI, Augusta	\$64,815	
Elzie W. Reese, II, MAI, Augusta	\$67,050	\$66,288
Ashby R. Krouse, III, MAI, Augusta	67,000	

The proceeds from the sale will be used to benefit plant operations by funding needed projects.

7. Demolition of Adamson Hall, State University of West Georgia

Approved: The Board declared Adamson Hall at the State University of West Georgia (“SUWG”) no longer advantageously useful to SUWG or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorize the demolition and removal of this building.

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

Background: Adamson Hall is a 16,300-gross-square-foot frame structure with brick veneer, built in 1917.

The cost of demolition and disposal, including environmental remediation of lead-based paint and asbestos is estimated at \$725,000 and will be funded from the capital projects budget.

Project I-62, “Renovation to Adamson Hall” was authorized by the Board on October 13, 1999.

Because Adamson Hall is subject to evaluation as a historic building, the Office of Facilities requested that the architect evaluate and provide cost estimates for three options defined by the Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Natural Resources. Demolition and reconstruction of the building were determined to be the most cost-effective option. The Historic Preservation Division concurs with SUWG’s plan to demolish and reconstruct.

Comparative costs for the three Historic Preservation Division options range from \$3,100,000 to demolish and re-construct Adamson Hall, to \$4,150,000 to rehabilitate the front bay of the existing building and construct an addition, to \$4,700,000 to rehabilitate the building in its entirety. All costs are based on the realization of a 16,300-square-foot building at completion.

8. Demolition of Napier Hall, Adams Hall, Wells Hall, Parkhurst Apartments and the Georgia House, Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board declared Napier Hall, Adams Hall, Wells Hall, Parkhurst Apartments, and the Georgia House at Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) to be no longer advantageously useful to GCSU or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of these buildings.

The approval of the demolitions is subject to the satisfactory completion of Phase I Environmental Assessments.

The Board also requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of these buildings from the campus of GCSU.

Background: Napier Hall is a 70,556-square-foot, four-story, 392-bed residence hall built in 1971. It is configured as double-loaded corridors with gang bathrooms and double-occupancy rooms.

Adams Hall is a 32,508-square-foot, two-story, 149-bed residence hall. It is of steel and masonry construction and was built in 1966. It is configured as double-loaded corridors with gang bathrooms and double-occupancy rooms.

Wells Hall is a 21,020-square-foot, two-story, 116-bed residence hall. It is of steel and masonry construction, built in 1963. It is configured as double-loaded corridors with gang bathrooms and double-occupancy rooms.

Parkhurst Apartments is a 21,016-square-foot, three-story, faculty apartment building of steel and masonry construction, built in 1949.

The Georgia House is a 2,680-square-foot former dwelling house of wood frame construction, built in 1950.

Napier Hall, Adams Hall, and Wells Hall are not eligible for listing with the Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Natural Resources. Parkhurst Apartments and the Georgia House are both eligible buildings due to their age. Neither Parkhurst nor the Georgia House is listed on any historic register as stand-alone buildings. Both would be included as contributing structures of the Milledgeville Historic District, which is listed on the National Historic Register.

Only the first floor of each building (all are multi-story) is accessible to the physically handicapped. While all of these buildings are equipped with the Americans With Disabilities Act compliant fire alarm systems and meet life safety codes effective at construction date, none would meet current code. The cost to renovate these buildings, including addressing historic preservation issues and meeting all present codes, would not be economically feasible.

The recently completed and approved university housing plan and soon-to-be-completed campus master plan indicate that these buildings should be demolished to make room for a comprehensive privatized housing project. The private developer that is selected to construct new residential facilities will fund the cost of demolition of these buildings, including environmental abatement of lead paint and asbestos-containing materials.

9. Information Item: Project Inspection

As the result of past discussions, the Office of Facilities staff were asked to review the appropriateness and legal ability of having a Board of Regents inspector who would provide construction inspection on projects constructed for the Board by Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (“GSFIC”). The staff reviewed this matter and discussed options with both the Department of Law and GSFIC. At this meeting, Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham discussed five ways of implementing such a program. He recommended that the best option would be for the Board to retain an independent, well-qualified inspector and assign that inspector to GSFIC, such that the inspector would represent both organizations. The inspector would have the authority to provide on-site construction inspection on behalf of the University System of Georgia. This would be easy to implement, and GSFIC would likely accept the proposal because the Board of Regents would be assuming the administrative burden of the new employee. It would also be cost-effective. Mr. Chatham noted that this could be implemented immediately with the next group of projects bid through the GSFIC.

Modification: Although this was not an action item, the Committee indicated its desire to

implement Regent project inspection as a pilot program for approximately six major capital projects. The staff will report back to the Committee on the success of the pilot program.

10. Information Item: Master Plan, East Georgia College

East Georgia College and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the institution. President Jeremiah J. Ashcroft and the consultant, Mr. Walt Miller, Vice President of the architectural firm of John Portman & Associates, 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, East Georgia College's master plan recommendations included the following:

- Accept a gift of property which will allow for a new and improved campus entry and will provide a site for a future rural economic development center
- Create appropriate future facilities for the growing academic needs, community outreach activities, and economic development needs
- Renovate several existing buildings to provide modern facilities
- Upgrade campus utility infrastructure
- Relocate campus roads and parking to create a pedestrian campus core
- Continue to preserve and enhance the campus environment and landscaping

11. Information Item: Gift of Property, East Georgia College

President Jeremiah J. Ashcroft discussed the proposed acceptance of approximately 19.795 acres in Swainsboro, Georgia from Mrs. Luck F. Gambrell. The property is comprised of two parcels separated by a public road, which will be constructed and maintained by Emanuel County. The two parcels will be developed as a new main entrance for East Georgia College as part of its master plan (Item 10 above).

Modification/Approval in Concept: Although this was not originally an approval item, the Committee approved in concept acceptance of this gift of property. President Ashcroft will bring this item back to the Committee for formal approval at the February 2001 meeting.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at approximately 2:05 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joe Frank Harris, Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Martin W. NeSmith, and J. Timothy Shelnut. Chair Harris reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 13 items, 9 of which required action. Additionally, 132 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. University System Immunization Policy, Change in Board Policy 408

Approved: The Board approved the request of the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension to modify Board Policy 408: Immunizations, effective January 10, 2001.

Background: An Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education Student Services developed, and the Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs endorsed, the following revision to Board of Regents Policy 408: Immunizations. The revision, which is underlined below, permits institutions to exempt from the immunization requirement students who attend University System courses only via distance education.

408 IMMUNIZATIONS

408.01 IMMUNIZATION AGAINST DISEASE DURING AN OUTBREAK/ EPIDEMIC

During an epidemic or a threatened epidemic of any disease preventable by immunization on a campus of the University System, and when an emergency has been declared by appropriate health authorities of this state, the president of that institution is authorized, in conjunction with the Chancellor and appropriate health authorities, to promulgate rules and regulations specifying those diseases against which immunizations may be required.

Any individual who cannot show proof of immunity or adequate immunization and refuses to be immunized shall be excluded from any institution or facility of the University System until such time as he/she presents valid evidence that he/she is immunized against the disease or the epidemic or threat no longer constitutes a significant public health danger. (BR Minutes, 1989-90, p. 406)

408.02 IMMUNIZATION REQUIREMENTS

STUDENTS - All new students (first-year, transfers, and others) attending regularly scheduled classes or receiving resident credit will be required to submit a Certificate of Immunization (measles, mumps, rubella) prior to attending such classes. The certificate will be kept on file at the institution and will be valid throughout the tenure of the student. Persons covered by this policy who were born prior to January 1, 1957, must show evidence of immunity for rubella (date must be after June 6, 1969). For all other students, evidence must be provided of MMR immunity (date must be after 1970) or separate immunizations for measles (after March 4, 1963), mumps (after April 22, 1971) and rubella (after June 9, 1969).

Except for students who have religious objections and students whose physicians have certified that they cannot be immunized because of medical reasons, students who have not presented evidence of immunization as set forth above will be denied admission to an institution or other facility of the University System until such time as they present the required immunization certification.

Institutions may exempt from this policy students who receive instruction solely via a medium that does not require physical attendance on a University System campus or off campus site (i.e., students who receive instruction via electronic media, correspondence).

This exemption would become void were a student to register for or attend classes on a

University System campus or off-campus site.

For exceptional and unusual circumstances, an institution may defer the immunization requirements for a period not to exceed thirty (30) calendar days from the first day of classes. Upon the expiration of a thirty-day period, no person will be permitted to attend classes until the required immunization record is on file.

The certification must be on a form provided by the University System of Georgia and signed by a physician or an official of a county health department. The specific requirements will be set forth on the University System of Georgia form/certificate. Requirements will be reviewed periodically and the form/certificate will be revised appropriately with regard to prevailing health risks and available vaccines. Institutions are authorized to impose additional immunization requirements for students when, in the opinion of the president of the institution and with the concurrence of the Chancellor, there is a substantial risk of exposure to other communicable diseases preventable by vaccination. (BR Minutes, 1990-91, p. 114)

2. Establishment of the Joint Juris Doctor/Master of Arts With a Major in Philosophy, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to establish the joint juris doctor/master of arts (“J.D./M.A.”) with a major in philosophy, effective January 10, 2001.

Abstract: The joint degree program, J.D./M.A. with a major in philosophy, was requested in order to be a mechanism for broadening intellectual horizons and facilitating interdisciplinary study, to satisfy the interests of those students who wish to pursue study in both the fields of law and philosophy, and to provide a focal point for exploring the connections between law and philosophy. Successful candidates will earn the J.D. awarded by the College of Law and the M.A. with a major in philosophy awarded by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Need: As the study of law has become more interdisciplinary, law schools have strategically filled their faculty portfolios with scholars knowledgeable in both law and other fields. Trends that led to the development of the joint program involved the establishment of endowed chairs and centers in ethics. In 1995, the Department of Philosophy established the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics to conduct research in ethics and to serve as a resource center for persons and organizations who find themselves grappling with moral issues in their professional lives. In January 2000, as a result of monetary awards based on the DuPont de Nemours case, the Board of Regents ratified the College of Law’s request to establish the W. Lee Burge Chair in Law and Ethics. The joint J.D./M.A. advances the goal of the College of Arts and Sciences through the development of an interdisciplinary area where there are shared research and pedagogical interests across divisions of the institution. The program also advances the College of Law’s efforts to further incorporate ethics into the professional law curriculum. Other institutions with similar programs include Columbia University, Cornell University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Georgetown University.

Objectives: As an interdisciplinary effort in the institution’s strategic plan, the joint degree program offers interested students an exposure to diverse perspectives on law and its social role.

Curriculum: Applicants must independently meet the admission requirements of each college, and admission to one unit creates no presumption favoring admission to the other. J.D./M.A. with a major in philosophy students are required to take at least nine hours of qualifying courses offered by the law program and at least six hours of qualifying courses offered by the philosophy

program. In terms of course cross-listings, no more than nine hours of law course credit will be applied toward the credit hours required to earn the M.A. degree and no more than six hours of philosophy credit will be applied toward the credit hours required to earn the J.D. Law students shall not take any philosophy courses while completing the first-year law curriculum. It is stipulated that the J.D. must be completed within six years of the initial semester of enrollment in the J.D. program. If a student enrolled in the joint degree program elects to not pursue both degrees but remains in one of the programs, any hours earned in the degree program from which a student withdraws will not be credited toward the degree program in which the student remains.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 2, 4, and 4 for the first three years of the program. The program is designed for a select group of students who seek to enter the nation's most prestigious law firms and philosophy doctoral programs.

Funding: No new state allocation has been requested. The institution will redirect resources to support the program. The program does not require any new faculty, staff, facilities, or courses.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2005, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness goals, as indicated in the proposal.

3. Redesignation of the Bachelor of Arts With a Major in Art as the Bachelor of Fine Arts With a Major in Art, Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Betty L. Siegel that Kennesaw State University ("KSU") be authorized to redesignate the bachelor of arts with a major in art as the bachelor of fine arts with a major in art, effective January 10, 2001.

Abstract: The bachelor of arts designation is no longer the most appropriate or accurate designation for KSU art majors. KSU requests that this degree be changed to conform to the degree titles offered by other fine and performing arts programs, namely the bachelor of fine arts ("B.F.A."). This designation reflects the degree's focus on the development of skills and concepts essential to the visual arts profession. This request is consistent with KSU's strategic plan and mission.

KSU's Department of Visual Arts has filed an intention to apply for accreditation with the National Association of Schools of Art and Design ("NASAD"), the accrediting organization for educational programs in visual arts. NASAD recognizes two principal types of undergraduate degrees: professional or liberal arts programs. Due to changes in the curriculum that heavily emphasize design concepts and negate the prospects of substituting other liberal arts courses, KSU's degree has evolved into a professional program.

KSU's existing bachelor of arts degree with a major in art was implemented 15 years ago. The program has since matured and become increasingly professional in orientation and degree requirements. The 120-semester-credit-hour program reinforces the professional preparation of artists by requiring a professional practices seminar, portfolio development, and a senior review exhibition. The program also requires that 60 semester hours of upper-division courses focus on drawing, painting, sculpture, photography, ceramics, graphic design, and printmaking.

The redesignation of the art major under the bachelor of arts ("B.A.") degree to the bachelor of fine arts ("B.F.A.") degree will strengthen the alignment of the Department of Visual Arts' current

commitment to a professional, skills-based curriculum that meets the standards of a NASAD-accredited B.F.A. program that is comparable to professional art programs offered by other universities in the University System and the nation. Current and future students in the redesignated program will be better served after completing their professional degree program in terms of employment prospects and candidacy for entry into graduate school programs.

4. Establishment of the Francis J. Tedesco, M.D. Distinguished Chair in Pediatric Hematology/Oncology, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) that it be authorized to establish the Francis J. Tedesco, M.D. Distinguished Chair in Pediatric Hematology/Oncology, effective February 1, 2001.

Abstract: The Medical College of Georgia Foundation (the “Foundation”) has garnered the required private donations to honor Dr. Francis Tedesco for his over 12 years of distinguished service as President of MCG. The Foundation asked MCG to request Board of Regents’ approval to establish the Francis J. Tedesco, M.D. Distinguished Chair in Pediatric Hematology/Oncology within the School of Medicine. The Foundation has on deposit \$1 million in an endowment for the chair.

The funding for this chair comes from a combination of sources as follows: 1) contributions provided by the estate of Gerald H. Achenbach, a long-time patient of Dr. Tedesco at MCG who was the former President of Piggly Wiggly Southern and former Chairman of MCG’s President’s Advisory Committee, 2) Foundation institutional support funds, which have come from donations by corporations and banks, and (3) the Foundation’s unrestricted endowment fund.

The endowed chair will be used to support the salary of a distinguished faculty member for MCG’s Department of Pediatrics — Section of Hematology/Oncology in the School of Medicine.

5. Establishment of the Carlos and Marguerite Mason Distinguished Chair in Transplant Surgery and Immunology, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the Carlos and Marguerite Mason Distinguished Chair in Transplant Surgery and Immunology, effective January 10, 2001.

Abstract: MCG has gathered the required private donations to establish the Carlos and Marguerite Mason Distinguished Chair in Transplant Surgery and Immunology. The Medical College of Georgia Foundation (the “Foundation”) has on deposit \$1,500,000 in an endowment for the distinguished chair. The funding level for the distinguished chair meets and exceeds the minimum requirement of \$1 million required by the Board for research and regional universities.

The funding for this special faculty position comes from a combination of sources as follows: 1) funds from the Mason Trust totaling \$750,000 and 2) a matching grant of \$750,000 from the Foundation’s institutional support funds, which have come from donations by corporations and banks.

The endowed position will be used to support the salary of an eminently recognized faculty member in the Department of Surgery in the School of Medicine.

6. Establishment of Revised Institutional Statutes, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to establish its revised institutional statutes, effective January 10, 2001.

Abstract: The proposed revision of the statutes reflects a thorough review and brings the statutes into line with current Board of Regents policies and procedures. The statutes also clarify changes that have occurred regarding System policies that have been impacted by semester conversion.

The general faculty at UGA approved these changes. The changes were reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and were found to be consistent with the current organization and administrative processes at the institution. The revised statutes will remain on file in the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs at the Board of Regents.

7. Termination of Specific Academic Programs, Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Betty L. Siegel that Kennesaw State University (“KSU”) be authorized to terminate specific academic programs, effective January 10, 2001.

Abstract: KSU requested approval to terminate the following specific academic programs: associate of science in nursing, bachelor of science (“B.S.”) with a major in business education, B.S. with a major in teaching field – business education, B.S. with a major in teaching field – history, B.S. with a major in secondary education, B.A. with a major in psychology, and B.A. with a major in political science. These programs have either been discontinued or were part of a planned phase-out based on strategic planning, student needs, and changing expectations and demands within the discipline.

Associate of Science in Nursing

In keeping with its mission, KSU discontinued the admission of students to its only remaining career associate degree program, the associate of science in nursing, in 1996. Subsequently, all eligible students in the associate of science in nursing program completed their programs, resulting in the deactivation of the associate-level courses and the redirection of faculty and program resources to the baccalaureate and master’s level programs.

B.S. With Majors in Business Education, Teaching Field – Business Education, and Teaching Field-History

The B.S. with majors in business education, teaching field – business education, and teaching field – history are deactivated majors. Retaining the degrees on the authorized list of programs for the institution serves no substantive purpose. No students are currently matriculating in the programs, and faculty resources have been redirected to existing programs.

B.S. With a Major in Secondary Education

The B.S. with a major in secondary education has never functioned as an independent B.S. degree program apart from a specific teaching field such as English education, mathematics education, or other similar degree program. Other approved majors for the preparation of secondary educators in specialized teaching fields are currently listed under the B.S. degree. These programs are fully functional.

B.A. With Majors in Psychology and Political Science

During semester conversion in 1998, the majors in psychology and political science under the

existing B.A. degree were deactivated. However, these majors were retained under the B.S. degree. The primary difference between the degree designations for the majors is the 200-level language requirement and scientific emphasis of the B.S. degree. Because there was no other substantive change between the actual major requirements for the programs and the B.S. programs had a strong degree conferral rate, KSU requested approval to terminate the B.A. degree designations for these majors.

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

System Institution by Type	Totals
Georgia Institute of Technology	26
Georgia State University	7
Medical College of Georgia	6
University of Georgia	32
Total Research University Appointments	71
Georgia Southern University	3
Valdosta State University	1
Total Regional University Appointments	4
Albany State University	4
Armstrong Atlantic State University	2
Augusta State University	0
Clayton College & State University	0
Columbus State University	0
Fort Valley State University	5
Georgia College & State University	1
Georgia Southwestern State University	0
Kennesaw State University	0
North Georgia College & State University	0
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	1
Total State University Appointments	13
Dalton College	0
Macon State College	0
Total State College Appointments	0
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	0
Atlanta Metropolitan College	0
Bainbridge College	1
Coastal Georgia Community College	0

Darton College	0
East Georgia College	0
Floyd College	0
Gainesville College	1
Georgia Perimeter College	3
Gordon College	2
Middle Georgia College	5
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	0
Total Two-Year College Appointments	12

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS 100

Summary of Part-Time Appointments of System Retirees

System Institution by Type	Totals
Georgia Institute of Technology	3
Georgia State University	4
Medical College of Georgia	1
University of Georgia	12
Total Research University Appointments	20
Georgia Southern University	2
Valdosta State University	0
Total Regional University Appointments	2
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	7
Kennesaw State University	0
North Georgia College & State University	0
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	0
Total State University Appointments	7
Dalton College	1
Macon State College	0
Total State College Appointments	1
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	1
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	1

TOTAL PART-TIME RETIREE APPOINTMENTS 31

Georgia Institute of Technology

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Cohen, Tal (Nmi): Research Engineer II, leave from Nov 1, 2000 through Oct 31, 2001, without pay.

Kaladi, Vasudevan M.: Research Engineer II, leave from Dec 1, 2000 through Nov 30, 2001, without pay.

Part-Time Appointments of System Retirees:

Bodnar, Donald G.: Principal Research Engineer, Sensors & Electromagnetic Applications Laboratory, beginning Nov 1, 2000 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Hayes, Robert D.: Principal Research Engineer, School of Electronic and Computer Engineering, beginning Nov 1, 2000 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Stevens, Donald D.: Sr Research Engineer, Signatures Technology Laboratory, beginning Nov 28, 2000 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Georgia State University

Conferral of Emeritus Titles:

Armstrong, Carol: Lecturer Emerita, Department of Mathematics, effective January 2, 2001.

Brieske, Thomas: Professor Emeritus, Department of Mathematics, effective January 2, 2001.

Rushing, Francis W.: Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics, effective December 1, 2000.

Walker, Larry: Professor Emeritus, Department of Art, effective January 2, 2001.

Leave of Absence Approval:

Austin, Gayle M.: Assoc Professor, Department of Communication, leave from Aug 13, 2001 through May 10, 2002, without pay.

Part-Time Appointments of System Retirees:

Arrington, Robert L.: Dept Head-Prof, Department of Philosophy, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending May 10, 2001.

Manns, Edith K.: Assoc Professor Emeritus, Department of Public Administration & Urban Studies, beginning Aug 1, 2000 and ending Sep 30, 2000.

Nelson, John C.: Assoc Professor, Department of Music, beginning Feb 1, 2001 and ending May 10, 2001.

Sizemore, Judith M.: Department of Psychology, beginning Feb 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Medical College Of Georgia**Conferral of Emeritus Titles:**

Crowley, Julia: Chairperson Emerita and Professor Emerita, Medical Technology and Graduate Studies, effective January 1, 2001.

Hodge, Lon D.: Professor Emeritus, Cellular Biology and Anatomy & Graduate Studies, effective January 1, 2001.

Kling, J. Malcolm: Director Emeritus, Professor Emeritus, Research Support Services, Pharm & Tox. Surgery, effective February 1, 2001.

Lanclos, Kenneth D.: Professor Emeritus, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology and School of Graduate Studies, effective January 1, 2001.

Lapp, David F.: Associate Professor Emeritus, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology and School of Graduate Studies, effective January 1, 2001.

Part-Time Appointment of System Retiree:

Talledo, O. Eduardo: Professor Emeritus, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, beginning Jan 9, 2001 and ending Jan 8, 2002.

Special Faculty Approval:

Abdulla, Abdulla M.: Part-Time Professor, Department of Medicine, effective Dec 14, 2000.

Tenure Status Change Approvals:

Ahmed, Rafique : Assoc Professor, Department of Medicine, from tenure track to non-tenure track, effective Nov 16, 2000.

Swift, Andrew E.B.: Asst Professor, Department of Medical Illustration, from non-tenure track to tenure track, effective Dec 14, 2000.

University of Georgia

Conferral of Emeritus Titles:

Barrack, John B.: Associate Professor Emeritus of Accounting, effective November 1, 2000.

Crawford, Johnny L.: Professor Emeritus, Crop and Soil Sciences, effective January 1, 2001.

Damian, Raymond: Professor Emeritus of Cellular Biology, Cellular Biology – Arts and Sciences, effective January 1, 2001.

English, John W.: Professor Emeritus of Journalism, Journalism and Mass Communication, effective November 1, 2000.

Hudson, Horace E.: Professor Emeritus, Agricultural Leadership, Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication, effective December 1, 2000.

Lehr, Carolyn A.: Associate Professor Emerita in Physical Education and Sport Studies, Physical Education and Sport Studies, effective November 1, 2000.

Penney, David E.: Associate Professor Emeritus of Mathematics, Mathematics Department – Arts and Sciences, effective November 1, 2000.

Travis, James: Research Professor Emeritus, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, effective January 1, 2001.

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Cofer, Judith Ortiz: Professor, Department of English, leave from Jan 5, 2001 through May 8, 2001, with pay.

Rayburn, Teresa Key: Public Service Assistant, Leave from Oct 30, 2000 through Nov 17, 2000, without pay.

Stavropoulos, Carol Susann: Asst Professor, Lamar Dodd School of Art, leave from Nov 30, 2000 through May 8, 2001, without pay.

Part-Time Appointments of System Retirees:

Allen, Joseph Dana III: Professor, Department of Psychology, beginning Oct 1, 2000 and ending May 8, 2001.

Barnhart, Harold M. Jr.: College of Agriculture, beginning Jan 1, 2001 and ending May 31, 2001.

Calhoun, Janet W.: College of Education, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Corina, John Hubert: Professor Emeritus, School of Music, beginning Aug 16, 2000 and ending May 8, 2001.

Legg, Jimmy A.: College of Agriculture, beginning Jan 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Loughner, William E.: Librarian III, Libraries, beginning Mar 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

McKillip, William David: Professor Emeritus, School of Teacher Education, Department of Mathematics Education, beginning Jan 5, 2001 and ending May 8, 2001.

Michaels, Gene Earl: Assoc Professor Emeritus, Department of Microbiology, beginning Jan 5, 2001 and ending May 8, 2001.

Nettles, Victor F.: Director Administrative, Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, Beginning Jan 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001

Travis, James: Research Professor, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, beginning Feb 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Weatherford, Lawrence E.: Consultant, beginning Jan 1, 2001 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Williams, Elmer Dean: Assoc Professor Emeritus, School of Teacher Education, Department of Social Science Education, beginning Jan 7, 2001 and ending Feb 21, 2001.

Georgia Southern University

Conferral of Emeritus Titles:

Bostwick, William J.: Associate Professor Emeritus of Accounting and Chair Emeritus, Department of Accounting, College of Business Administration, effective January 1, 2001.

Nolen, Martha T.: Emerita Assistant Professor of Reading, Department of Learning Support, College of Science and Technology, effective November 1, 2000.

Leave of Absence Approval:

Briggs, Charles F.: Asst Professor, Department of History, leave from Jan 1, 2001 through May 31, 2001, with pay.

Part-Time Appointments of System Retirees:

Alston, Gordon: beginning Oct 1, 2000 and ending Jun 30, 2001.

Shriver, George Hite, Jr.: Professor Emeritus, Department of History, beginning Jan 1, 2001 and ending May 31, 2001.

Armstrong Atlantic State University

Conferral of Emeritus Title:

Newberry, S. Lloyd: Professor of Science Education and Dean of College of Education Emeritus, College of Education, effective February 1, 2001.

Georgia Southwestern State University

Part-Time Appointments of System Retirees:

Bates, John W.: Acting Dean Academic, School of Business Administration, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 31, 2001.

Carroll, Andrew D.: Professor, School of Education, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 31, 2001.

Maxwell, Willie P.: Part-Time Instructor, Department of Biology, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 31, 2001.

Middlebrooks, Bruce A.: Professor, School of Education, Beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 31, 2001

Norton, Jack : Asst Professor, Department of English & Foreign Languages, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 31, 2001.

Whitt, Mary A.: Professor, Department of English & Foreign Languages, beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 30, 2001.

Woodward, Earl W.: Professor, School of Education, Beginning Jan 2, 2001 and ending Jul 31, 2001.

State University of West Georgia

Conferral of Emeritus Title:

Scherm, N. Carolyn: Asst. Professor and Associate Dean Emerita, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership, effective January 15, 2001.

Dalton College

Part-Time Appointment of System Retiree:

McGee, Grace A.: Division of Social Sciences, beginning Jan 9, 2001 and ending May 9, 2001.

Floyd College

Conferral of Emeritus Title:

Cook, James F.: Professor Emeritus, Division of Social Science, effective January 1, 2001.

Part-Time Appointment of System Retiree:

Moss, Andrea G.: beginning Aug 14, 2000 and ending May 14, 2001.

Georgia Perimeter College

Leave of Absence Approvals:

Bennett, Kim W.: Assistant Professor, Division of Developmental Studies (Lawrenceville), leave from Oct 3, 2000 through Oct 2, 2001, without pay.

Carr, Stephen A.: Counselor - Academic, Division of Developmental Studies (Decatur), leave from Sep 17, 1999 through Dec 10, 2000, without pay.

Christian, Lula Cary: Assoc Professor, Division of Developmental Studies (Dunwoody), leave from Jan 11, 2000 through Jan 31, 2001, without pay.

Tenure Status Change Approval:

Cromer, David M.: Asst Director-Academic, from non-tenure track to tenure track, effective Aug 14, 2000.

Board of Regents Central Office

Part-Time Appointment of System Retiree:

Day, Sherman R. Consultant, beginning January 16, 2001 and ending April 13, 2001.

9. Second Reading: Change From Monthly to Annual Reporting of Memoranda of Understanding Respecting Affiliation of Students for Applied Learning Experiences and Clinical Training

Approved: The Board approved a change in the schedule for reporting memoranda of understanding (“MOUs”) respecting affiliation of students for applied learning experiences and clinical training from a monthly basis to an annual basis.

Background: Before February 1984, the Chancellor executed and filed copies of all affiliation agreements between University System institutions and hospitals or clinics for training of nurses and allied health personnel, as well as those for applied learning experiences.

In 1984, the Board passed a policy authorizing presidents to execute the memoranda of understanding on a form approved by the Attorney General and to keep those agreements at the institution. From that point forward, the institutions have reported summary information on the affiliation agreements to the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis on a monthly basis. The summary report shows the number of agreements, whether each MOU is new or a renewal, and the type of affiliation (e.g., allied health, dentistry, medicine, Georgia Hospital Association, kinesiology and health, nursing, nutrition, physical therapy, other hospitals, clinics, etc.). The summary report is then presented to the Board through the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension as an information item.

The Central Office does not keep copies of the MOUs on file. However, while there is no requirement that they do so, the Office of Legal Affairs checks the terms of some MOUs.

This change will streamline institutional reporting. Institutions will report to the Central Office at the end of the fiscal year, and the Central Office will report the number and type of clinical training and applied learning agreements to the Board in September of each year.

10. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training

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

Georgia State University		Pharmacy	2
Georgia Hospital Assoc.	12	Recreation and Leisure	2, 2R
Counseling/Psychology	4, 1R	Social Work	1, 8R
Health and Kinesiology	2		
Nursing	10, 1R	Georgia Southern University	
Physical Therapy	6, 1R	Family/Consumer Sciences	10
Psychology	3	Health and Kinesiology	3
Social Work	2	Leadership/Technology	1
		Nursing	3
Medical College of Georgia		Armstrong Atlantic State University.	
Allied Health Sciences	12, 6R	Education	1
Dentistry	1, 13R	Nursing	1
Medicine	1, 5R		
MCG Research Institute	2	Georgia College & State University	
Nursing	1, 2R	Health Sciences	1
University of Georgia		Kennesaw State University	
Child and Family Dev.	2	Health Care Services	1
Communication Science	13R	Nursing	3, 1R
Counseling/Human Dev.	2		

North Georgia College & State University
 Physical Therapy 1
 Nursing 2, 1R

State University of West Georgia
 Nursing 3, 6R

Coastal Georgia Community College
 Nursing 2, 2R

Darton College
 Occupational
 Therapy 1

Floyd College
 Physical Therapy 1

Total 161

R = Renewal

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 payments as indicated:

Georgia State University

Support SCIES program (early intervention)	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	9/11/00 – 9/30/01	\$517,500
Conduct needs assessment	“ “ “ “	9/30/00 – 9/30/01	\$50,000
Provide training for child welfare	“ “ “ “	8/16/00 – 8/16/01	\$183,950
Provide nutrition education for new Americans	“ “ “ “	10/1/00 – 9/30/01	\$294,209
Conduct Safety Net program	Georgia Dept. of Community Health	1/1/00 – 12/31/00	\$99,500
Study roles and responsibilities of education organizations	Office of Planning and Budget	8/14/00 – 7/1/01	\$59,270
Produce school performance reports	Office of Education Opportunity	9/1/00 – 6/30/01	\$256,068
Provide family support	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	10/1/00 – 9/30/01	\$75,000
Study family preservation	“ “ “ “	10/1/0 – 9/15/01	\$75,000
Study electronic court filing	Georgia Courts Automation Commission	7/1/00 – 12/31/00	\$70,000

Provide administrative support	Office of Educational Accountability	10/2/00 – 6/30/01	\$100,000
Assist with human resources development	Griffin Tech	7/1/00 – 6/30/01	\$132,963
Conduct state employees survey	Georgia Merit System	2/1/00 – 9/30/00	\$25,088
Conduct performance evaluations	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	8/1/00 – 12/31/00	\$150,000

University of Georgia

Provide support for grandparents raising grandchildren	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	10/1/00 – 9/15/01	\$75,000
Provide training in capability assessment	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	9/15/00 – 12/15/00	\$15,600
Establish and operate fish and wildlife research unit	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	7/1/99 – 6/30/01	\$29,000
Conduct Leadership 2001 training	Georgia Dept. of Transportation	9/20/00 – 6/30/01	\$59,735
School-to-Work needs assessment	Lanier Technical Institute	12/01/99 – 12/31/00	\$10,000

Georgia Southern University

Study reducing college underage drinking	Children and Youth Coordination Council	6/01/00 – 5/31/00	\$17,000
Study efforts to increase seatbelt use	Office of Highway Safety	7/01/00 – 2/28/01	\$11,165

Darton College

Conduct workshop	Lee Co. Elem. School	10/30/00	\$1,200
Conduct workshop	Dougherty Co. Schools	10/31/00	\$2,500
Present Challenge course	Lee Co. High School	10/19/00	\$1,025

Total Amount – January	\$ 2,310,773
Total Amount FY 2001 to Date	\$14,922,524
Total Amount FY 2000 (to January)	\$21,339,137
Total Amount FY 2000	\$25,106,814

12. Information Item: Grants, Contracts, and Gifts Received by Institutions in the University System of Georgia for Instruction, Public Service, and Research for Fiscal Year 2000

Much of the financial support for the University System is derived from extramural sources. The dollar amounts for contracts and grants received by the institutions were presented to the Committee along with highlights of some of the larger research grants awarded to our institutions.

The total external support for these activities in all institutions equaled \$622,794,953, an increase of \$48,116,506, or 8.4%, above fiscal year 1999.

13. Information Item: Intellectual Property Income Summary in the University System of Georgia for Fiscal Year 2000

Income received from intellectual properties during fiscal year 2000 was presented to the Committee. The total income represents an increase of \$9,218,294, or 174%, above fiscal year 1999. Almost \$6.3 million of this increase was a result of Medical College of Georgia's sale of stock in a company which contributed to the development of their invention, Electronic HouseCall.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at approximately 2:40 p.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Regent McMillan presided over the meeting at the request of Board Chair Glenn S. White. Committee member Hugh A. Carter, Jr. was in attendance as were ex-officio members Hilton H. Howell III and Glenn S. White. Regent McMillan reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had five applications for review, four of which were denied and one of which was continued. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. In the matter of William Pollard at Valdosta State University, concerning grievances, the application for review was continued.
2. In the matter of Gail Dillard at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, concerning denial of promotion, the application for review was denied.
3. In the matter of Pamela Carter-Brown at Georgia State University, concerning termination of her position, the application for review was denied.
4. In the matter of Elizabeth Willis at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning disciplinary suspension, the application for review was denied.
5. In the matter of Farrell Blease at Georgia State University, concerning academic dishonesty, the application for review was denied.

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. We missed y'all last month, but we managed to stay busy.

After attending the two-day Governor's Education Reform Study Commission with Regent Howell, I became curious about the impact of the last reform effort: QBE (Quality Basic Education Act). This effort was led by some Governor called Harris and some young floor leader named Barnes. It happened in 1985. Coincidentally, the students who first entered public school under the BE reform are just graduating from the University System now. So, new millennium and all, it is a perfect time to take stock.

Let me share a few low-tech charts with you as a welcome, albeit temporary, relief from PowerPoint. In many ways, they are an extension back another decade from those Dan Papp shared with you yesterday.

The conclusion is clear. BE has left a legacy of progress. So, too, must the latest round of reform. As I remarked in my State of the System speech, there has been considerable progress. We simply have to continue and accelerate that progress. The Board's focus and actions are appropriately targeted to such efforts, and our renewal of the strategic plan this spring will be perfectly timed.

One other comment on a matter I raised in my State of the System speech. Did anyone notice how many days and how many pages the changing of an athletic coach at one of our institutions commanded? Did anyone see the news conference announcing the new coach? The large room was bursting at the seams, particularly with television cameras. Up until then, I had felt good about the five print media who came to the news conference when my appointment was announced in 1994!

Incidentally, while I'm picking on the media, let me take issue with a headline writer in today's *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. (Let me be clear, not the writer, because the story was a fair one.) You heard the presentation yesterday. Would your headline have been "Some colleges fall short of new admission policy"? Reminds me of a time the Pope went fishing with a buddy. His buddy had a great fishing hat. Unfortunately, it blew off his head into the water. The Pope said, "No problem," and promptly walked on the water and retrieved it. Unfortunately, the press saw the incident. The headline the next day? "Pope can't swim."

We simply must continue to value academic accomplishment and achievement. That's why I make no apology for my regular good news highlights. And for every one I bring you, time excludes me sharing ten others with you.

- John Williams, an Albany State University Presidential Scholar, won first place in an oral presentation at the Universidad Metropolitana ("UMET") Eleventh Undergraduate Research Symposium in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The symposium is sponsored by the National Science Foundation. A cash prize of \$2,000 was awarded.
- Augusta State University's chapter of Psi Chi, the national honor society in psychology, was selected as the outstanding chapter in the nation for 1999-2000 by the American Psychological Association.
- Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") aerospace engineering

student, Karen Feigh, is the first British Marshall Scholarship winner (and only winner in the State of Georgia this year). The scholarship provides \$50,000 over two years to study in universities in the United Kingdom. The Marshall Scholarship is one way the U.K. thanks the U.S. for its post-World War II rebuilding Marshall Plan.

- The Georgia Southwestern State University Center for Elderhostel Studies was recognized as the most outstanding elderhostel center in the nation.
- The U. S. Agency for International Development (“USAID”) has awarded a \$5 million grant to Georgia State University (“GSU”) to create a business training and skill development institute in Sub Saharan Africa. Named for the late U. S. Secretary of Commerce, the goal of the Ronald H. Brown Institute is to contribute to private-sector-led economic growth in Africa by strengthening the skills of people already in business and providing training to other individuals, especially students, aspiring to enter the business world. GSU’s J. Mack Robinson College of Business and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies are leading a consortium of U. S. and South African institutions to undertake the project.
- Nancy King, Vice President for Student Success and Enrollment Services at Kennesaw State University, was presented the National Advising Award by the National Advising Academy Association and the Virginia N. Gordon Award for Excellence in the Field of Advising.
- The pass rate of Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) occupational therapy graduates taking the certification exam was once again 100%. The pass rate for all the U.S. graduates was 79.77%. The MCG pass rate for the nurse anesthesia graduating class of 2000 was 100%. The program mean score was 542, while the national average was at 514.
- North Georgia College & State University’s (“NGCSU”) Blue Ridge Rifles won the 2000 National Drill Team Championship, and the Corps of Cadets were ranked number one in the country for the fourth year running at the Annual Advanced Camp in Fort Lewis, Washington. More than 270 schools attended and competed during the month-long session.
- NGCSU’s physical therapy professor, Lynda Woodruff, was awarded a \$750,000 federal grant to help fund a volunteer health outreach program that assists elderly community members continue to cope at home. “Project Partnership” has more than 350 volunteers from NGCSU’s faculty, staff, and student body, and many community residents.
- Savannah State University received \$1.4 million from the U.S.

Department of Education to launch and operate Project GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs), which has similar aims as PREP (Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program).

I'm also proud of the accomplishments of our Presidents. Two examples for today:

- Southern Polytechnic State University President Lisa Rossbacher has been named a fellow by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. A fellow is recognized for “efforts on behalf of the advancement of science or its applications are scientifically or socially distinguished.”
- Gainesville College President Martha Nesbitt was honored at the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; she was presented with one of five awards for meritorious service to the group.

Yet it's not just presidents. Take Albany State University's Johnny Hayes, a plant operations staff member who has invented an air compression tool that can help motorists fix flat tires on the spot (Where was this when I needed it last night?!), buff cars, and operate ratchet wrenches, among other uses. Hayes has received a patent from the U.S. Patents Office for designing “Roto Air.”

And then at GIT, researchers have developed a “smart shirt” which can be made from any fabric and can be used to monitor vital signs such as a patient's heart and respiration rate. The information would then be transmitted to a doctor over cellular or satellite networks. The project was funded by the military, which was looking for ways to monitor the physical conditions of soldiers during battle.

Now to come full circle, I do believe college athletics has an important role to play; I just want it kept in perspective. In that regard, let me share two great success stories: Kristy Kowal, a former University of Georgia swimmer (and early childhood education major) and silver medallist at the 2000 Olympic Games, was named the 2000 NCAA Woman of the Year. Kowal is a seven-time NCAA individual champion and holds eight American, one world, and three U.S. Open records. She is an outstanding student.

The Georgia Southern University Eagles are the NCAA 1-AA National Champions in football, the sixth overall title and third in the last ten years.

I've had a busy and productive time since we last met. Let me mention a few items. As you know, I don't stray far during the legislative session. So, it was fortunate that a spate of national speaking engagements came just prior to that 40-day, 80-night self-imposed curfew.

It was a distinct honor to be chosen to give the president-to-president lecture to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. It was a tad disturbing to learn that it had been Webcast and that our staff watched and listened live. No longer do we have the safety of leaving town to share our innermost thoughts!

I also gave speeches to the Midwestern Higher Education Consortium (their

equivalent to SREB [Southern Regional Education Board]) in Chicago, at the inauguration of former Valdosta Vice President Lloyd Benjamin as President of Indiana State University in Terre Haute and was on a panel at the presidents meeting of the Association of Governing Boards in Washington, D.C. These events in December confirmed my wisdom in moving South!

And I gave short remarks at two of the finest regular events sponsored by the University of Georgia: the Georgia Economic Outlook luncheon and the Biennial Legislative Institute.

I also gave an address at an impressive Senate high-tech roundtable sponsored by Senator Cleland in Statesboro. Your former colleague Elsie Hand was instrumental in this, and your own technology leader Martin NeSmith participated.

Finally, I want to show you a picture that is literally worth millions of words. Let's look at the front page of *The Albany Herald* as Tifton celebrated its self-designation as "Reading Capital of the World." The declaration marked the culmination of more than three years of reading by the students and citizens of Tift County who accumulated 1 million accelerated reader points, raising reading test scores by 25% and increasing local library circulation by 50%. These are the values I want to celebrate.

Incidentally, might I ask Regent Hunt to identify someone he knows in this picture. (The Hunts' granddaughter was in the picture. Regent Hunt praised the community reading and literacy programs in Tifton.) Thank you Mr. Chairman. That concludes my report.

* * * * *

Chair White asked the Chancellor whether his figures about the 18- to 24-year-olds participating in higher education included students in Department of Technical and Adult Education institutions. Chancellor Portch responded that they did.

Chair White remarked that the University System has some work still to do to address these figures.

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 thanked Regent White. He noted that over the past several months, the Board has been receiving reports on the scope one findings of the benchmarking and management review report. This meeting would begin with a presentation by Interim Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes, who would be addressing scope two of the report, the management review that used as its sample the Central Office and the following four institutions: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College ("ABAC"), Kennesaw State University ("KSU"), Macon State College ("MSC"), and the University of Georgia ("UGA"). The purpose of the management review was to find best practices that could be replicated throughout the System. After Mr. Bowes' presentation, three System presidents would be sharing their institutions' best practices in retention. Finally, guest speaker Dr. John N. Gardner would be speaking on retention and

graduation rates.

Mr. Bowes reiterated that he would be discussing scope two of the benchmarking and management review report, which was the selective analysis of administrative functions in the University System at four institutions and the Central Office. He noted that the purpose of scope two was to identify opportunities to achieve greater efficiencies or to effect cost savings in the System. He explained that the selected institutions represented a cross-section of the System's different sectors. The seven functional areas that were examined were purchasing, budget, facilities design and construction, warehouse operations at UGA, materials requisitions at UGA, business services at the Central Office, and custodial services. He noted that custodial services were evaluated by the consultants, but they had no findings or recommendations.

Mr. Bowes explained that the first step in the scope two analysis was to identify the functional areas for examination. The consultants felt the identified seven areas would yield the most promise in terms of System efficiency and cost savings. They interviewed senior management and staff at each of the four institutions and the Central Office. They conducted well over 100 interviews, including interviews of Mr. Bowes and other Central Office staff. They also looked at background materials and supporting documents, including organizational charts and the policies and procedures in place. Then, they looked at transactional data, such as the workload comprising each administrative procedure and operation. They took this information and performed an analysis of the processes to document how things were being done and then developed findings and recommendations with particular emphasis on what potential savings could be achieved. Mr. Bowes reminded the Regents that Dr. Alceste T. Pappas, President of the Pappas Consulting Group, Inc., had reported that the findings in the recommendations could not be generalized to all of the System institutions. However, one area, purchasing, may have some implications across the System, which Mr. Bowes would discuss. While ABAC, KSU, MSC, UGA, and the Central Office had responded to all of the recommendations, Mr. Bowes would only be focusing on the major recommendations of the report. He noted that there were a few recommendations with which the Central Office or institutional staff disagreed.

Mr. Bowes next discussed the area of purchasing in particular, which was examined at all four institutions and the Central Office and the findings of which are applicable to all institutions. The consultants recommended the automation of processes using PeopleSoft. In many institutions, a fairly manual process was in place, and the consultants felt it was important to go forward with the continuing implementation of PeopleSoft to automate the purchasing process. Very closely related to that issue is another recommendation that the University System migrate to e-procurement or e-commerce systems. That is, the System should consider purchasing systems that are Web-based and that enable the System to take advantage of the economies that exist and cost savings it can achieve by broadening purchasing capabilities. A second recommendation was for institutions to collaborate in major equipment purchases. Mr. Bowes noted that this is something the System is already trying to do but needs to expand its efforts. A third recommendation was for institutions to raise their buying and equipment inventory thresholds. He noted that the state threshold on purchasing requires four quotes for purchases between \$2,500 and \$5,000, which greatly diminishes an institution's ability to streamline processes. The consultants pointed out that this is a very low threshold that should be raised in order to make the purchasing process more efficient. In addition, the consultants felt the inventory threshold, which is currently at \$1,000, needs to be raised closer to the federal standard of \$5,000. One of the reasons for this recommendation is that the latest Government Accounting Standards Board ("GASB") financial reporting requirements include depreciation accounting on major capital items. Having the threshold at \$1,000 means there will be a great deal of work for relatively insignificant pieces of equipment. So, it would benefit the System not to have to track that type of

equipment as it adopts the new GASB procedures. The last recommendation was to increase use of the Procurement Card, which was introduced about two years ago by the Department of Administrative Services. Mr. Bowes stated that usage of the Procurement Card has increased at the Central Office and at many institutions. Overall, the consultants identified potential savings in the area of purchasing of about \$750,000 to over \$1 million.

Next, Mr. Bowes discussed the budget. The consultants examined the budget process, particularly from the perspective of the Central Office. Their first major recommendation was that the budget staff continue to streamline the budget amendment process. He noted that the staff started that process two years ago by changing the procedure with regard to information brought to the Board for approval. The staff had previously been bringing very detailed information to the Board. The consultants proposed that the staff bring only amendments of \$1 million or more to the Board but not evaluate all amendments coming forward from each institution. The staff have already taken initiative on this recommendation and have greatly streamlined the process. They are now working with institutions to help them understand the process and support those changes, which have had a great impact on lowering the workload at both the Central Office and the institutions for any non-value-added activity. The new process has allowed the staff to go forward with another recommendation to redirect budget staff to more productive activities. The budget staff is now much more involved in supporting the fiscal policy activities of the Board and doing financial analysis and reporting. The consultants also recommended that the Central Office budget staff create a common database for financial analysis and reporting. Currently, there are many manual systems in place. As the System moves along in its implementation of PeopleSoft and as it looks to create a data warehouse for the information gathered, the staff will be able to implement this recommendation fully, probably within the next year or two. The last recommendation made regarding the budget was that the institutions plan quarterly budget allocations. The intended purpose of this recommendation would be to improve budget control. However, this is one recommendation with which the Central Office disagreed because the staff feel that with the PeopleSoft system, which has a lot of budget checking and control features, the institutions do not need to do this. The institutions can better manage their budgets without having to actually go through quarterly allocations.

The next area Mr. Bowes addressed was facilities design and construction. There were four major recommendations in this area. The first two were to continue 1) to build upon the best practices and periodically review selection criteria and 2) to improve communication regarding the approval and selection process for professional services. He reported that these activities are already underway and in place under Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham and his staff. They have done many things in these areas and continue to do so. The last two recommendations actually concern the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (“GSFIC”). Those recommendations are 1) to streamline the GSFIC change-order process and 2) to develop policies and procedures for building commissioning based on best practices. These recommendations are dependent on GSFIC leadership and willingness to go forward with changes in GSFIC’s current practices. Mr. Chatham and his staff have proposed to GSFIC ways of streamlining the change-order process, and Mr. Chatham had brought before the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities the recommendation of establishing a Board of Regents inspector (Item 9, pages 25 to 26), to which the Committee responded favorably. This would aid in terms of facilitating and expediting the change-order process at least as it concerns those change orders related to construction demands. The potential savings in the area of facilities design and construction are fairly significant if the staff can get GSFIC to cooperate with them on changing the building commissioning procedures. The savings relating to building commissioning could be in excess of \$5 million, and the savings related to the change-order process could be between

\$250,000 and \$500,000.

Next, Mr. Bowes addressed the warehouse operations and materials requisition matters at UGA. He stressed that these matters were examined only at UGA. The first three recommendations were to 1) reduce inventory, 2) implement industry best practices, and 3) institute practices to improve vendor delivery lead time. UGA has already made major changes in these areas and is seeing some improvements. Another recommendation to implement procedures to reduce petty cash and cash-on-delivery (“COD”) transaction processing is being addressed by UGA’s efforts to fully implement the Procurement Card process, which was not previously being used by UGA’s physical plant staff. Its implementation will eliminate much of the transaction processing of paperwork.

Another recommendation to consolidate the warehouse materials requisition functions was one with which UGA disagreed, and Mr. Bowes concurs with UGA. He explained that years ago, these operations were combined, but UGA found that it was very inefficient in terms of being able to get campus projects done. The materials requisition staff deal specifically with special non-stock inventory items, whereas the warehouse staff deal with standard central-supply items. Overall, the potential saving in the area of warehouse operations and materials requisition at UGA with regard to all the recommendations except the last one would be approximately \$150,000 to \$300,000. Approximately \$25,000 to \$50,000 of that would be in the transaction processing area.

Business services was the next area Mr. Bowes addressed. He reiterated that this was an area the consultants examined only in the Central Office. There were five major recommendations in this area. The first recommendation was that payroll be separated from human resource functions. For many years, human resources and payroll were the responsibility of a single individual in the Central Office. That has since been changed. There is now a Director of Human Resources, and different procedures are being established to ensure proper separation of duties. The second recommendation was that the Central Office fully implement the PeopleSoft purchasing model and Procurement Card process. Mr. Bowes stated again that the staff are in the process of doing that. The Central Office will have fully implemented PeopleSoft by January 1, 2002. The staff have already fully implemented the Procurement Card process and have seen many improvements in that area in terms of reducing purchase orders and paperwork associated with the purchasing process. Another recommendation was to eliminate extra steps in the accounts payable process. Mr. Bowes explained that part of the problem was that the Office of Instructional and Information Technology (“OIIT”) business function had for years been separate from the Central Office business function. However, they have since been combined, and now the staff are working with OIIT to eliminate shadow systems and train staff on the current legacy system and PeopleSoft. In a related matter, the last recommendation was to put financial data online to departments to enhance service and reduce demands for reports. The staff will no longer be creating special reports from two different systems. Rather, reports will come out of a single system and will be available to those staff who have access to PeopleSoft. The consultants projected that savings in the area of business services would be between \$150,000 and \$180,000. Mr. Bowes reported that this savings has already been achieved and the staff have been reduced by three full-time equivalent employees.

Mr. Bowes next addressed issues for future strategic planning consideration. He asserted that one of the best things to come out of the benchmarking process was the process itself, that is, the evaluation the consultants performed on the five institutions and the rigor that was followed in terms of getting to transactional information. He proposed that all institutions perform a self-study of their administrative functions, at least those that they identify as having the potential for achieving cost savings or creating additional efficiencies, and that they follow the same rigorous

formal process that the consultants used in doing that. He suggested that they identify those areas and then begin to do the analysis. The staff would report back to the Board within six months with a report on what had been done in those areas, what the institutions had achieved, and what initial findings they had found. Then, those institutions could begin implementing the changes they should be making to improve their administrative operations.

The second major area Mr. Bowes highlighted was purchasing. He stated that there is a great deal the institutions can and ought to do in this area. He suggested they find new opportunities for consortial arrangements, that is, a formal coming together of different institutions or institutions with outside agencies to leverage their purchasing power in a number of areas. A few years ago, the System worked with the Atlanta Regional Consortium for Higher Education (“ARCHE”) to achieve savings on the use of Federal Express. ARCHE made an agreement in which the System could participate, which greatly reduced the System’s Federal Express costs. Another example is the System’s utilities task force, which includes a number of institutions that are working to see how the System might leverage its purchasing power to reduce utilities costs. The staff are working with the task force and will likely have some recommendations in the next six months.

A third major area for consideration, Mr. Bowes said, was grouping purchases with other state agencies and organizations and within the University System. The greatest opportunity for savings in this area will be in computer acquisitions. With the creation of the Georgia Technology Authority (the “Authority”), which has oversight for all of the other state agencies in this area, the System’s ability to work very closely with the Authority on some major software purchases should yield significant savings in this area. Mr. Bowes proposed that the staff report back to the Board within six months regarding what they are able to achieve in this area.

The final area Mr. Bowes addressed was the System’s schedule for implementation of PeopleSoft. The staff have been taking a hard look at the System’s business processes and evaluating what makes sense and what does not to better streamline processes. President Carl V. Patton reported to the Board last year that Georgia State University (“GSU”) had accomplished a great deal in its implementation of PeopleSoft. The staff believe all of the institutions in the System will achieve similar results in their implementations. The Systemwide implementation is on schedule to be completed by May 2002. In closing, Mr. Bowes asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent White lauded Mr. Bowes and his staff for expanding the scope of the benchmarking and management review report by requesting that all of the institutions give feedback about their administrative processes. He asked Mr. Bowes when PeopleSoft will be completely implemented across the System.

Mr. Bowes replied that the 30 institutions involved in the GeorgiaFirst project will complete implementation by May 2002. In addition, the staff have been working closely with the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”). At this point, MCG is evaluating whether it will join the GeorgiaFirst project, which means that the System will host its databases in Athens and MCG will function like all of the other institutions, or whether it will take the model and run it on the MCG campus. There have also been very preliminary discussions with UGA, which is evaluating where it wants to go with its information systems. UGA is giving serious consideration to using PeopleSoft, but UGA has to consider whether it would be more cost-effective to update its legacy systems or go with PeopleSoft. The Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) is already in the process of implementing the new version of the PeopleSoft financial module. GSU has already implemented the financial elements of PeopleSoft and will be implementing the human resources

function as well.

Chair White asked for clarification on what particular PeopleSoft functions the 30 institutions will have implemented by May 2002.

Mr. Bowes replied that they will have implemented all of the critical financial and human resources/ payroll modules.

Chancellor Portch added that MCG will likely also have implemented these by May 2002.

Mr. Bowes reiterated that MCG will either be part of the GeorgiaFirst implementation or be implementing PeopleSoft on its own using the established model. GIT and GSU are already coming along.

Regent Hunt asked why UGA may choose not to use PeopleSoft.

Mr. Bowes responded that UGA did not originally want to be part of the GeorgiaFirst project. Its systems are already very highly integrated, although they are unique, "home-grown" systems. At the time of the PeopleSoft acquisition, the decision was made that UGA would not be part of GeorgiaFirst. In the meantime, the rest of the System would be part of the centralized implementation, except for GIT, GSU, and MCG, who would be implementing PeopleSoft on their own. Mr. Bowes noted that there had since been changes in the financial leadership at UGA and that new issues are arising. For example, UGA is aware that by the end of next year, it has to change its reporting procedures to be able to meet the GASB requirements. That is why UGA is seriously reconsidering PeopleSoft. Mr. Bowes has told UGA that whatever it decides to do, by next year, it must be using the System's standardized chart of accounts and reporting its financial information consistently with all of the other institutions.

Regent White encouraged UGA to implement the PeopleSoft system. He remarked that it would create the optimum efficiency to have all the institutions on the same system.

Chair Leebern agreed.

Chancellor Portch stated that his recent conversations with the leadership at UGA are encouraging, particularly with regard to the PeopleSoft implementation and other partnerships.

Mr. Bowes noted that the interesting issue with MCG was that, until the hospital and clinics were spun off as a separate entity, MCG had a much more complicated financial situation. Now that it is less complicated, MCG is more likely to join the GeorgiaFirst implementation. He also felt more encouraged recently that UGA is reconsidering PeopleSoft.

Regent Coles remarked that it seemed 32 institutions were definitely implementing PeopleSoft.

Mr. Bowes responded that 33 were definitely implementing it. The only uncertainty with MCG is whether it will implement the program as part of GeorgiaFirst or independently.

Regent Coles asked who manages the maintenance agreement with PeopleSoft.

Mr. Bowes replied that the Central Office pays PeopleSoft for a maintenance agreement on the software for support to all institutions, the Central Office, and the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, excluding UGA.

Regent Coles asked whether UGA would be the only one that would be doing its own maintenance of a separate system.

Mr. Bowes responded that if UGA implements PeopleSoft, he would expect them to provide their own support. That is not to say the Central Office would not be doing things to support UGA with regard to the implementation, but the major technical support would be UGA's responsibility.

Regent Coles asked whether there would be a duplication of expense in having UGA operating on its own system when the University System has a contract with PeopleSoft.

Mr. Bowes replied that there would not.

Chair Leebern remarked that there seemed to be a consensus among the Regents that they would encourage UGA to implement PeopleSoft.

Regent Cater asked why the Board could not ask UGA to implement PeopleSoft.

Chancellor Portch responded that he felt confident that things would go in that direction, and he noted that President Michael F. Adams of UGA was present at the Board meeting. He asked whether President Adams would like to address the Board.

President Adams reiterated that there is new financial leadership at UGA and that UGA is seriously considering implementing PeopleSoft.

Chancellor Portch added that the PeopleSoft issue is a good example of the kind of services the Central Office provides to the System and its relationship with the institutions. He stated that it has been advantageous to have 30, rather than 34, institutions in the centralized implementation of PeopleSoft. When the System gets to the point of having all of its institutions on PeopleSoft, the larger institutions have the talent and resource base to run and maintain those systems, which allows the Central Office to better assist the 30 that do not. So, as long as all 34 institutions end up on the same system, how they are serviced may need to be differentiated. This is also true with regard to construction and similar matters. A smaller institution will require a higher level of support and help from the Central Office than a larger institution, and it is beneficial to the Central Office that the larger institutions are more self-supporting. With GIT and GSU, it has been advantageous to the GeorgiaFirst project that they are outside the project, because they have been a sort of pilot for implementation elsewhere in the System.

Mr. Bowes agreed that a research university is much more complex and has different issues with regard to implementation of programs like PeopleSoft. For example, allocating salaries across different fund groups is an issue specific to research universities that smaller institutions do not have. There are many other reasons why it makes more sense for the research institutions to run the software on their own.

Chancellor Portch explained that faculty members at a research university may receive part of their salary from state funds and part from a research grant or contract. That has payroll implications that are unique to a research institution. The key is that all institutions need to be on the same financial system so that the information needed for the Board's policy decisions and management responsibilities is uniform and coherent across the System. The Chancellor remarked that he is confident this will happen.

Chair Leebern asked whether there were any further questions.

Chancellor Portch added that concurrent with the PeopleSoft implementation, the Central Office has asked every president to send in a list of any process, procedure, or policy in any areas that he or she does not believe is currently adding sufficient value. The Central Office staff are carefully considering everything the System does to determine what is adding value. Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services Corlis Cummings is heading up that effort and will likely report to the Board in May or June and again in September with proposed policy revisions. He said that this is just something that all organizations must do periodically to examine their processes. An example would be the Board policy that all resumes of administrative finalists for positions at institutions must be sent to the Central Office before the applicants are interviewed. The Chancellor said that the intent of the policy was to ensure that there was diversity in the applicant pools, but with 34 institutions, no one in the end was examining whether there was diversity in hiring. So, this procedure will be one that the staff recommend be dropped in lieu of a better process to examine diversity in hiring. This will save a great deal of paperwork and time. There is another policy that the minutes of every faculty senate meeting shall be sent to the Chancellor. He said that he does not read them, and this is another policy that needs to be reconsidered.

Regent White remarked that this was an outstanding effort.

Regent Carter asked whether this effort should be continued further such that there is an automatic review process that takes place every certain number of years.

Chancellor Portch replied that this is a very good suggestion and perhaps this would be a good policy.

Chair Leebern asked Mr. Bowes when the new GASB procedures would take effect.

Mr. Bowes responded that they are being implemented along with the PeopleSoft implementation. There are different schedules of what procedures become effective when, but they will all be in place for fiscal year 2002 based on GASB deadlines. He explained that under the leadership of Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ronald B. Stark and Interim Executive Director for Business and Financial Affairs Debra Wike, there is a capitalization task force that will be working with an outside consultant on this issue. The matter is very complicated, and the staff will develop a set of guidelines that will be applied to all institutions as a result of this process. He asked Mr. Stark to comment on this.

Mr. Stark stated that there are differences in the financial reporting needs at research institutions versus other University System institutions and that the differences are significant in how the GASB rules are applied.

Chair Leebern asked whether the capitalization process will take into account the historical cost of all facilities at the 34 institutions.

Mr. Stark responded that there are two methodologies to employ: depreciated historical cost versus estimated remaining value.

Chair Leebern asked how 34 chief financial officers (“CFOs”) will be brought into agreement about how to account for expenses.

Mr. Stark replied that all of them will be in agreement because many of them are participating in

the setting of standards and rules and that all campuses will be required to follow the established rules.

Chair Leebern expressed that he hoped it will be that easy. He said there will be certain situations where the institutions will disagree.

Mr. Stark responded that the state auditors will be assisting in evaluating the implementation of a consistent set of principles. They will let him know if the campuses are not in compliance.

Chair Leebern asked whether there is a spirit of cooperation among the CFOs.

Mr. Stark replied that there is.

At approximately 10:20 a.m., Chair Leebern called for a short break. He reconvened the meeting at approximately 10:35 a.m. and turned the floor over to Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs Daniel S. Papp.

Dr. Papp thanked Chair Leebern. He explained that as part of the Board's continuing study of the benchmarking and management review, there were three presidents at this meeting representing System institutions on the leading edge of the System in retention of students from the freshman to sophomore years. Dr. Papp reminded the Regents that one of the objectives of the benchmarking effort was to identify those best practices that could be replicated throughout the System. The three presidents who would be presenting at this meeting were President Portia H. Shields of Albany State University ("ASU"), President Nathaniel Hansford of North Georgia College & State University ("NGCSU"), and President Barbara P. Losty of Waycross College ("WC"). Dr. Papp noted that ASU is the only university in the state university sector that is above the normative range for retention. NGCSU is at the top of the normative range, while WC is at the top of the normative range for retention in the two-year sector. Following the presidents' presentations, the Board would hear from Dr. John Gardner, the leading national expert on the first-year college experience and retention. Dr. Gardner has directed student retention programs for over 25 years, most of them at the University of South Carolina ("USC"), where he founded the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. In 1999, Dr. Gardner moved from South Carolina to Brevard College in North Carolina, where he founded the Policy Center on the First Year of College, which was funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. Dr. Gardner has visited 18 of the 34 University System of Georgia institutions to examine and assist with retention efforts. Dr. Papp then turned the floor over to President Shields of ASU.

President Shields thanked Dr. Papp and introduced Dr. Walter M. Kimbrough, Vice President for Student Affairs at ASU. She explained that both she and Dr. Kimbrough had attended Dr. Gardner's workshops on retention and that ASU is doing everything that he recommends. However, she could not tell the Regents which specific programs in which particular combinations are responsible for ASU's retention success. ASU is willing to try everything because it has a challenging task in educating students from rural Southwest Georgia. Retention is the linchpin, she explained, but graduation is the goal. She said that a very important part of retention at ASU is having a safe and secure campus. Students must feel that they are at home and protected, and their parents must also be assured of this. ASU has a very low rate of crime compared to other institutions. ASU is also continually improving its customer service functions.

ASU also aggressively recruits the best students in Georgia, stated President Shields. The institution makes a big deal out of getting presidential scholars, including inviting the parents to an official signing ceremony. The presidential scholars also accompany President Shields when she

makes speeches and attends important meetings. The students are making an excellent adjustment to ASU, and a few of them have 4.0 grade point averages (“GPAs”). One presidential scholar recently competed in the Miss Albany State University pageant as Miss History and Political Science. Another important retention tool is the “transition-to-independence” ceremony at the end of orientation week. This is a ceremony in which ASU asks the parents to put a medallion around their children’s necks and say “I believe you. I trust in you. I know that you can do it.” The students reciprocate by assuring their parents that they can be depended upon to do their best. President Shields distributed the medallions to the Regents. She noted that last year’s graduation was the first time that students marched on the stage with their medallions.

Dr. Kimbrough stated that once ASU has completed its orientation period, there is an extended orientation course known as “ASU 1000.” He noted that a 1997 national study showed that 70% of institutions had an extended orientation program. So, this is not unique, though there are many unique things ASU does with this course. It lasts the entire first semester, and ASU has developed its own planner and textbook for the course. This is an opportunity to start teaching students how to become viable members of the ASU academic community. The instructors spend time discussing the traditions and customs of the institution, such as the alma mater, so that students feel a part of the campus community. A major element of this course is that, twice a month, state and national leaders are brought in to speak to the students to inspire them to stay in college. One of the past year’s speakers was Dr. Lee Jones, an author and Associate Dean of the College of Education at Florida State University. ASU believes it is important to bring in people of that stature to interact with the students. A separate program that is sometimes linked to the freshman seminar course is a distinguished scholars program. ASU brings in national figures to interact in smaller groups with the students. One of the major programs last year featured Dr. Preston T. King, who, after being pardoned, returned to Albany and spoke at ASU about that era of history and political science. This was a great opportunity for all students to feel they are a part of the institution by engaging them in intellectual discourse. Dr. Kimbrough said that there is also a youth motivation task force. He noted that the program was originally a national program created under President Lyndon B. Johnson. It presents an opportunity to bring the business sector and minority students together. Funding was cut off for the national program in 1984, but institutions such as ASU decided to continue with the program anyway. In the past year, approximately 70 consultants came from different corporations across the Southeast and worked with 156 classes, 2 middle schools, and 2 high schools. In total, over 4,000 students were impacted by the program, which takes place every year. It reinforces for all students, but particularly freshmen, that they have an opportunity to interact with the business sector.

President Shields said that the second part of ASU’s orientation strategy is to make students feel they are part of the community. This is accomplished through a service-to-leadership program, in which students provide services as part of a course requirement. The faculty and staff also participate. The students must create a portfolio depicting their community service experiences and how such experiences might evolve into a leadership opportunity for them in the future.

Dr. Kimbrough stressed that part of ASU’s approach to retention is to make sure that all of the faculty, staff, and administrators are dedicated to all of the students and to develop a sense of community on campus. This starts with the president in terms of school spirit and promoting interaction among the students, faculty, staff, and administrators. There are small group discussions and focus groups where people can become better connected to each other and the institution. He stressed that ASU looks for many opportunities to bring in outside persons of national stature to interact with its students. Another ASU tradition is a Thanksgiving dinner where members of the staff serve a holiday meal to the students. Even students who do not live on campus enjoy coming back to campus for this special occasion. Also, within the residence life

program, ASU created the friendship games, which are week-long intermural activities between the different residence halls. Dr. Kimbrough noted that most of the students in the halls are freshmen, so this is another opportunity for students to get to know each other outside of classes. This has been one of ASU's most popular events with 400 to 500 students attending the different activities each day. These are the types of programs and traditions ASU is developing, which he asserted are very critical to the retention efforts.

In closing, President Shields reiterated that retention is very important at ASU. Next year, ASU will require all freshmen to live on campus, because she believes it will add more structure and encourage more interaction. She believes ASU is doing an outstanding job. ASU's first-year retention rate is excellent, and President Shields is very proud. However, the second-year retention rate is even more important, because students must pass the Regents' Exam, Praxis I, and other indicators of progress. Now that ASU is successful in retention for the first year, it will focus on second-year retention.

Chair Leebern thanked President Shields and welcomed President Hansford.

President Hansford greeted the Regents and expressed that he would be delighted to discuss the retention rate at NGCSU, which has been one of the highest in the System for many years. He said that he has had little to do with this phenomenon as he had only been President for about a year. One program that has likely impacted retention, however, is a mentoring program that targets certain groups of students, in which peer and faculty tutors work with those students. NGCSU's strategic plan has identified different groups of students it needs to work to recruit and retain, specifically minority and international students. There are also peers who tutor the cadets, because it is very demanding to be a first-year college student and go through the cadet corps at the same time. Other valuable retention programs include the special skills programs. Every student is required to take two writing-intensive courses, which is known as the Writing Across the Curriculum Program. They also must take one course that has been identified as a communications component for improvement of their oral skills. President Hansford remarked that these courses help the students become good scholars, and they also help students on their Regents' Exams.

Another important factor in retention is that NGCSU has very strong student organizations, said President Hansford. In 11 of the last 13 years, NGCSU's student government association ("SGA") has been selected the best SGA in the state. There are also other strong student groups, such as a commuter council, a graduate students council, and fraternities and sororities that help to bind students to make them feel like they are part of the NGCSU community. He asserted that because of the institution's strong student organizations and the type of students the university attracts, NGCSU is also able to bring the students into its governance. He has meetings with the SGA president and with the commander of the corps brigade every month to talk about campus issues. Also, on almost all campus committees, there will be a student representative. President Hansford stated that the SGA is the only institution in the System with total budget control over the student fees budget. Students develop the budget and decide how their student activities fees will be spent. Of course, President Hansford approves the budget, but he has never had to make any changes to it because the students are very responsible. Last year, the Board of Regents implemented a policy that at each institution there should be a committee composed of at least 50% students that would approve fee requests and increases. At NGCSU, requests for student fees have always been taken to the SGA for its approval before the university presented them to the Board. So, this was nothing new for NGCSU.

President Hansford remarked that President Shields had touched on something he also feels is

very important: the institution must have a safe and secure campus environment. NGCSU has been nationally ranked as one of the top 20 safest college campuses in the United States. He said that he was very proud that the university has such a safe campus environment and noted that many parents appreciate that too. NGCSU also has many rules. In fact, he said, the university may have more rules than any other institution in the state. For example, NGCSU is an alcohol-free campus. No one can bring alcohol on campus, no matter his or her age. Students cannot even have alcohol in their cars. In many instances, students can be suspended for one semester for any violation of this rule. NGCSU is also a tobacco-free campus. Of course, this rule is harder to enforce, acknowledged President Hansford. Another thing that is a bit unusual about NGCSU is that its freshman women students must be in by 10 p.m. their first five weeks of school. He noted that the men, because they are in the corps of cadets, must be in by 8 p.m. for their entire first year. Another effective retention tool is the leadership program. NGCSU tries to instill in its students a sense of community by putting them to work in the community, as does ASU. The concept of leadership through service is something that bonds the students to the community so that if they decide to leave the institution, they are also leaving behind a community that has supported them.

President Hansford reiterated that there are not just a few programs that have affected NGCSU's retention rate. Rather, a package of programs aids in this cause. Nonetheless, he asserted that two or three of these programs might be replicated elsewhere in the System to improve retention rates. The special skills programs, such as Writing Across the Curriculum, can be replicated at other campuses to help support students. Another important element is the level of student involvement in institutional governance. Students may not make final decisions, but it is important that they have input into the process. President Hansford remarked that he received some of the best advice from students. This is very valuable and it helps build a community that promotes student retention. Finally, it is worthwhile to establish programs that support certain groups, such as minority and international students and, in the case of NGCSU, the corps of cadets. This will help them transition into a new environment like NGCSU and will help them succeed. In closing, he thanked the Regents and asked whether there were any questions.

Chair Leebern asked whether the Regents had any questions, and seeing that they did not, he called upon President Losty to make her presentation.

President Losty greeted the Regents. She explained that there were three statements that summarize best practices in retention at Waycross College: 1) recruit and retain qualified students; 2) know how you are doing in retention; and 3) make student success everybody's business. WC is an associate degree-granting institution without dormitories in rural South Georgia, and 95% of its students come from just seven counties. WC offers a full range of learning support ("LS") courses, and faculty normally teach 15 semester hours every semester. The most frequently declared major is "undeclared," followed by teacher education and business administration. WC's students vary widely in the measures used for admissions. This fall's entering freshmen had Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") scores ranging from 450 to 1220. One student achieved a low high school GPA of less than 1.5, while 29% had high school GPAs between 3.5 and 4.0.

President Losty returned to the first statement. She explained that WC wants to recruit and retain the full spectrum of college students, but it is easier to retain students who do well. There are three ways this principle is applied at WC. First, the Waycross College Foundation (the "Foundation") offers impressive scholarships to high school valedictorians, salutatorians, and honor graduates. These scholarships are in addition to the HOPE Scholarship Program ("HOPE"). Valedictorians, for example, receive a scholarship equal to HOPE, the sum of tuition, fees, and a book allowance. Once students are on campus, they are involved in the SGA, clubs,

class projects, intramurals, and anything else that keeps them on campus, because if they are involved, they are more likely to stay. Secondly, the Foundation also offers an Adult Start College Grant. President Losty explained that adults typically take three years from the time they first start thinking about returning to college until they take the first step of getting an application. Adults will often get everyone else in their families off to school before they even apply. This means that they miss financial aid deadlines when they finally get the courage to begin. However, if they begin, they are likely to do well in their first semester, and they can use that time to complete the financial aid process. WC guarantees any adult 23 or over who has been out of school five years or more that the Foundation will pay the tuition for his or her first WC course. The college followed up on the first students given Adult Start College Grants, and their median grade was a B. President Losty explained that approximately 35% to 40% of WC students need to take LS courses. If they place in two or more LS courses, they are also required to take an LS course called Introduction to College. This course focuses on areas that can increase college success, such as note-taking, understanding how college works, and study skills. Teachers in LS courses are aware of the challenges these students face. One LS teacher puts her home telephone number on every syllabus and tells students to call her at home. She lets them know that she is a resource and that being stuck, an experience they have all had, does not mean staying stuck. LS students are qualified for admission to WC, and WC intends to see that they succeed so they can move on to other courses. WC works hard to recruit and retain qualified students. After all, it is more cost-effective to retain students than to go out and recruit even more.

Next, President Losty addressed the second statement: know how you are doing in retention. She began as President in summer 1996, and she had no idea how many students had been retained from the fall of one year to the fall of the next. However, she wanted to know about the retention of all students, not just first-time full-time students. After all, about half of WC's students are part-time students. She worked with the director of computer services to get a list of all students new in fall 1996. She then checked how many returned in the winter and spring quarters. By mid-fall 1997, she could report to the faculty that they were rather good at retention. American College Testing data on two-year public colleges indicated that nationally about 52% of first-time full-time students who entered in fall 1996 returned for fall 1997. Her data showed that 58% of all WC entering freshmen in fall 1996 returned in fall 1997. As years have gone by, she has continued to report this information back to the faculty each term.

The final statement President Losty addressed was about making student success everybody's business. At WC, she started with the faculty and professional staff. At the faculty fall conference in 1997, she led a workshop on retention. The day began with reports from eight areas key to retention: academic advisement, the academic support center, the early warning system, entrance placement testing and orientation seminars, financial aid (including Foundation scholarships), the Introduction to College course, the LS programs, and the minority advising program. Eight people were asked to convince the workshop attendees that the retention area for which each was responsible was the most important retention effort at the college. At the end of the workshop, each individual developed a list of three things he or she could do as an individual to improve retention. Every individual was asked to declare to the group one new effort that he or she would implement during the first two weeks of class, the most critical time for retention. President Losty declared that because approximately one-third of WC students each fall are new, she would wear a name tag for the first two weeks of class. Others pledged to know every student in every class by name by the end of the second week, to escort lost students to their destinations, to implement study groups, and many other ideas. Each person left the workshop pledging one new personal action to improve retention. President Losty still wears her name tag at the beginning of every semester. She also writes to every student she admits as a presidential exception encouraging them to use WC's resources to assist them. She tells them that at the end

of the semester she will check their grades, and she does. However, student success does not just involve the president, faculty, and professional staff. The theme for President Losty's inaugural address in November 1997 was based on the telephone greeting: "Waycross College. How may I help you?" One of the examples in her address was of a secretary who encouraged her work-study student to discuss a low exam grade with the teacher. President Losty restated her theme: make student success everybody's business. In closing, she said that when she received her invitation to speak to the Board about WC's best practices in retention, she e-mailed faculty and staff to ask what she should say. They responded that retention and graduation rates are about support and caring. Retention literature says a student is more likely to be retained if one individual on campus cares about that student. President Losty quoted from a reply from an associate professor of physics, who said students are "valued for the abilities and motivation that they do possess and, yes, are applauded for the courage to attempt a college education." With that, she ended her presentation.

Chair Leebern asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent NeSmith observed that there was a common thread in the presidents' presentations. At each institution, the faculty and staff go beyond what is expected of them to show the students that they care. He then asked whether every institution has something similar to ASU's orientation textbooks.

Chancellor Portch responded that ideas like this are what the Board needs to consider replicating throughout the System. He then called upon Dr. Gardner to speak.

Dr. Gardner thanked the Chancellor and greeted the Board. He explained that one-third of all students who enter college in the United States each year do not return the following year. At the baccalaureate level in particular, the rate is about one-fourth. At the two-year level, it is closer to one-half. As the Board's benchmarking data suggests, in many categories, the University System is doing better than the nation as a whole. Dr. Gardner said that Dr. Papp had prepared him well with data he needed to better understand the System in terms of the benchmarking and management review report. He acknowledged that Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Services Barry A. Fullerton had also been very useful in helping him understand the System. He said his appreciation for the institutions has also been enhanced by the fact that he has visited 18 of them. While he is not an employee of the System, he does have more than a casual understanding of the System's institutional cultures. That understanding had also been enhanced by listening to the three presidents at this meeting. One theme he felt was very well illustrated was that these institutions represent a major change in what has happened at colleges and universities in recent years. Historically, there has been a philosophy that colleges and universities act as families. There was a 30-year experiment of trying to give that up, but the effort has been a miserable failure. Two of the three presidents at this meeting talked to the Regents about the pride they have in their rules and regulations. This is something colleges are increasingly seeing. Congress is encouraging colleges to be more intrusive. Dr. Gardner reported that 75% of the African-American baccalaureate degree holders in this country are graduates of historically black colleges and universities ("HBCUs"), while 80% of the currently enrolled African-American citizens are enrolled in public, predominantly white institutions. One of the challenges is to learn how the HBCUs have been so successful, because many retention practices can be replicated.

Dr. Gardner explained that like many of the Regents, he went to college full-time as a traditional-aged student. He lived on campus, he did not have a part-time job, and he was fully supported by his family. In that respect, he is highly representative of most of the senior-level college and

university administrators and faculty in this county, which means that they had a very different college experience from the majority of today's college students. That challenges their ability to understand what the student experience is really like today. Dr. Gardner reported that there are 14.8 million students enrolled in approximately 4,000 colleges and universities in the United States right now. Of that number, only 1.5 million live on campus. The typical student is a female commuter student above the traditional age. Yet, only 25% of the tenure-track or tenured faculty in this country are women. So, there are enormous differences between those who teach and those who are taught. The colleges are having to learn from these best practices to try and change a number of the ways they do business. Dr. Gardner stated that he almost flunked out of college. His first semester grades were three Fs, two Ds, and one A. One of his life goals is to help other students do better in the first term of college than he did.

One theme Dr. Gardner observed running through each of the presidents' presentations was that the president personifies an intentional effort to teach students how to be successful. He noted that WC likely serves some of the poorest counties in the nation, where it would be assumed that the majority of students would not be successful in college. Dr. Gardner has learned that great corporations and military organizations are very intentional about teaching people how to be successful. They believe there is a body of knowledge and information that you can teach people to be successful. He said this is likely what is happening in WC. WC is not accepting the national stereotype that its students are poor, Southern, and have generations of deprivation in their rural schools and, therefore, these students cannot be successful. Fundamental to all of this, he said, is being very optimistic about what students can do and taking responsibility that starts with the Board of Regents and goes to the Chancellor. He asserted that it is up to the Regents to encourage institutions to put an emphasis on retention.

Dr. Gardner explained that he worked at USC 32 years, where he founded the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. It is a research continuing education center that works with colleges and universities all over the nation to improve student retention. He wanted to redefine the concept of retention, because the majority of the faculty in this country do not buy into the concept of retention. They think it is someone else's responsibility, not theirs. So, this challenge must be redefined as something in which they believe. He told the Regents to think of retention as having to do with learning. When students learn, they are successful and they stay. So, retention is about learning. It is also about what the institutions do with students for the first several months, including what they study, who teaches them, what pedagogies are used, and student services. Essentially, the retention challenge is about the first year of college. If institutions are going to be more successful with regard to retention, they will have to undo the way they have historically organized and executed the first year of college in this country. Historically, the first year of college has had three purposes. The first purpose was to generate revenue and redistribute it to areas of the academy that are deemed more valuable. The second purpose was to weed out students who many believe do not belong in college. The third purpose was to allow professors, especially senior professors, to do as they please. The three presidents at this meeting had said that they had different objectives for the first-year experience. The United States has long been pessimistic about the first year of college. It is assumed there will be high failure rates and that students are buffoons. Until 20 years ago, it was legal in most states to harass and haze first-year students, subjecting them to indignities. Historically, interest in the first-year experience has been very low because faculty and administrators were more concerned with other issues. Another problem is that the first year of college was not designed for students in Georgia. The first year was originally designed for white, affluent, property-owning, Anglo-Saxon Protestant males in New England. It was never designed for rural or urban students in Georgia, high proportions of women, high proportions of minorities, part-time students, working students, etc. In the past 35 years, the typical entering

college student has changed.

The issue of retention is not a value for students. Many do not know when they start college whether they will ever finish. Retention is a value to the policy makers. Dr. Gardner noted that most students graduate with a bachelor's degree with a median level of indebtedness three to four times their annual income. That is a disincentive for many students to continue in college. Many do not even want to start because they are afraid of debt. Georgia has had a roaring economy where men have found it even less necessary to go to college than women, which is one of the reasons why male enrollments are dropping off. There has historically been an inverse relationship between the strength of the economy and student retention. When the economy is strongest, attrition rates are higher because students feel they do not have to go to college.

Dr. Gardner provided to the Regents a handout with a list of some of the more common strategies that colleges and universities have been using to attempt to achieve retention. The central point is that most of the efforts to enhance student retention understandably but unfortunately do not focus on the core academic experience. They do not focus on what faculty do in the required first-year courses. They focus instead on what administrators, staff, and student affairs officers do, because it is easier to lead, motivate, and direct those employees than it is to direct faculty. So, efforts have focused on the periphery, on things that are easier to manage. It is easier to improve orientation than it is to improve instruction in core introductory college courses. Dr. Gardner said that one of his central points is that for the majority of students, their experience with the University System of Georgia is what happens in the classroom in the beginning courses because so many of the students do not reside on campuses. Ultimately then, the challenge must be squarely focused on the classroom experience.

Dr. Gardner urged the Board to make the first year of college a top priority. He further urged the Regents to consider measures that could serve as encouragement to make the first year more of a priority for the institutions. The Board already has an initiative that could be scaled up and could have enormous impact on first-year student success. That initiative is the P-16 initiative, and it is an effort to align what is going on in the public schools with what is going on in the first year of college on System campuses. That means having more college faculty talking to faculty in the high schools about their expectations and pedagogies. School-college collaborations are terribly important, Dr. Gardner said, and while they can be difficult, they are well worth the effort. He also urged the Regents to have all institutions do what Dr. Losty described, which was to better understand the nature of attrition and retention on campus. With the assistance of Dr. Fullerton and upon the authorization of the Chancellor, Dr. Gardner worked with 15 University System institutions last year on a project to study the first year of college using a set of guidelines that he had developed. This was an optional project, but the campuses willingly participated for their own reasons. He wondered how much more they could have done if it were a matter of higher policy and coordination. So, he urged that the Board have each of the institutions make a more precise analysis of its own culture to examine why it is or is not attracting and retaining students. He also urged the Chancellor to encourage the presidents to make the first year a higher priority. They are very attune to what his priorities are, and he could leverage this if he chooses. Once presidents get involved, they capture the attention of the chief academic officers and it trickles down from there. The Board could make responsibility more defined and assign senior individuals with that responsibility. Unfortunately, what typically happens on many campuses is that they hire a junior-level director of retention who does not have faculty rank and tenure and is not high up in the hierarchy. Because he has no authority, he has no impact.

Dr. Gardner stated that each institution needs a clearly articulated vision statement for what the first year should be about. The three presidents at this meeting could do this. The other 31

should be able to do this as well. Each vision statement should be connected to the institution's mission statement. Each of the institutions should have some type of high-powered advisory board to monitor the first year on an ongoing basis. If the Board accepts Dr. Gardner's thesis that the heart of the student experience is in the classroom, then anything that can be done to improve the quality of instruction in the first year will pay rich dividends, including investing in teacher learning centers to help faculty better understand their students. The institutions must focus on what they do control rather than what they do not control. For example, many educators are greatly concerned about the amount of time students spend watching television. The typical 18-year-old has watched between 18,000 and 21,000 hours of television before entering college in contrast to spending 11,000 to 12,000 in school. In other words, a student has spent 50% more time watching television than he has in the classroom. It is no wonder that students are very visual and kinesthetic learners, Dr. Gardner said. He did not grow up learning that way; he is an auditory and abstract learner who likes broad concepts. That is not the way today's students learn. However, faculty can be educated to better understand student learning styles and alternative strategies to help them communicate with visual learners. Faculty were educated to be scholars in their disciplines; they were not prepared to be teachers. So, institutions need to invest in faculty development, particularly for faculty who are teaching first-year students in the core introductory courses. That is where institutions get their greatest degree of attrition or success. Another related national movement is the "roles and rewards" process, said Dr. Gardner. Faculty are rewarded based on how much they learn, which is measured by how often they publish. They are not evaluated on how much their students learn. Many institutions are rethinking alternative and additional ways to evaluate faculty to reward them for doing the kinds of things for which the three presidents were arguing. There is a proven set of retention initiatives the Board should be investing in. The first-year seminar courses that all institutions have are not offered for all students, and on some campuses, faculty are not even paid for teaching them even though the courses have been found to significantly leverage student retention. Another new strategy is having students enroll in small groups as cohorts called "learning communities." There can be many small cohorts in a large lecture class. The concept of a small group of students taking a group of courses together helps them to see the connections between different courses. Students often drop out of college because they do not understand the connections.

Dr. Gardner stated that the University System has the kind of leadership that is willing to reconsider practices it has been using for years and ask whether they should be continued. This is a phenomenon that the British called "waiting for Napoleon." In 1803, the British created a job for a man to stand on the cliffs of Dover with a spy glass to look out across the channel to watch for the Napoleonic armada, which the British were certain would invade. Well, Napoleon decided not to invade Britain. However, the British government continued to maintain a formal job with a salary for a man to continue to do this. Napoleon was twice defeated, he was exiled, and he died a horrible death in 1821, but the British parliament continued to pay for staff for this position until 1945. Every organization develops practices and procedures which were at one time useful. The way college was organized originally works well for people who come from affluent families and can afford to send their children to attend college full-time, live on campus, and not work. However, this is no longer the prototype of the American college student. So, Dr. Gardner urged the Board to reexamine its own practices of "waiting for Napoleon." The University System needs to benchmark itself against its own best practices to significantly exceed these benchmarks. He stressed that certain things will not happen unless the Board gets involved.

Chair Leebern asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent White thanked Dr. Gardner for his presentation. He encouraged the Chancellor and staff to report back about the rewards for faculty, perhaps at the retreat in May. From what he heard in

this presentation, an overall change of attitude about retention by the faculty can reap significant positive outcomes.

Dr. Gardner agreed that faculty are the key. If they are not significantly invested in retention efforts, the System will not be able to achieve its full potential.

Regent Hunt noted that the Governor had commented on rewards for teachers at “Eggs and Issues,” and it is a timely subject. He remarked that he always believed in rewarding employees and that he hoped the System could move toward this goal.

Dr. Gardner responded that faculty do listen and respond to incentives, and the Board provides the incentives.

Chancellor Portch added that a couple of the presidents confessed that they were not sure exactly which particular programs work with regard to retention. He asked whether Dr. Gardner’s research had identified any particular variables that work best.

Dr. Gardner replied that certain types of programs are shown to have more impact than others nationally. Most importantly, there is no panacea, no one variable. Success is dependent upon a multiplicity of approaches. Some interventions, such as first-year seminars, learning communities, and supplemental instruction, have been heavily researched and well validated. However, many of them are still perceived to be marginal or fringe programs that have not been moved to the core of the academic experience, and they will not be until it becomes a matter of academic policy and more faculty become involved.

Chair Leebern asked whether there were any further questions, and there were none.

Chancellor Portch thanked Dr. Gardner for his presentation. He remarked that he has known Dr. Gardner for 20 years and has always admired him. Dr. Gardner formulated a sort of “cottage industry” of first-year experience conferences that have now been held worldwide for the last 15 or so years. Dr. Gardner understates his own impact on higher education, which has been enormous, and the Chancellor greatly appreciated that he shared his wisdom with the Board.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Gardner and the other presenters. There being no further business to come before the Strategic Planning Committee, he adjourned the Board into its regular session.

Chair White thanked Regent Leebern and remarked that these were outstanding presentations.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair White reported that the Chancellor was not called upon to take any actions necessary on behalf of the Board between the November 2000 Board meeting and this meeting that would require Board ratification. He then called upon Regent NeSmith to tell the Board about an upcoming tour of campuses.

Regent NeSmith explained that there would be a tour of Armstrong Atlantic State University, Georgia Southern University, and Savannah State University from February 20 to February 22, 2001. He discussed the particulars of the visit and encouraged the Regents and their spouses to attend.

Chair White thanked Regent NeSmith for organizing these campus visits and remarked that much

can be gained from such visits, particularly for the newer Regents.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business at this meeting.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Chair White noted that in each Regent's folder was a schedule of Board meetings through June 2002 and that Secretary Gail S. Weber would also send this schedule to the Regents' administrative assistants.

Secretary Weber announced that the Chancellor would be making his budget presentation before the Senate Appropriations Committee on Wednesday, January 17, 2001 at 1:30 p.m.

Chair White added that it is important for the Board to have good representation at this presentation.

Secretary Weber then announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, February 13 and Wednesday, February 14, 2001 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia. She noted that there would also likely be a social event with the Department of Technical and Adult Education and its board on the evening of February 13.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00 p.m. on January 10, 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