

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA  
HELD AT  
244 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W.  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA  
JANUARY 9-10, 1996**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, January 9, 1996, at 1:00 P.M., and again on Wednesday, January 10, 1996, at 9:00 A.M., in the Board Room at 244 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Regent Juanita Powell Baranco. Present, in addition to Chairman Baranco, were Regents: Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. (Vice Chair), John H. Anderson, Jr., Kenneth W. Cannestra, S. William Clark, Jr., John Howard Clark, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A. W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Suzanne G. Elson, Elsie P. Hand, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and William B. Turner. Absent on Tuesday, January 9, was Regent John H. Clark, and absent on Wednesday, January 10, was Regent A. W. "Bill" Dahlberg.

The Attendance Report was read on both days by Secretary Gail S. Weber.

Upon motion by Regent Leebern, seconded by Regent Dahlberg, the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Regents held on December 12-13, 1995, were unanimously approved as distributed on Tuesday, January 9.

**PRESENTATION: UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA INTERNAL AUDITING**

Senior Vice Chancellor Lindsay Desrochers led a discussion concerning internal auditing. Dr. Desrochers introduced her colleagues: State Auditor Claude Vickers, Associate Vice Chancellor Bill Bowes, and the Central Office's internal auditor, Assistant Vice Chancellor Levy Youmans. Dr. Desrochers noted that discussions with various Regents had revealed general financial management issues about which they were concerned. One issue that arose was the question of auditing and the auditing capacity of the University System of Georgia. Dr. Desrochers said that she would speak about the current picture of how that auditing was being conducted and in which direction the University System of Georgia should turn. With the concurrence of the Chancellor and the Chair, Dr. Desrochers had undertaken a study of auditing and used for that study an external consultant from an internal audit institute that is based in Washington D.C. In addition, the Central Office staff had consulted with the State Auditor, Mr. Vickers, regarding findings, conclusions and recommendations to bring to the Board. She indicated that Chairman Baranco had requested that the presentation begin with an explanation of the purposes of auditing from the perspective of higher education.

Dr. Desrochers remarked that there were multiple purposes for audits. First, audits are designed to assist management; they are management tools, and this is the most general purpose of audits. Certain things are insured through audits: (1) that policies, plans, and procedures are in place and clearly communicated to colleges and universities and that these institutions are in compliance; (2) that institutional assets are accounted for and safeguarded from loss; and, (3) as a tool that assures management that the information used for decision making is reliable and complete. Another important aspect of what auditing can provide for institutions of higher

education is the assurance that assigned responsibilities to the various financial managers and other managers on a campus are carried out competently. Finally, auditing will insure that at the institutional system level, state and federal reporting requirements (of which there are many) are met.

On the whole, auditing really serves as the conscience for a financial manager. It is a way of stepping outside the normal, day-to-day, course of business and looking back at how one manages. It asks the question, "Are we doing the best job that we can, or are the current practices as efficient and effective as they could be?". If not, what are the practices that need improvement? An audit report frequently contains certain audit exceptions. The audit exceptions are really tools for management to then go back and assess what they are doing and make the necessary changes to improve the overall effectiveness and efficiency of safeguarding and controlling their assets.

Dr. Desrochers spoke next on the subject of audit capacity. She noted that there had been little attention paid to auditing over the past decades in the System. In the 1960's, an auditing function was created within the Board of Regents office; it was created with the aim of assuring compliance with Board policy. About 1991, the Board recognized that some of the larger institutions were adding their own campus auditors. The Board then adopted the policy that the Chancellor's office should coordinate with campus-based auditors, and that, in fact, the Central Office should provide some direction to the institutional auditors. This policy stated that, in fact, the Central Office should supervise those locally campus-based auditors. To illustrate the overall audit capacity of the System, Dr. Desrochers made reference to a triangular chart that represented the three sides of auditing:

1. The Central Office audit staff is composed of nine auditors headed by Mr. Levy Youmans, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Accounting. These auditors have various functions to perform, and they largely perform auditing on a cyclical basis. The smaller campuses are audited about once every 18 months, and the four larger universities are audited on an annual cycle. About 15 full campus audits are performed each year.

2. Institutional audit staffs began to grow over the last decade. The campuses currently have audit capacity of about 27 auditors; these auditors also have a number of functions that are similar to the Central Office staff, but they are locally based and provide the President of each institution with the opportunity to deploy an auditor on any particular areas that are of grave concern to a President and his staff. Dr. Desrochers pointed out which institutions currently have their own auditors on campus. Most of the auditors are on the large campuses, and a number of campuses have a single auditor. Last June, the Board requested that the Central Office look at expanding audit capacity on some other campuses - given the size, complexity and overall audit history of those other campuses. A list of those institutions which are currently adding an auditor or recruiting for one was displayed.

3. The third leg of audit capacity is the State Auditors' office, which plays a critical role in the triangular relationship. Dr. Desrochers noted that Mr. Vickers would be asked to

describe his office's role in the auditing of institutions of higher education and to speak about his office's future plans.

The basic findings of the study showed that, first and most importantly, the audit process needs greater involvement directly with Board of Regents. Dr. Desrochers remarked that it was advisable for the Board to consider adopting a charter to establish the purposes, functions and responsibilities of the audit process. She noted that it would also be advisable for the Chair of the Board to appoint an audit committee or some group within the Board that could regularly interact and work with the internal auditor to create an annual plan for the kinds of audits needed; this might include unannounced or surprise audits and audits that are in areas of high risk (financial aid or cash management might be considered high risk). It was also mentioned that the internal auditor should have direct access to the Board and the Chair. Although there should be a close working relationship, the auditor would remain administratively linked to the Senior Vice Chancellor's office. It was stated that, additionally, there is a lot more room for clarifying and strengthening the relationship between the internal office at the Board of Regents and the locally-based campus auditors. Every campus needs to have its own locally-based auditor to a certain extent, but the System should be able to better coordinate between the work done in the internal office and that being done on the campuses. This will insure that there is no duplication, or to make duplications where needed, and to assure coordination of the planning for audit work at both levels. Also, additional resources should be sought for the auditing function within the Central Office; a request this year to the Governor reflects that point. Those additional resources might be focused on increasing the number of staff auditors or on outsourcing of some of the audit function. Finally, the scope of audit work should be expanded. The Central Office has been focusing on compliance audits. Dr. Desrochers mentioned that there was another type of audit that had been neglected and that there was a need to proceed to look at more complex audit work. She asked Mr. Claude Vickers, State Auditor, to speak about the State Auditor's role and some of the plans he has in relation to the University System.

Mr. Vickers described where the State Auditor's Office fit into the auditing of the state institutions of higher education. The office provides the function of external auditing by looking over financial statements, telling the Board of Regents and the General Assembly whether those statements are reliable, and whether the Central Office is doing what it should do with the State's assets and resources that this office controls. The law requires that Mr. Vickers' office look at compliance with all the rules and regulations, federal laws, and state laws to make sure that the State's assets are being safeguarded. Mr. Vickers mentioned that his office's work was similar to that of a large CPA firm except that there is no charge for their services -- this is a state-provided service. The State Auditor's Office would look at the work of the internal auditing staff and their internal controls. The office would also look at the law, regulations and systems that are in place to make sure there is compliance with those laws. Mr. Vickers' staff would also look at the internal staff and into their economy and efficiency efforts; they would also look at the program and determine if the goals of that program are being met. Information should come from such reviews to allow evaluation of these programs, and to decide if the programs need to be modified or if they need to be expanded, or if (perhaps) they need to be abandoned. In addition, management intuitively knows what areas in their operation give them concern: those are the areas into which internal auditors should be looking. Management does not necessarily tell an external auditor where their concerns are; certainly they should talk to their internal auditors and give them directions about these concerns. The State Auditor's Office plans to use the internal auditors' work when they begin to plan their annual audits; once a year the office looks at all the

institutions. This look at their work will allow the office to expand the audit coverage given. If the internal auditors' work is reliable, there would be no need for the State Auditor's office to go over the same ground; they can then expand their audit and look into other areas. This would also mean the State Auditor's office would be out of an institution's accounting offices sooner. Another plan (similar to what the State Auditor's office had done for K-12 in Georgia) is to take all the statements from all the 34 University System of Georgia institutions and consolidate that into one concise report.

Dr. Desrochers then spoke about the next steps in the process. She first asked the Board to consider strengthening the relationship between the internal auditors' staff and the Board itself. Better communication between the Board and the internal auditors will give the Regents what they need to know in order to make good decisions. It was asked, therefore, that the Board consider the adoption of a formal charter (a normal thing that boards of higher education have with their internal audit division). It was also requested that the Chair consider the appointment of a committee that would work on a regular basis with this auditor, perhaps meeting every other month or three times a year (whatever is appropriate). The committee should be charged with a list of responsibilities that will be distributed at the end of the meeting for the Board's consideration; this would help in the planning process for setting up the annual audit schedule and the post-audit process.

Mr. Levy Youmans, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Accounting, was introduced. Dr. Desrochers noted that Mr. Youmans had given a great deal of thought to what the strengthening and improvement of the quality of internal audit division means to the organization. Mr. Youmans remarked that there are several administrative steps that must be taken to facilitate the proposed plan. First, the authority of the Central Office audit staff should be strengthened to coordinate the internal audit functions on campus. Currently there is a substantial internal audit resource on some of the campuses. As previously indicated, there is a total of 27 auditors on 8 campuses across the System: 23 of these auditors are located at the 4-year research university campuses. The audit effort of the Central Office auditors and the campus-based auditors will begin functioning in a more collaborative approach designed to complement each other and to prevent a duplication of effort. The proposed plan provides for coordination of this resource, including the development of a consolidated annual audit plan with input and consultation from the audit committee and from the campus auditors.

Mr. Youmans reminded the assemblage that the Board approved the hiring of auditors at six additional institutions at its June 1995 Board meeting. He stated that work would begin with the Committee to develop a strategy to ensure adequate audit coverage on all campuses and to promote a quality output through updated audit techniques and adherence to current auditing standards. The existing internal audit function will also be reconfigured. For the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources, the change will provide for direct access and a more formal process of communicating audit activity with the Board's Audit Committee. This access communication will also provide the opportunity to plan for annual audit activity as well as to review all necessary findings and recommendations from internal audits and state audit reports. The reconfiguration is not simply a reorganization but a change in focus of the audit function.

The change will focus on the concept of management and audit advisory services which is a growing practice in internal audits, including institutions of higher education. It acknowledges that the course of internal audits, expertise and position within an organization can provide a wide range of services and assistance to management to prevent problems, rather than focusing only on past deficiencies. The emphasis will be to help prevent audit exceptions and findings through up-front advice and assistance. It will really be a more proactive, rather than reactive, approach.

When developing audit plans for the System, noted Mr. Youmans, a greater emphasis will also be placed on risk assessment and determining which institutions to audit along with the specific areas which should be reviewed. With limited resources and increased demands on audit time, it is imperative that available resources be used in the most efficient manner. The change in focus also compels the System to expand and broaden the scope of audits to include the following: the adequacy and effectiveness of accounting operating controls, compliance with System policies and procedures, the efficiency of the resources which are employed, and accomplishing the established goals and objectives for operations of the programs and operations. Mr. Youmans also noted that the current audit capacity is limited by the availability of resources to the staff and maintaining an adequate number of auditors to respond to the demands and needs of a system as large as the University System of Georgia. The change in focus mentioned earlier, the extended audit scope, and the recent changes in audit requirements of the federal government and other grantor agencies, as well as new funding methods and programs in state government, will create a greater need for additional accountability and review. Desperately needed is additional audit capacity. The administration is seeking state resources to enhance the capacity of the internal audit function, both through staffing and outsourcing. The Central Office is committed to exploring all options for expanding the audit coverage. There is interest in finding the most appropriate and cost-effective method of providing the capacity needed to insure the financial integrity of the System including outsourcing.

As Dr. Desrochers explained, remarked Mr. Youmans, outsourcing is appropriate for many specific audit programs. Contracted auditors have successfully been used in the past for specific projects, and expansion of such use will be considered by the staff and by the Board's committee when formulating the annual audit plan. Lastly, additional staff alone will not insure increased capacity and quality output - it is necessary to provide professional development opportunities and promotion incentives for a qualified and well-trained staff. Historically, a major problem in the internal audit department has been the extremely high turnover rate of the staff. Due to high travel requirements and absence of career opportunities, the average tenure of the staff over the past five years has been one and one-half years. While the System has been fortunate to have had the ability to attract highly qualified entry-level auditors (most of whom were educated at University System of Georgia institutions), it has not been successful in retaining the individuals long enough to realize the System's investment in training and the full potential of audit output. Mr. Youmans stated that attention must be focused on efforts to retain these auditors. A comprehensive staff development plan, much of which was modeled on a similar plan at the state auditor's, has been developed. This plan not only provides for professional growth and development but also provides promotion opportunities and incentives for deserving staff members. He added that an increase in productivity and proficiency can certainly be achieved with highly trained and experienced auditors.

Dr. Desrochers thanked Mr. Youmans for the extensive work he had put into his study

over the past year. She again emphasized the need to step up interaction with the Board; she underscored the need to be able to communicate with the Board of Regents when audits are being produced and the need to work with them on developing annual plans. She stated that there was obviously a need to coordinate more closely with University System campuses to be able to leverage the resources that are found on those campuses with the Central Office's resources. She stated that there clearly was a need to improve relationships with the State Auditor's office and that Mr. Vickers was right on point on this - he would like to bring to the Board of Regents a consolidated report of financial statements and an audited report. Mr. Vickers' office is trying to move on different fronts to improve the audit function.

#### Comments:

Regent Dahlberg asked if production of the annual audit plan would include the State Auditor's audit figures? Mr. Vickers answered that he thought it would. Regent Dahlberg then asked whether the 40 resources shown reflect the State Auditor's office or a portion of it? Mr. Vickers answered that that was just an estimate of the equivalent full-time employees who are devoted to the University System audits. There actually are more people than that involved in the audits, but each might be involved on a 5-6 month period of time. Dr. Desrochers noted that many different auditors are used during the time of reporting, but the number represents an equivalency of 40 man hours. Mr. Dahlberg then questioned whether, if coordination of the resources of the institutions with the Central Office occurs, would the auditors still be assigned just to that institution, or will some of them be rotated around to various institutions? Dr. Desrochers responded that on the big campuses an institution would obviously need several auditors there who know that complex environment and are working with management, therefore, some campuses would have a permanent group of auditors. Other campuses, however, would have only a single permanent auditor working for them. She stated that it had been envisioned that a number of the small campuses really would not need a full-time auditor; that a consortium of campuses might share an auditor. This had been discussed with some of the southern campuses and there seemed to be some interest in the idea. Additionally, Mr. Youmans' office might become much more of a standards and advisory office to work with those circuit-riding auditors for the smaller campuses. Certainly, Mr. Youmans' officer would be coordinating the plans that are created for audits on the campuses with the Central Office's plan and the State Auditor's plan.

Regent Leebern asked whether the headings and sub-headings

would be the same as the State Auditor's in the index of figures of assets and liabilities and checks and balances; it seemed this would facilitate matters for both. Mr. Youmans answered that there were plans for (in the very near future) to try to identify and secure a new accounting software package for the entire System. Once that is complete, the University System would be able to coordinate with the State Auditor's office and eventually be able to have some financial statements in the format that Mr. Vickers' staff can audit. Mr. Youmans' noted that it was necessary to understand the difference between Mr. Vickers' role as an external auditor: he audits financial statements like a CPA firm. The Central Office would like to get to the point where it could generate those financial statements and they would be comparable to Mr. Vickers' and vice versa. This would save a lot of time and certainly eliminate a lot of confusion for readers of those statements. Both auditing offices are committed to that end and are very close to achieving it.

Regent Anderson, in referring to internal auditors, stated that he would like to have someone on staff at each institution (even part-time) who was protected by the Board of Regents. In this way, problems could be brought to the Board's attention much sooner and, perhaps, solved much sooner instead of having to wait until the audit staff discovers them. Dr. Desrochers said that she agreed with this statement; she noted that what needs to be done is to assure somehow (during next the 6 months to a year, or 2 years at most) each campus has at least on a part-time basis an auditor who is theirs, who can be accessible, and who has access to the records and can keep vigilant to any problems. Regent Anderson said that it was very important that the auditor knows that he/she has the Board standing behind them and not the institution. In this way, they will not be fearful of losing their job and thus compromising their responsibility. Dr. Desrochers commented that such is spelled out in the policy manual: the Board can direct the campus-based auditors to look at certain things and pursue certain lines of investigation. The System just needs more auditors to be able to handle the workload.

Chairman Baranco noted that she felt strongly about the issue and that she agreed that these auditors need to have a direct line with the Board. Regent Hand also said that the auditors should report to the Board of Regents and that the institutions should understand this. While they work under the President of the institution, they should have the strength of the Board as the stewards of the taxpayers' money.

Regent Dahlerg reiterated that the one thing that makes the process work is access to the Board. The Board of Regents members are

the ones who are charged with this responsibility - an auditor needs to be able to come to the Board when he/she has a concern. It is a way to keep from learning about these problems before they appear in the

newspaper. Regent Dahlberg noted that in this way, the Board would learn about the problems and get them resolved before they become big problems.

Regent Jenkins stated that he wanted to make certain that every auditor at every institution fully recognizes that they have direct access to the Board. Regent Jenkins then queried whether the Board presently had the capacity, if problems are perceived, to have them looked into immediately? Mr. Youmans replied that there was enough flexibility in the audit plan to react and to call on the State Auditor's office for help (which had been called on in the past). Regent Jenkins also questioned whether the internal auditors would be hesitant to make recommendations if they felt that there would be opposition to such at their particular institutions. He also asked whether recommendations had been received from these internal auditors. Mr. Youmans answered that some recommendations had been received. Mr. Youmans noted that it was imperative for the campus-based internal auditors to have such independence and to have access both to the institutional president and to the Central Office. He also noted that semi-annual reports are received from internal auditors on each campus - these will be shared with the Committee.

Chairman Baranco stated that there was a proposed charter that would be distributed. The charter should be studied and considered by the Board members for 30 days. Dr. Desrochers stated that the charter would send a signal - it would define a relationship between the Board and the internal audit function. She remarked that the charter listed responsibilities for the Audit Committee as well. Once finalized, the charter would be disseminated to the campuses so that they are aware that their responsibilities are being formalized and to assure them that access is available.

Regent Cannestra stated that, in most businesses, management advertises to their staff that they can call a special telephone number to report problems. He asked whether that would be done at the institutions? Mr. Youmans answered that some institutions do have such a number. Regent Cannestra suggested that this should be a part of the charter so that when people feel that there is something suspect going on, they would know exactly who to call. Their call would be kept confidential through this independent chain. Regent Cannestra



also noted that 80+ seemed like a lot of auditors. Dr. Desrochers responded that it was not a large number. She stated that the volume of business done by the System and the complexity of it called for even more auditors. Regent Cannestra asked when the Board would be able to see the master audit plan, and Dr. Desrochers answered that first the charter should be adopted and then other elements could be added to it. She noted that the members could meet with the internal auditor who would bring a draft plan to share with the Committee which could then be considered, amended and adopted.

Regent Hand said she had noticed in Mr. Youmans' remarks a comment on the length of the tenure of auditors (1-1/2 years). She suggested that it might be helpful to look at adequately staffing the Central Office with those who could appropriately oversee the functions. She remarked that perhaps after getting the special software program, it might be practical to look at utilizing private auditing firms for some functions. This was affirmed by Dr. Desrochers, who stated that both options were open - that of adding staff or of using outsourcing (if more economical) to handle specific parts of the audits. The software could help to keep this a uniform process. Regent Hand also remarked (and Regent Anderson concurred) that she supported the idea of surprise audits at University System institutions.

Regent Jones commended Dr. Desrochers, Mr. Vickers, Mr. Bowes and Mr. Youmans on their presentation - saying that it was most significant and had great potential for improvement in the System. Mr. Jones moved that the Board study this proposal for 30 days. The motion was seconded by Regent Leebern, and further discussion ensued.

Regent Allgood mentioned that he wished to discuss what brought the Board to investigate the audits. Breakdowns in internal auditing had occurred in the past at the units, and on at least two occasions there were suggestions of outright fraud. On some occasions, the Board had repeatedly demanded information from the System units, but it was not forthcoming. It was determined that the Central Office staff did not have the resources to go out and investigate these problems as promptly as they should. There was mismanagement and, on at least one occasion, there was a large sum of money that could not be accounted for. The problem was threefold: inaccurate internal auditing of a unit, mismanagement within the unit, and the Board's inability to supervise the institutional auditors. Regent Allgood noted that an immediate response to the individual unit where there is a problem is needed; if the staff cannot respond to it, a policy should be formulated through outside auditors or some other means to get it

done. Regent Allgood stated that he did not feel the new plan addressed the crux of the problem. He proposed that perhaps making the auditors at each unit employees of the Board of Regents rather than the individual institution would solve the problem. He averred that a much quicker way of discovering and responding to these problems needed to be available.

Dr. Desrochers stated that there was a specific statement in the draft of the proposal concerning coordinating of planning, staffing, scope of work and reporting necessary to fulfill the University System plan. Regent Allgood said that the statement was non-specific and would not accomplish the solution needed. He also said there needed to be specific guidelines for the institutions to follow.

Dr. Desrochers noted that in the present policy a direct relationship is established, but this is done more in the manual than in fact. She remarked that those auditors report to their president, but also report through to the Senior Vice Chancellor and Internal Auditor at the Central Office. That kind of prescribed relationship had not yet been established with many System units. The Central Office is trying to establish a formal audit committee of the Board and also a formal infrastructure through a charter. Dr. Desrochers noted that, by enhancing the staff in-house with the internal auditors and strengthening the relationship between the State Auditor's office and Central Office auditors, that kind of relationship can be accomplished.

Regent S. William Clark, Jr. asked whether the Central Office auditors have any oversight about the auditors stationed at the four large universities - could some of them become circuit riders? Mr. Youmans answered that even those numbers were really not enough: they are understaffed, especially at the Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Georgia where research dollars are quite large. It would be difficult to redirect those auditors. The policy, however, would allow such. Mr. Youmans suggested that the internal auditing staffs at those institutions stay intact. The missing link in the University System of Georgia's policy in the past has been the direct access to the Board which this new proposal would cover. Constant communication with the Board on the problems at the institutions would help the institutions and their presidents to be more responsive to solving these problems.

Regent Dahlberg said that he had some of the same concerns as Regent Allgood. He wondered if it might be more appropriate if an audit committee was made responsible for coming up with the charter language. Regent Jones said he would amend his motion to include the remarks of Regents Dahlberg and Allgood. Regent

Jones then withdrew his motion. Chairman Baranco stated that she would name the committee members, that the draft of the charter would be given to the committee for their study and amendment, and that language would be written to insure the relationship between the Board and the auditors.

Chancellor Portch commented that one of the advantages of having the Board involved from the planning stage through receipt of abstracts of all reports to dealing with problem cases is that the whole picture is then revealed. Up until this time, the Board saw only the problems. In the grand scheme of things, however, stated the Chancellor, there are a lot of people doing a very good job in the System and handling money well.

Chairman Baranco thanked all involved with the presentation. She remarked that this was an excellent report which detailed a longstanding need.

\_\_\_\_\_Chairman Baranco reminded those present that at 4:00 P.M. there would be a meeting with the University System of Georgia presidents at the Depot.

On Tuesday, January 9, 1996, there being no objection, the meeting was recessed at 2:15 P.M. in order for the Committees to meet.

## **COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Upon motion by Regent Leebern, with no objection, the Board unanimously approved and authorized the following Committee reports:

### **Report of Committee on Education**

The **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION** met on January 9, with the following members present: Regents S. William Clark, Jr. (Chairman), Elson (Vice Chair), Dahlberg, Hand, McMillan and Rhodes. Regent John H. Clark was absent. Regent S. William Clark, Jr. presented the Committee's report with the request that the following items be adopted. The Committee, through its Chair, reported that in separate letters to Chancellor Portch, the Presidents of the institutions of the University System submitted various items, listed below, for approval or discussion by the Board. After discussion of these and other items and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee on Education, by motion of Regent S. William Clark, Jr., seconded by Regent Rhodes, and unanimously adopted (except where otherwise noted), the Board approved and authorized the following items.

#### 1. Information Item: Organization Changes

**BACKGROUND:** Members of the Education Committee have discussed whether all

organizational changes proposed by System institutions should be brought to the Board. As a result of that discussion, staff was asked to review the current policy and rationale and propose options for the Committee and Board to consider.

CURRENT POLICY:

### **Board of Regents Policy 2.07 ORGANIZATION CHANGES**

Changes in the organizational structure of a unit of the University System, including but not limited to the addition or elimination of a department, division or school and the addition or elimination of one or more major administrative positions shall be submitted by the president to the Chancellor for his review and recommendation for action by the Board of Regents.

### **Bylaws of the Board of Regents 201.0303**

The Chancellor is authorized to develop procedures for approval of the following matters without the necessity of formal Board action:

E. Changes of designation for approved degree programs and approved administrative units.

*Therefore, current policy requires Board approval for all changes in "organizational structure" including the deletion or addition of departments and major administrators; however, Board approval is not now required for the changing of names of approved degrees and administrative units.*

RATIONALE FOR THE CURRENT POLICY:

- Allows Board to consider overall consequences of seemingly subtle organizational and personnel changes.
- Allows Board to review organizational and personnel decisions in light of the best management practices and the most efficient delivery of services.
- Permits Board to review the amount of proliferation and administrative bureaucracy.
- Assists Board in fulfilling its fiduciary responsibility to Georgia taxpayers.

PROPOSAL:

The wording of the current policy, with its reference to "department, division, or school," could be interpreted to mean "academic." Were the Board to agree, the Chancellor could be authorized to administratively approve the ADDITION OR DELETION OF NON-ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS AND DIVISIONS BELOW THE VICE-RESIDENT LEVEL. This would reduce the number of re-organization requests which the Board would have to review, while it would preserve to the Board its critical role in overseeing

the development of new institutional academic areas and the hiring of major administrators.

2. Reorganization, West Georgia College

The Board approved the request of President Beheruz Sethna that West Georgia College be authorized to reorganize the School of Education and to rename four departments within the School, effective immediately.

During the planning and prioritization process, the College concluded that separate Departments for Middle Grades and Secondary Education did not seem justifiable or efficient for the future, and proposed to reduce the number of departments in the School of Education from eight to seven by merging the two departments. The combination of these units through the redirection of funds created two additional positions to meet additional instructional needs in Early Childhood Education and Instructional Technology Departments.

The departmental name changes are as follows:

- The Department of Early Childhood Education to the **Department of Early Childhood Education and Reading.**
- The Department of Educational Leadership to the **Department of Leadership and Foundations.**
- The Department of Media to the **Department of Research, Media, and Technology.**
- The Department of Special Education to the **Department of Special Education and Speech Language Pathology.**

3. Reorganization, Darton College

The Board approved the request of President Peter J. Sireno to reorganize Darton College, effective immediately.

The new chart shows the Student Services function reporting directly to the President rather than through the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This change reflects the equal importance of the Student Services function with such other functions as Academic Affairs and Business Services.

The new chart also shows Continuing Education and Community Services reporting

directly to the President. This reflects the change approved by Chancellor Propst in his letter of December 29, 1993.

4. Reorganization of Georgia Southern University

The Board approved the request of President Nicholas L. Henry that Georgia Southern University be authorized to reorganize, effective immediately.

The effect of this reorganization will be to eliminate a vice presidential position. This reorganization follows an earlier request to redefine the position of Vice President and Dean for Graduate Studies and Research and to reclassify the position of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies. Continuing Education and Distance Learning also will report to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies. The change is also reflective of the dismantling of the graduate affiliation between Georgia Southern University, Savannah State College, and Armstrong State College.

5. Naming of Health Professions Building, Armstrong State College

The Board approved the request of President Robert A. Burnett that Armstrong State College be authorized to name the Health Professions Building for the late Henry Ludlow Ashmore, effective immediately.

This building would be known as "Henry Ludlow Ashmore Hall" in memory of Dr. Ashmore, a former president of Armstrong State College.

Dr. Henry Ashmore was the President of Armstrong State College from 1964 to 1982. During 18 years of leadership he transformed a junior college with 500 students, 35 faculty members, and five academic degrees into a baccalaureate institution with graduate students, 155 faculty members, and 40 academic programs. He led the move of the campus from historic Savannah at Bull and Gaston streets to a 250 acre campus eight miles south on a dead end dirt road named Abercorn Extension, where classes began in January 1966. The current facilities, except the new Sports Center, were developed under his guidance.

One of Dr. Ashmore's greatest legacies was his vision of health education in Southeast Georgia. He established the first two-year allied health programs in Georgia. He expanded these into the School of Health Professions which became the third largest Health Professions Center in the University System of Georgia. Because of these achievements, it is appropriate that Armstrong's Health Professions Building be renamed the Henry Ludlow Ashmore Hall.

Dr. Ashmore's career in education extended well beyond the Armstrong campus. He earned his bachelor, master, and doctoral degrees from the University of Florida and served as teacher and principal in Florida high schools before entering collegiate employment. His first position was that of a professor of education at Georgia Southern College from 1950 to 1954. From that short professorial experience he stepped into the president's shoes at Pensacola Junior College in 1954 and served until 1964. In his last

year, 1994-1995, he served as the Interim President of Anderson College in South Carolina.

Dr. Ashmore was an expert in academic accreditation and for decades served the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. After his presidency at Armstrong State College, Dr. Ashmore worked for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. He served as Associate Director and for one year as Interim Director. He devoted almost eight years to helping institutions achieve excellence through accreditation.

6. Establish an External Degree in Health Information Management at DeKalb College, Medical College of Georgia

The Board approved the request of President Francis Tedesco that the Medical College of Georgia be authorized to offer an external degree program in Health Information Management at DeKalb College, effective immediately.

The Medical College of Georgia has a well established baccalaureate level program in Health Information Management on the Augusta College campus. The institution is presently requesting that the program be authorized as an external degree program for DeKalb College, primarily using the Central Campus. Health Information Management faculty at the Medical College of Georgia will be responsible for all professional courses to be taught.

It is envisioned that the program will make extensive use of distance learning technology. A distance learning classroom on DeKalb College's campus will be made available to deliver classes and instruction. The advantage of using this technology is that the courses can be offered concurrently at the Medical College and DeKalb College, as well as other sites throughout the state. The proposed external degree program at DeKalb College is the exact program that the Medical College of Georgia has on its campus. All requirements for admission to the proposed program will be the same to the present Health Information Management program at the Medical College of Georgia. Program content for the DeKalb courses will be equivalent to the present Medical College of Georgia program.

Students will be considered in residence at the Medical College of Georgia. They will be enrolled by the Medical College of Georgia Registrar, and billed through the Medical College of Georgia for their courses. Students will be assigned an advisor during the first quarter of the program. Technology will be used to keep the student and the course instructor in constant contact with each other. It is expected that 15-20 students per year will be admitted to the program, many of whom will be non-traditional students. Ten percent will be minority students. To meet the special needs of the students, courses will be planned for late afternoons, evenings, and weekends.

The Medical College of Georgia has the library resources to support the program.

DeKalb College also has a significant holding in the area. Students needing access to the Medical College materials will be able to access the material via computer, fax, and through overnight delivery. The Medical College of Georgia has the faculty and staff to deliver the program. No new monies are being requested as a part of this request for authorization of the external degree program.

In 1998, the Office of Academic Affairs will re-examine this program in terms of quality, budget, support, and enrollment, and report to the Board at that time.

7. Establishment of the Master of Science Degree in Physical Therapy, Armstrong State College

The Board approved the request of President Robert Burnett that Armstrong State College be authorized to offer a Master of Science Degree in Physical Therapy, effective immediately.

The request for the Master of Science Degree in Physical Therapy is a response to national trends. Specifically, the proposal requests a change in degree designation in Physical Therapy from a Bachelor of Science with a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate to a Master of Science degree. Rationales for this change in the degree are not only to reflect the accreditation standards of the Commission on Accreditation for Physical Therapy Education, but also to meet the expressed needs of both community health care leaders and physical therapists in south Georgia. The Physical Therapy program at Armstrong State College is comparable to the masters and doctoral degree professional programs in Physical Therapy at other institutions. The offering of the masters degree will require no lengthening of the education of the students when compared to the present Bachelor of Science with a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate.

The recent Consensus Conference on Physical Therapy Professional Education stated that the professional degree in Physical Therapy should be at least the masters degree. The masters degree would be more attractive to the most qualified applicants and physical therapy faculty candidates. There is strong support from the community for offering the masters degree in Physical Therapy. The degree provides an opportunity to create an innovative case based active learning model which places the emphasis on the students taking responsibility for their own learning. There will be no increase in cost to the students and a minimal additional cost to the institution.

The principle objective for the Physical Therapy program is to educate and provide physical therapy practitioners whose skills and knowledge are able to meet the challenges of the rapidly changing health care system and the expanded need of physical therapy services in south Georgia as well as the rest of the state. Upon completion of the Physical Therapy program at the masters level, the graduate will demonstrate:

- Performance of specific physical therapy assessment and treatment skill;
- Critical thinking and clinical problem-solving skills to develop a physical therapy diagnosis and treatment plan when faced with a patient problem;
- The ability to evaluate new developments and ideas which advance the practice of



physical therapy;

- A knowledge of scientific inquiry and critical analysis of professional literature;
- An ethical approach to practice and a respect for all individuals regardless of their cultural backgrounds; and
- An understanding of the importance of injury prevention and health promotion as an important part of health care.

The masters program in Physical Therapy at Armstrong State College would exemplify the Access to Academic Excellence of the Board of Regents, the mission of Armstrong State College, and the Vision Statement of the School of Health Professions. Armstrong State College plans to admit 20 students a year for the next three years, for a total enrollment of 20 the first year, 40 the second year, and 60 the third year. The Department of Physical Therapy is committed to increasing the numbers of under-represented minorities within the profession of Physical Therapy. To this end, the department will work closely with the Minority and International Affairs office of the American Physical Therapy Association and the Cultural Diversity Committee of the Physical Therapy Association to assure the acceptance of qualified minority candidates.

Armstrong State College presently has sufficient faculty and staff to offer the Physical Therapy program at the masters level. Additionally, the library holdings are more than adequate and temporary facilities have been constructed to house the Physical Therapy program, with permanent facilities being planned for the proposed office/classroom building. Therefore, the masters degree program requires no additional facilities other than those that are already planned. The director of the program will be the department head of the Department of Physical Therapy. The department head will be responsible to the Dean of the School of Health Professions who in turn is responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Accreditation of this program will be sought through the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE). A Declaration of Intent has already been sent to CAPTE and the agency will be notified of the modifications.

No new funds were requested to implement this request. The institution will reallocate from the present combined bachelors degree-post baccalaureate certificate in Physical Therapy program to cover cost for the masters degree program.

#### 8. Establish a Masters in Physical Therapy Program, Medical College of Georgia

The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco that the Medical College of Georgia be authorized to offer the Masters in Physical Therapy Program, effective immediately.

The request for a Masters degree in Physical Therapy is in response to national trends. Specifically, the program requests a change in degree designation in Physical Therapy from a Bachelor of Science degree in Physical Therapy to a masters in Physical Therapy. Rationales for this change in the degree are to reflect the accreditation standards of the

Commission on Accreditation for Physical Therapy Education and to meet the expressed needs of both community health care leaders and Physical Therapists throughout the State of Georgia.

The recent Consensus Conference on Physical Therapy Education stated that the professional degree in Physical Therapy should be at least the masters degree. The masters degree would be more attractive to the most qualified applicants and Physical Therapy faculty candidates. The professional curriculum is anchored in the clinical practice of physical therapy. It is designed to progress from the basic sciences and introductory clinical courses to courses in advanced clinical skills, research, administration, professional issues, and community services. Clinical experiences are disbursed throughout the curriculum so that students can practice in the clinic the skills which they have learned in the classroom and laboratory. Final clinical experience will be a 12-week internship where students will be expected to refine their clinical skills and integrate information obtained throughout the program.

The curricula goals which follow provide the base on which the curriculum is built and reflect the expected professional knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behavior of program graduates. Upon graduation the student will be able to:

- Perform physical therapy assessment and treatment skills;
- Analyze human structure function throughout the life cycle; recognize normal and abnormal; and determine which abnormalities or problems are amenable to physical therapy intervention and which need to be referred to other health care providers;
- Integrate basic science concepts of pathology, current clinical practice, and psycho-social considerations into the formulation of and justification for evaluation and treatment decision;
- Manage physical therapy programs for individuals of any age from the well to the chronically ill, using a variety of tools and techniques;
- Interact effectively with a wide variety of clients, family, and other health care professionals and special interest groups;
- Function legally, ethically, and effectively as a member of the health care profession;
- Critically analyze new concepts, findings, and technologies and integrate them into practice as appropriate.

The Masters Program in Physical Therapy at the Medical College of Georgia will be consistent with the institution's Strategic Plan, the mission of the School of Allied Health Sciences at the Medical College of Georgia, and the University System of Georgia's desire to have programs of national excellence. The Medical College of Georgia plans to admit 44 students a year for the next three years, for a total of 132 students. In the past, the baccalaureate program at the Medical College of Georgia has enrolled one or two

minority students. To help improve that figure, the institution has established a Cultural Diversity Enhancement Council to advise the department chair. It is hoped that this Council will provide the strategies and advice to enhance the number of minority participants. The department is also making its presence known within the estate Physical Therapy organizations in an effort to enhance diversity. The institution feels that its liaison with Albany State College related to distance learning will enhance its ability to attract a more diverse student body.

The Medical College of Georgia presently has sufficient faculty and staff to offer the Physical Therapy program at the masters level. Additionally, the library holdings are more than appropriate. Facilities are already in place to house the program. No new funds were requested to implement this program. The institution will reallocate from the existing baccalaureate program to the masters program to cover the cost. The program will be conducted by the faculty of the Department of Physical Therapy of the School of Allied Health and Sciences. The degree awarded will be the Master of Physical Therapy and it will be awarded by the Graduate School. This is a similar arrangement to other departments within the institution.

Accreditation of this program will be through the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE). The current BS program has been accredited since its first graduating class in 1973. The present curriculum has been developed with fore knowledge of the accreditation standards and the belief that the Master of Physical Therapy curriculum meets criteria of the accreditation association. The program will be reviewed within the normal cycle of the association's review process.

In 1998, the Office of Academic Affairs will re-examine this program in terms of quality, budget, support, and enrollment, and report to the Board at that time.

9. Establish an Associate of Applied Science degree program in Dental Hygiene, Valdosta State University, in cooperation with Valdosta Technical Institute

The Board approved the request of President Hugh C. Bailey to establish an Associate of Applied Science degree program in Dental Hygiene, in cooperation with Valdosta Technical Institute, effective immediately.

Valdosta State University proposed to enter into a cooperative program with Valdosta Technical Institute to offer an Associate of Applied Science degree in Dental Hygiene. Valdosta State University will be responsible for providing the academic core of course work needed for completion of the degree. Valdosta Technical Institute will be responsible for providing the occupational skills training and coursework needed for satisfaction of degree requirements.

Valdosta Technical Institute will be responsible for providing adequate facilities and all required equipment for the occupational skills instruction portion of the program.

Valdosta Technical Institute will also provide the occupational faculty and staff for the program.

The Department of Technical and Adult Education recognizes the need for this program and has tentatively allocated the funds for facilities renovation and equipment purchase to Valdosta Technical Institute. The initial estimate of this investment is \$600,000.

There is an urgent need for implementation of a Dental Hygiene program in this area of Georgia. Area dentists have approached Valdosta Technical Institute asking the Institute to offer a hygiene program to alleviate a labor shortage.

It is the mission of the University to offer a comprehensive curriculum which offers graduate, professional, and associate degree programs designed to meet the needs of regional students seeking to enter the hygiene profession, and their future employers. The following are the program's objectives:

- Provision of educational opportunities to individuals for attainment of the knowledge and skills necessary for job acquisition, retention and advancement in the dental hygiene profession;
- Meeting area labor demand for dental hygiene professionals through provision of curriculum, instructional materials, and equipment appropriate for training;
- Provision of effective academic instruction to enhance performance on the job;
- Teaching of employability skills to improve work ethics; and
- Fostering a desire for life-long learning.

Since Valdosta State University already offers the general education courses which will comprise its contribution to this program, no new costs will be incurred in the offering of this program.

10. Establishment of Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs at Clayton State College, Georgia Southern University, Southern College of Technology, and Valdosta State University

The Board approved the requests of presidents Richard A. Skinner, Nicholas L. Henry, Stephen R. Cheshier, and Hugh C. Bailey that their respective institutions be authorized to offer, effective immediately, Bachelor of Applied Science programs with the following majors or specialty:

Clayton State College

Administrative Management  
Allied health Administration  
Technology Management  
Dental Hygiene Practice and Administration

Georgia Southern University

Technology

Valdosta State University

Technical Studies

Southern College of Technology

Specialty in Organizational Behavior

This action is in accord with the Board's approval at its November 1995 meeting of the Bachelor of Applied Science degree concept which was recommended by the Georgia Postsecondary Education Collaborative Council (G.P.E.C.C.).

**General Information:** As approved by the Board, Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs are designed for students who begin their educational program in career, diploma, certificate, associate of applied science degree, or associate of applied technology programs, and then decide to achieve a baccalaureate degree. Admission to a B.A.S. program requires the completion of an associate of applied science (A.A.S.), or associate of applied technology (A.A.T.), degree. Students completing diploma or technical certificate programs at technical institutes must obtain either an associate of applied science or associate of applied technology degree before they will be eligible to be admitted to a bachelor of applied science degree program.

These programs are designed to build upon specific technical skills by providing students with advanced coursework in a related area of specialization and additional general education to increase their skills, knowledge, and perspectives. These degrees will appeal mainly to individuals who are already working in a technical area and who need additional education and baccalaureate credentialing in order to enhance their advancement opportunities.

Although a few students might choose to move immediately into the cooperative program as they discover their academic talents, the recent G.P.E.C.C. report adopted by both the Board of Regents and the State Board of Technical and Adult Education indicates that a student who expects to pursue studies through to a baccalaureate degree should begin in a University System institution.

It should be stressed that, even though the B.A.S. degree will share some components with more traditional bachelors degrees, there will remain important differences. For example, a B.A.S. that draws heavily on business course work will differ from a Bachelor of Business Administration because the B.A.S. will include a significant technical component while the B.B.A. would include substantially more hours related to the major.

**Requirements:** Students for this degree program will follow regular transfer admissions, and the degree program will require completion of both legislative requirements and the Regents' Test. College Preparatory Curriculum requirements will not apply since students will have completed either an A.A.S. or A.A.T. in order to be admitted into this program. University System institutions may require placement examinations and may require remediation based on the results as long as such examinations are administered to students regardless of the sending institution. System institutions may also restrict the amount of credit accepted from the two-year institution to 90 quarter credit hours or may allow as much as permitted by University System regulations at institutional discretion.

Since B.A.S. programs are designed around different areas of specialization, not all students who complete the A.A.S. or A.A. T. degree will be admissible to all B.A.S. programs.

In order to complete an A.A.S. or A.A.T. degree. students will have completed at least 30 quarter credit hours of general education courses which are equivalent to courses in the University System's Core Curriculum Areas I-III and a program area related to the B.A.S. A maximum of 60 quarter hours of technical courses may be applied to the B.A.S. Transfer of the occupational program will be by block although specific courses will be listed.

At the senior colleges, students will complete the balance of the 60 quarter credit hour general education requirement. Although some specific general education courses may be recommended or required depending on the B.A. S., institutions may choose to accept up to a total of 60 hours of general education in transfer. The senior college will require a specialty or major which complements the related A.A.S./A.A.T. program and which includes at least 60 quarter credit hours of upper division work.

### **Institutional Specialties or Majors**

#### **Clayton State College**

Administrative Management: The administrative management specialty/concentration is designed to prepare clerical workers and administrative assistants to move into supervisory, managerial, and/or executive assistant position in the office administration field. This specialty is appropriate for students with A.A.S. degrees in office administration, office management, secretarial studies, medical office administration, data processing and similar areas. Students seeking the B.A.S. in administrative management will typically be working as secretaries, administrative assistants, office managers, clerks, or similar positions.

#### **Clayton State College**

Allied Health: The allied health administration concentration is designed to prepare allied health workers to move into supervisory, administrative, or managerial positions in health care facilities. This concentration is appropriate for students with A.A.S. degrees in a wide range of health occupations. Students seeking the B.A.S. in allied health administration will typically be working as clinicians (e.g. Paramedics) with some additional administrative duties or as medical office assistants/administrators.

## **Clayton State College**

Technology Management: The technology management concentration is designed to prepare technicians to move into supervisory and managerial positions in the fields of their technical expertise. This specialty is appropriate for students with A.A.S. degrees in electronics, drafting, computer service, aircraft maintenance, and similar areas. Students seeking the B.A.S. in technology management will typically be working in

such jobs as computer hardware maintenance in office settings, production mechanics in industrial plants and shops, drafters for utilities and construction firms, or mechanics in the aviation industry.

## **Georgia Southern University**

Technology: The Bachelor of Applied Science with a major in Technology is designed to provide graduates with upper division work which adds to the breadth of their technical knowledge gained from A.A.S. or A.A.T. degrees. This program targets individuals who plan to move into supervisory positions in manufacturing and other technical industries.

## **Southern College of Technology**

Specialty in Organizational Behavior: This program is designed to cap appropriate associate degree programs with a primarily upper-level, broadly-based component at Southern Tech. It provides a general coverage of management and systems together with written and oral communications coursework to lead a candidate into a supervisory role in business or industry. It is not intended to provide a formal baccalaureate competency in any specific discipline. Students desiring a regular specialty should bridge into one of Southern Tech's existing B.S. programs.

## **Valdosta State University**

Technical Studies: The objectives of the program are to: (1) create better trained workers for a technical environment, (2) encourage life-long learning in a seamless education system, and (3) aid in the economic development of the state by providing a better trained, more literate work force. B.A.S. graduates will serve society as a ready pool of highly trained workers who are at ease in a technologically changing work environment. Students will benefit by exercising career options that provide access to Georgia's public educational opportunities.

11. Conferring of Emeritus Titles. At the request of the presidents of various institutions in the University System, the Board conferred the title of Emeritus upon the following faculty members, effective on the data indicated:

(a) **THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Mr. William Eugene Beery, Associate Professor Emeritus School of Environmental Design, effective January 10, 1996.

Dr. James Willard Demski, Professor Emeritus Department of Plant Pathology, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, effective January 1, 1996.

Mr. Robert Johnson Hill, Associate Professor Emeritus School of Environmental Design, effective January 10, 1996.

12. Appointment of Faculty and Leaves of Absence. The Board approved the appointment of faculty members at the salaries and for the period recommended at the following institutions: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, DeKalb College, Floyd College, Gainesville College, Georgia College, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, Medical College of Georgia, Middle Georgia College, Savannah State College, Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, South Georgia College, University of Georgia, Valdosta State University and West Georgia College. These appointments and leaves of absence were recommended by the presidents of the institutions subsequent to the last regular meeting of the Board on December 12-13, 1995. The recommendations were found by the Chancellor and his staff to be in order. A list of these appointments and leaves of absence is on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

13. Appointment of Faculty Member Previously Retired from the University System. The Board approved the part-time appointments of faculty members previously retired from the University System. The appointment was recommended by Chancellor Portch and Presidents Watkins, Knapp and Sethna, as follows:

(a.) **GAINESVILLE COLLEGE**

Dr. Joel H. Paul, Professor Emeritus/Coordinator - Evening Program, Division of Social Science, for period January 2, 1996-June 7, 1996.

(b.) **UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Dr. Marion Mahan Duncan, Jr., Professor Emeritus, Department of Physics & Astronomy, Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, for period January 4, 1996-March 21, 1996.



Dr. Lola Wells Finn, Part-time Instructor, School of Teacher Education - Department of Language Education, College of Education, for period January 4, 1996-June 13, 1996.

Mr. John A. Gibson, Project Director, Vice President for Research, for period December 1, 1995-June 30, 1996.

Mr. Billy F. Selph, Administrative Specialist-Administration, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, for period February 1, 1996-June 30, 1996.

Dr. Kim Hong Tan, Professor Emeritus, Department of Crop & Soil Sciences, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, for period December 8, 1995-December 31, 1995.

(c.) **WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE**

Dr. Robert Milton Reeves, Associate Professor Emeritus, for period January 2, 1996-June 14, 1996.

14. The **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION** reported through its Chairman that the individuals listed below had filed applications for review of decisions made by the presidents of their respective institutions, as authorized by Article IX of the Bylaws of the Board. After careful consideration, discussion, and upon the recommendation of the Committee on Education and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, with motion properly made, variously seconded and unanimously adopted, the Board made the following decisions:

1. Savannah State College: Ms. Jerrie K. Huewit, concerning her application for review of the search/screen and hiring process. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review due to the fact that she had not exhausted college remedies.

2. Savannah State College: Lt. William D. Wilcox and Lt. LeRoy Groover, concerning their application for review of salary grievances. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

3. The University of Georgia: Ms. Renee Pappamihel, concerning her application for review of her in-state residency status. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board recommended that Ms. Pappamihel be granted in-state residency status retroactive to Fall 1995.

4. Clayton State College: Ms. Julie Shuman, concerning her application for review of her termination of employment. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

## **Report on Committee on Finance and Business Operations**

The **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS** met on January 9, 1996, with the following members present: Regents Cannestra (Chair), Coleman (Vice Chair), Allgood, Anderson, Jones, Leebern and Turner. After discussion and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and Committee on Finance and Business Operations, by motion of Regent Cannestra, variously seconded and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Amendments to Fiscal Year 1996 Budget

The Board of Regents approved the consolidated amendments to the Fiscal Year 1996 Budget of the University System of Georgia as displayed in Appendix I, which is on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources/Treasurer.

2. Note:

The committee requested the staff report on campuses' cash management procedures particularly pertaining to returns on invested funds.

The committee requested a policy proposal which would require institutions to bid, on a competitive basis, all banking services.

The committee requested a review of campus executive officers in regard to their relationships to banks and financial institutions with which the institutions do business.

## **Report on Committee on Buildings and Grounds**

The **COMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS** met on January 9, 1996, with the following members present: Regents Jones (Chairman), Anderson (Vice Chairman), Allgood, Cannestra, Coleman, Leebern and Turner. The Committee, through its Chair, reported that in separate letters to Chancellor Portch, the presidents of the several institutions of the University System listed below submitted eleven items for approval by the Board.

After discussion of these items, and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, with motion by Regent Jones, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Lease Agreement, The University of Georgia

The Board declared approximately 0.927 acres of land located on Lumpkin Street on the campus of the University of Georgia to be no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia 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 Delta Chapter House

Association of the Sigma Chi Fraternity for the purpose of renovating and improving existing facilities for the operation of fraternity housing for the benefit of students attending the University of Georgia.

The Board authorized the execution of a lease agreement with Delta Chapter House Association of the Sigma Chi Fraternity covering the above-mentioned 0.927 acres of land located on the campus of the University of Georgia for the purpose of renovating and improving existing facilities for the operations of fraternity housing for the benefit of the students at the University of Georgia.

The terms of the above lease agreement are subject to review and legal approval of the Attorney General.

- The University of Georgia requested Board approval of the leasing of the above land to Delta Chapter House Association of the Sigma Chi Fraternity on November 21, 1995.
- The lease rate will be \$1.00 per year.
- The lease will be for a term of forty years, with option to renew for one additional forty year period.
- Delta Chapter House Association of the Sigma Chi Fraternity will improve the property under the terms of the lease to provide bed space for twenty (20) University of Georgia students.
- Sigma Chi Fraternity is returning to campus following their suspension in 1990, and desires to renovate the house prior to occupancy.

It was also noted that the supervisor of the Sigma Chi Fraternity was suspended from the Campus due to a series of problems, the most recent of which was an "unregulated party" which required police intervention.

## 2. Allocation of FY 96 MRR Funds "Renovation of Herty Hall," Savannah State College

The Board authorized the allocation of FY 96 MRR Emergency/Contingency funds in the amount of \$244,000 for Project No. BR-69-9604 "Renovation of Herty Hall," Savannah State College.

- Savannah State College requested allocation of FY 96 MRR Emergency/Contingency Funds for this project on November 3, 1995.
- Herty Hall is currently unoccupied and is in a state of disrepair. The College wishes to renovate for use by the Math and Science Department.
- This project will include replacement of the roof, removal of asbestos and other

minor repairs.

- Herty Hall, a 60-year-old building, contains 12,640 square feet.
- Construction cost for this project is estimated to be \$187,746 (\$14.85 per square foot).

It was also noted that Herty Hall is not an historic building.

### 3. Demolition of Fire Signal Station, Georgia State University

The Board declared the Fire Signal Station located on the Georgia State University campus to be no longer advantageously useful to Georgia State University or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of this building.

The Board requested Governor Miller to issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of this building from the Georgia State University campus.

- The Board of Regents, in January 1995, authorized the purchase of the property located at 46 Courtland Street, Atlanta (\$650,000 cash and \$444,000 in-kind credit\*), that will be a major portion of the site of Project No. H-53 "Student Center." Construction of the Student Center is planned to start in June, 1996.

- The demolition will be conducted by public works contract.
- The estimated cost (estimated by the architect, Turner Associates) of demolition is \$110,000 and is included in the budget of the Student Center project.

\*In-kind credit will include enrollment of City of Atlanta employees in academic courses, access to research services of the Applied Research Center and admission of one City of Atlanta employee to each annual class of the Executive MBA Program.

### 4. Appointment of Construction Managers, University System of Georgia

The Board appointed Whiting-Turner/A. L. Johnson - A Partnership as the construction manager for the Animal Science Complex, University of Georgia.

The Board appointed C. D. Moody Construction Co., Inc. as the construction manager for the Poultry Research Center, University of Georgia.

- The Animal Science Complex, University of Georgia, was authorized by the Board with a construction cost of \$16,950,000.
- The Poultry Research Center, University of Georgia, was authorized by the Board with a construction cost of \$5,000,000.
- Construction managers for three of the nine projects were approved at the

December, 1995 meeting. The above two construction manager selections have been completed since the December, 1995 meeting, leaving the remainder for approval at the February, 1996 meeting.

- The construction manager selection process is a qualifications and fee based approach that takes into consideration the firm's experience and qualifications and fee.

5. Information Item: Report on Lease of Space by Institutions

Regent Jones, Chair of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, reported that a thorough discussion on the issue of one-year leases had taken place during the Buildings and Grounds Committee meeting, and it had resulted in the determination that further discussions with state financial authorities might bring options for renewal of University System leases. Regent Jones noted that other state agencies had been able to lease properties with options for multiple year renewal options. The possibility of using this practice for state institution dormitories, etc., was mentioned. The Buildings and Grounds Chairman called for direction in further pursuing this issue from the Chairman, the Chancellor and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources.

Regent Baranco responded that, since there is no specific pending item on this issue, the Board, the Chancellor, Dr. Desrochers, the Committee on Buildings & Grounds, and the Committee on Finance & Business Operations will continue to monitor and gather information on this issue. The issue, she noted, had been postured.

5. Information Item: Albany State College Update

It was reported that renovation and demolition work was proceeding at Albany State College according to plan. In an effort to minimize traffic problems on the Campus, the demolition work and hauling is being coordinated with the College. It was also noted that the Caroline Hall Chimney would not be preserved and not demolished.

**Report on Committee on Research and Extension**

The **COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND EXTENSION** met on January 9, with the following members present: Regents Hand (Chair), John H. Clark (Vice Chair), Dahlberg, Elson, S. William Clark, Jr., McMillan and Rhodes. The Chair, Regent Hand, reported that Item No. 1 involved 52 agreements for clinical research and that Item No. 2 involved 9 contracts with state agencies, for a total of \$259,954 in awards. The Committee, through its Chair, reported that in separate letters to Chancellor Portch, the presidents of the several institutions of the University System listed below submitted one item for approval by the Board. After discussion of these items, and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee on Research and Extension, by motion of Regent Hand, seconded by Regent Cannestra, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1, Information Item: Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7-8, 1984, the presidents of Augusta College, Dartmouth College, Floyd College, Georgia State

University, Kennesaw State College, University of Georgia and West Georgia College executed 52 memoranda of understanding respecting affiliation of students for clinical training in the programs indicated.

2. Information Item: Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7-8, 1984, the presidents of Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University and University of Georgia executed 9 service agreements with the indicated agencies for the purposes and periods designated, with the institutions to receive payment as indicated.

3. Appointment of Research and Extension Staff: The Board approved five full-time research/scientists or engineers at the Georgia Institute of Technology and one part-time faculty, retired, at The University of Georgia. The appointments were recommended by President Clough subsequent to the last meeting of the Board on December 12-13, 1995. The recommendations were found to be in order and are on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

(a.) **GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

Dr. D. Ray Hixon, Research Engineer II, Aerospace Science Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective December 18, 1995.

Mr. Samir Y. Panchal, Research Engineer I, Office of Inter-Disciplinary Programs, effective January 11, 1996.

Mr. William D. Ray, Senior Research Associate, Signatures Technology Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective December 14, 1995.

Dr. Jay B. Romine, Research Engineer II, Huntsville Research Operations, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective January 11, 1996.

Mr. David T. Speer, Senior Research Engineer, Systems Development Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective January 11, 1996.

(b.) **UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Ms. Margaret Mims Johnston, Instructor, Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Vice President for Service, for period December 1, 1995-June 30, 1996.

## **COMMITTEE ON VISITATION**

Regent John Howard Clark, Chairman of the Committee on Visitation, reported that he had received a Visitation Report from Regent Cannestra. Regent Cannestra reported a visits to Georgia State University to meet with Business School Dean John Hogan on January 5th. Their discussion included Business School challenges, objectives, goals and future trends. Dean Hogan and Regent Cannestra had lunch and then toured the business facility to evaluate the degree of utilization.

## **GENERAL ITEMS**

The Chancellor introduced two state legislators, Senator Jack Hill and Representative Calvin Smyre. Senator Hill spoke to the meeting about his work in education. He spoke of the partnership between the Board of Regents and the Legislature that has worked so well in the last two years that Georgia is the envy of many other states. He mentioned that the P-16 Council, guided by Dr. Jan Kettlewell, was doing a wonderful job. Senator Hill said that he liked the idea of examining the educational process in Georgia and cooperating with other states by sharing information about Georgia's educational programs and learning about their programs. Senator Hill also spoke about the current budget talks and asked for the help of the Board of Regents in this regard. He said that he felt it important to emphasize teaching and how education ties in to the economic development of the state.

State Representative Smyre, who chairs the University System of Georgia Committee, stated that the Legislature had just passed the largest tax cut in the history of the state. He also stated that the largest item in the Governor's new budget would be education and that the Board of Regents and higher education would share in that. Representative Smyre spoke about the importance of the Legislature and the Board of Regents having a good relationship. He remarked that the Board was committed to better students in higher education and that it was important for the Legislature to ensure that better students came from K-12 so that they could be better prepared for going into the higher education process. He thanked the Board for their sensitivity in this area and pledged his continuing support to the University System of Georgia.

Chairman Baranco thanked Senator Hill and Representative Smyre for their support of the Board of Regents and the University System of Georgia.

## **THE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

Chancellor Stephen R. Portch wished all present a happy new year and announced that 1996 is the year of the Centennial Olympics, that the University System of Georgia was excited to be a part of the action. The Chancellor noted that he had, under the advisement of Regent Hand, eaten hog jowls, black-eyed peas and greens on New Years Day; the hope was that, in addition to bringing prosperity and humility, this consumption would also bring an eternally happy Board of Regents and a forever bountiful Governor and Legislature.

### **Good News Items:**

- Chancellor Portch remarked that 1996 has started right with the cover story of the Chronicle showing Georgia Institute of Technology's President Wayne Clough. The story is a very positive one on how colleges and universities will benefit from the Olympic connection, and it helps to raise the national visibility of the System.

- The Chancellor noted that he was proud to receive a letter from Major General Lyle of the U.S. Army Cadet Command indicating that North Georgia Colleges Cadet Corps had been selected to the all pro team for the second year in a row -- an honor attained by only 15 out of 316 ROTC units nationwide.

- Another success story comes from Georgia Southern University which was cited by the American Sociological Association for its Masters Program in Sociology. This association selected 13 programs nationally that have achieved real success that others may be able to emulate.

- Also drawing national attention to the System is Dr. LeFair in Sports Nutrition at Armstrong State. He was featured in The New York Times article on chromium, a controversial nutrient supplement. The other scientists cited were from Dartmouth College and George Washington University.

The Chancellor noted that he had reported on the System's increased national visibility to the Joint Appropriations Committee last week. He also noted that initial budget news from the Governor's proposal was very good indeed -- that he had proposed significant support for System initiatives and for continuing progress on salary competitiveness. The Governor had asked the University System of Georgia to accept the transfer of the State Data and Research Center from the Office of Planning and Budget to the School of Public Policy at Georgia Institute of Technology. Chancellor Portch announced that he had indicated the Systems willingness to cooperate on this and other issues of mutual benefit to the State and the System.

Although a tough session of the State Legislature has been predicted, Chancellor Portch stated that the University System of Georgia was well positioned. He credited the Days of Accountability program for that positioning. To date, 31 of the University System of Georgia campuses have had events to celebrate their accountability to their communities, and that very positive comments had been received from Legislators along with excellent press coverage. The Chancellor noted that clippings from these events had been distributed to the Board members. He also noted that Valdosta, Columbus, Clayton, Dalton, Georgia Southern, Medical College, Armstrong and Brunswick alone had drawn a combined total of over 40 Legislators who attended these events. He pointed out two items of special interest: (1) during Gordon College's event, Medical College of Georgia's President Tedesco reported on the collaborative distance education nursing program via GSAMS -- a wonderful way to model the program; and (2) a wonderful photo of Speaker Murphy using GALILEO was featured in the Atlanta Journal/Constitution under the headline, "Murphy at the Mouse." It's the only time the Speaker's name has been associated with a mouse in a newspaper story! The Speaker has been, stated the Chancellor, and continues to be, a great supporter of the University System.

The Chairman called for the Committee on Planning and Oversight report. There being no objection, the regular meeting of the Board of Regents was recessed and the meeting of the Committee on Planning and Oversight, meeting as Committee of the Whole, convened.

#### **MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT, MEETING AS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Regent Leebern, Chair of the Committee on Planning and Oversight, announced that Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, would lead a presentation on the



P-16 Initiative with an update on its progress.

Dr. Kettlewell announced that a major educational reform effort had been launched in Georgia with the P-16 (pre-school to college) Initiative. The effort had involved colleagues in K-12 schools, the technical institutes, the University System institutions, communities and also private sector participation. The work had been focused on five purposes:

(1) From pre-school to post-secondary education (technical institutions and University System institutions), the purpose had been to increase student achievement to high levels by focusing cross-sector changes in the three educational systems in the state.

(2) Another purpose was to make it easier for students to move smoothly from one educational sector to another - either from high school to college, from high school to technical institute and then to college, or to work and back to college.

(3) The P-16 Initiative aimed to ensure that all students who enter post-secondary education (either technical or University System institutions) and are not only prepared to succeed but, in fact, that far more actually do so.

(4) Another purpose is to increase the admission and success rate of minority students and students from low income groups in post-secondary institutions.

(5) The last purpose is to rethink teacher education and the way that it connects to the reform of our schools.

Since the Board's approval of the policy direction in March 1995, these have been the P-16 Council's purposes and focus. In July 1995, Gov. Miller appointed the Georgia P-16 Council to provide overall leadership and coordination of this effort. Since that time the work has progressed concurrently at the state and local levels.

Dr. Kettlewell introduced four members of the Georgia P-16 Council: Mr. Roy Richards, Chair and CEO of the Southwire Company; Ms. Leslie Graitcer, Executive Director of the Bell South Foundation; Dr. Carl Glickman, Professor of Education at the University of Georgia; and, Dr. Ron Henry, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Georgia State University. Dr. Kettlewell mentioned that an outline had been distributed which would give an overview of what

would be discussed. Specifically, she wanted to present an overview of the work plan that had evolved in the statewide council. She would review the work of the three sub-committees of that Council and look at participation throughout the state calling attention to the formation of a network. Lastly, there would be a brief look at the successes for year one of the Georgia P-16 Council.

Mr. Roy Richards addressed the meeting by noting that he chaired the Senior Advocacy Group of the P-16 Council and that he also chairs a manufacturing company (Southwire) in Carrollton, Georgia. From a business standpoint, it was exciting to see an effort to close the gaps in Georgia education. Mr. Richards pointed out that the University System has been involved in

far more remedial work than it should be - the P-16 initiative is a great opportunity to stitch up the seams in Georgia education and make it a seamless system that the business community has been advocating for a long time. The Senior Advocacy Group is the body that sets the direction and expectations for the P-16 effort. Others participating in this group are the Chancellor, Ms. Linda Shrenko, Mr. Ken Breeden, and eight other educators and legislators -- all of whom are strong educators or strong business people. Mr. Richards stated that it was exciting to be with the group and be involved with their work. The Senior Advocacy Group has recommended a four-pronged work plan: (1) defining student success, (2) gaining agreement on P-16 standards and assessment, (3) aligning of curriculum among the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the Department of Education and the University System, and (4) developing a profile of the successful teacher. He noted that the group has accomplished the first part and was proceeding apace with the remainder of the work plan. Mr. Richards exclaimed that the time is right with a strong Governor who is also a strong advocate of education, with a Board of Regents that works very effectively, and with attitudes in general that are right at the top.

Ms. Leslie Graitcer, Chair of the Sub-Committee of the P-16 Council dealing with current reform initiatives, said that the sub-committee is charged to canvas the state and compile in comprehensive fashion a look at what is happening in educational reform across the state. The sub-committee planned to look at the whole landscape and see what needs to be done to make the connections and the linkages among those efforts so that all of them can fall comprehensively within the philosophy and the framework of what P-16 is about. Ms. Graitcer remarked that her group would then see how, as an umbrella, they could try to deepen and accelerate the work that is going on. She noted, however, that everyone was working in a collaboratively fashion towards a comprehensive and systemic kind of change. The plan was to continue, until February 1, gathering the data of what is happening around the state and building on some good work begun by the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education that had put together a matrix of some reform efforts in the country. Adding to that, the sub-committee sent out a questionnaire to every school superintendent, every dean of education, and every head of a technical college, concerning their reform efforts. The hard work would begin then in looking at all this research to determine what it means and make some connections. A lot is happening around the state, reported Ms. Graitcer. She noted that the danger is that fragmentation might be the result and people might be pitted against each other. The sub-committee did not want the P-16 effort to look like just one more reform item that will draw time away from their other efforts. The opportunity is not to let that happen but to allow P-16 to be a philosophy - an umbrella that is a way to connect everything under it which can all move comprehensively together. This is the goal of the sub-committee, and Ms. Graitcer announced plans to have some recommendations in Spring 1996 in that regard.

Dr. Carl Glickman, Chair of the Sub-Committee on Policy, noted that his group had been charged with a five-fold mission: (1) to review current policies at the state level that support or impede student progress in the P-16 reform; (2) to develop recommendations on local and state levels for incentives for policy sector change in the overall P-16 reform effort; (3) to develop recommendations for elimination of policies at the state level that impede student progress in P-16 reform; (4) to review and, where appropriate, recommend amendments to existing policies that are intended to strengthen linkages among school services; and, (5) to give progress reports at each meeting of the Georgia P-16 Council. Dr. Glickman stated that his group, composed of approximately 15 members, had met four times; they had decided to first look at policy framework in terms of what was to be the direction of policy and then decide what would be the

group's recommendations. He expected to report on these recommendations around June 1, 1996, although some other issues would need longer study.

Dr. Glickman said that he saw policy work as long term with the idea that his group might be able to move fairly quickly on some issues in the coming months. They were looking at policy framework to find one that would encourage support and invite interagency collaborations without regulating, mandating, or standardizing the work of each agency. The group would attempt to work out top-down support for bottom-up initiatives and coordination. They were looking at linking health and education between the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Human Resources and Department of Education with courses and programs to lower the health risk factors for students. He remarked that this would also have implications in the academic preparation of health, education and other public sector professionals and post-secondary education. There is grant money, stated Dr. Glickman, which is available for doing such work that would be detailed and submitted. A second recommendation from Dr. Glickman was to develop a core curriculum for all high school students through pathway courses to give them access to higher education as well as to occupational education. Those courses that are most specifically considered pathway courses, he noted, are mathematics, geometry, and algebra. When students pass those courses, they have many more options than if they do not. The group had looked at studies done in other states that have developed these core requirements for not just some, but for all students. They had studied the success rates which have gone from 22% of students previously being able to pass such courses in high school to over 80% of students being able to pass. To develop those core courses as pathway courses also requires professional development and support for teachers dealing with a much wider range of students than they have worked with previously. Intensive assistance for students, such as mentoring and tutoring programs, would also be required. Public schools, universities and colleges would be invited to collaborate and pilot new forms of assessment which demonstrate student learning in both authentic as well as public settings. Such assessments would be developed from current work being done in other states to include participation of local business and community members, and it would involve disciplinary experts at higher education institutions along with parents. The assessments would be used as final displays of competence for exiting to the next level, as well as partial criteria for admission to the next level of education. All of the recommendations are going to be based on the actual practice and research that is going on in the field in schools, universities and community settings in the United States. The Sub-Committee on Policy would look at what is working and then figure out how we can evolve that and how to coordinate it in Georgia.

Dr. Ron Henry stated that the main target of P-16 is to improve student learning. The cornerstone of that is to keep an eye on that target; in order to do that, it is very important to have data. The committee chaired by Dr. Henry is the Assessment and Research Sub-Committee of the Georgia P-16 Council. The charge they were given is to examine current student data bases and to identify the gaps that exist. Secondly, they will look at trends and directions from other states so that they can learn from progress of others. Dr. Henry recommended variables to monitor the student academic progress to Georgia's public educational systems. He noted that the aim was to pick out what are the most relevant variables. Once having those recommended and approved by Georgia P-16 Council, the Assessment and Research Sub-Committee would try to oversee the development of the P-16 statewide student data base that incorporates the approved variables. A timeline would be established for gathering baseline data. Dr. Henry's group would be involved with developing criteria, would give annual benchmarks for measuring

it for looking at improvements, and then report annually on a student's progress. In the first four months in which the sub-committee has met monthly, reported Dr. Henry, they had listened to representatives from the Department of Education, the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE), and the University System of Georgia as to types of data they currently are collecting. The committee had also heard from College Board (particularly the connection between success and achievement of SAT scores and how that links back to academic preparation of students). There is a council on school performance that has been in existence for a couple of years, and they have just come out with an important report looking at eight measures toward Goal 2000 on which they have been working. The League of Professional Schools is another national organization which has about 65 middle and high schools involved with their work of gathering good data to see what works on the local level. Finally, there is the Georgia Educational Information System, a massive statewide list of data collecting on all levels of K-12 and which is trying to link that with the public institutions of higher education and the DTAE.

Dr. Henry said that the group had looked at what is available and is in the process of trying to see where gaps are and what are the important issues. The sub-committee was to hear at the end of the month from a person involved with the Florida Department of Education on what they had been doing for the last several years to connect the P-16 into a statewide data base. Dr. Henry stated that he expected, by March 1996, to make a recommendation to the Georgia P-16 Council on what the variables are that are important for tracking and then to begin looking at a timeline on the various criteria. The reason for this was to enable to P-16 Council to demonstrate the achievement of high standards and expectations which are directly connected to students' success at the next level. As Roy Richards had noted, student success had been defined, and they also wanted to define how a student can go from one level to the next. Dr. Henry's sub-committee wanted to be able to provide information to the previous levels on the progress of students so that all may benefit; they need to know what works, what does not work, and where improvements should be made in the various levels. In the final analysis, they hoped to be able to make some significant progress. Lastly, Dr. Henry listed the indicators that are highly correlated with superior achievement:

- (1) Set high standards and expect that people can reach them. A way to help people achieve highly is to make sure they are well prepared in the six academic subject areas which will also help through whole lifelong learning;
- (2) It is important to instill stronger student aspirations as to what they can become;
- (3) It is important to have parental or caregiver involvement;
- (4) Teacher development and preparation (no matter at what level of P-16) is important; teachers must know the content of what they teach, and they should know about learning styles of students;
- (5) Finally, teachers should have high expectations for students.

Dr. Kettlewell thanked the Chairs of the sub-committees for sharing with the Board a brief look at what is going on at the state level. She then spoke about what is going on at the local level in Georgia communities. Under the leadership of the three heads of the educational systems in Georgia, the P-16 Council had distributed a request for proposals in October 1995. It

was a very small planning grant opportunity. The purpose was to either encourage formation of the local P-16 Council to work on the five purposes or to build on the work of existing partnerships to work on the five purposes of the P-16 Initiative. Excited by the level of participation that has evolved in Georgia to date, Dr. Kettlewell referred to a chart which showed the 34 institutions in the System. The chart illustrated that Georgia presently has 14 of the 34 University System institutions serving as "lead" institutions: these institutions prepare teachers in the state. In addition, there are 14 other collaborative partners in the System. Georgia has 115 public school districts participating out of total of 181. There are 20 technical institutes participating out of total of 33. In addition, 17 private schools, 57 participants from the private sector, and 24 other agencies in the state are participating. Since October, the Georgia P-16 Council has been pleased with local councils which had been started. Additional partners continue to join the effort, and Dr. Kettlewell stated that the goal is to show 100% participation. All of the local councils are part of a Georgia network: the purpose of it is for the councils to come together across the state to share lessons learned in each partnership with the others. This network was scheduled to get underway the next month.

Dr. Kettlewell asked the Board members to look at the material that had been distributed and to review a document entitled, "Georgia P-16 Initiative - Anticipated Successes for Year One." She acknowledged that it could take years to achieve the five purposes, but in its first year the P-16 initiative was well underway.

Comments:

Regent McMillan noted that in Dr. Henry's presentation it seemed that a lot of the initiatives that are either underway or contemplated track rather nicely some of those in the Admissions Policy. He asked whether they would be dovetailed or would the new ones supersede those anticipated activities that will be part of new admission requirements? Dr. Kettlewell answered that Dr. Henry had been chosen to chair the sub-committee because he was also co-chair of the Admissions Task Force. The idea is to bring those two together very tightly and to connect them with the P-16 initiative and vice versa. Chancellor Portch noted that a report had just been received from the Fast Track Pre-College Initiative task force on pre-college activities. Visits had been scheduled to foundations and corporations to seek support for that initiative, which dovetails right in with this.

Regent Leebern thanked all the presenters for the time they had spent on this matter and for making their presentations to the Board.

Regent Jones moved to recess the Committee as a Whole, seconded by Regent Coleman, with no objection, and the regular meeting of the Board of Regents reconvened.

Chairman Baranco also thanked the presenters and noted that the way students learn and the theme of accountability had been most impressive. This will set the tone for education in Georgia for many years to come. She thanked Regent Leebern for sharing with the Board through Planning and Oversight.

**SPECIAL OVERVIEW OLYMPIC COMMITTEE REPORT**

Chairman Baranco called on Regent Rhodes to report on planning for the 1996 Olympics. Regent Rhodes announced that there are less than 200 days until the Olympics begin. He promised to bring periodic updates to the Board. Regent Rhodes introduced Mr. Levy G. Youmans, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Accounting, who serves as liaison officer between the Board of Regents and the Olympic effort. Mr. Youmans announced that he had invited three University System presidents to make presentations concerning preparations for the Olympic events on their respective campuses.

Mr. Youmans remarked that there were 191 days remaining before the Opening Ceremony of the Olympics and that it was time to bring a status report from the three University System campuses hosting venue sites. Those campuses are: Georgia State University, the University of Georgia and Georgia Institute of Technology. Mr. Youmans then introduced

Presidents Patton, Knapp and Clough respectively.

President Patton addressed the meeting, noting that many present had joined Georgia State University at the Depot the evening before where the flags of 106 nations were displayed. Those flags represented the various countries of international students attending Georgia State University. President Patton said that his university was pleased to be involved in the Olympics and its international activities. He noted that there had been many questions about how the Olympics would affect his campus. He stated that the campus of Georgia State University would be affected in three ways: (1) welcoming people to Georgia State; (2) establishing a legacy for years to come, and (3) involving the University community in this historic opportunity.

President Patton stated that first, people would be welcomed to the campus through the badminton venue being held there. The sports arena has been improved for badminton with new seating, heating, ventilating, air conditioning improvements, and health safety improvements along with construction of sports laboratories that will be available for use after the Olympics. He noted that Georgia State University had a supplemental venue agreement involving a \$3 million project - \$2 million of permanent improvements to the facility and \$1 million of temporary improvements. Three test events had been held in the facility, and it had been proven well-suited for the badminton competition. He noted that a second way of welcoming people is through the Olympic Woman exhibit, which will be hosted in Alumni Hall. It is a multi-media exhibit of the involvement of women in Olympics and is a part of the 1996 Olympic Arts Festival. The exhibit will run from June 23 - August 4, 1996. The third way the Olympics will affect the University is by establishing a legacy through improvements to the sports arena and, more importantly, the Olympic residence halls at North Avenue and Techwood streets. He mentioned that these four Olympic buildings can be seen from the connector when going north or south. These buildings represent an \$85.2 million dollar project; this is a significant project for both state and Georgia State University for this will be the University's first time to have student housing. The buildings will be able to house 2,000 students after the Olympics. These are not typical residence halls: there are suites of four individual bedrooms connected to a living room and kitchen (completed with refrigerator, stove, and microwave).

President Patton said that he believed concerns addressed in the past about facilities are well in hand, however, there are still some lingering concerns about occupancy and the need to occupy the buildings very quickly. The University has retained a Director of Campus Housing, and she has been very active in marketing these four Olympic buildings. President Patton declared it a great housing opportunity for students who now have to compete in the Atlanta market for housing. Dr. Patton stated that the University community was encouraged to be involved in the Olympic games through the Center for Sports Medicine and Sports Sciences. This Center has a couple of laboratories which are involved in the Olympics. One of the laboratories, the Biomechanics Laboratory, is the official science laboratory for the 1996 Games - this coordinates the research and science of 80 scientists from around world. The second laboratory, the Laboratory for Elite Athletic Performance (LEAP), is one where physiological testing is done. At LEAP, scientists have begun to test some of the Olympic athletes there: Ms. Shannon Miller, Olympic gymnast, and Ms. Monica Seles, professional tennis player, have been tested there. President Patton also mentioned the involvement of the University through an athletic association wherein two Georgia State University students who are Olympic athletes are sponsored: Mr. Joe Russell is a power weight lifter in the Paralympics and a several-time gold medal winner who can lift three times his own weight. The second athlete is Mr. Joe Jacoby, a

gold medal winner from Barcelona, who won a gold medal for doubles canoeing and will be competing in singles canoeing in the 1996 Olympics. President Patton announced that there were about 12 other Georgia State University faculty and staff members involved in the Olympics.

President Patton also declared that the campus would be open for business as usual during the Olympics. Classes would be suspended for three weeks, but campus facilities will be open and continue to provide access to the library, the professors will have access to research labs, and the University will continue to provide admissions advice for students, financial aid, etc. The University was working with the City of Atlanta to ensure that the campus will be accessible. President Patton closed his presentation by saying that he appreciated the support of the Board and requested any additional help they could give.

President Knapp spoke about the preparation of the University of Georgia for the 1996 Games. The University will be the host of three venues: football (soccer) competition, volleyball and rhythmic gymnastics. Soccer will be played at Sanford Stadium and volleyball (not a medal round competition) and badminton will be played at the Georgia Coliseum. President Knapp said that he could see a major opportunity for the University to gain exposure to the world. The facilities at the University were basically ready for use. The University had a stadium that could accommodate more than 80,000 people, and the Georgia Coliseum was also available. While the physical legacy would not be same as at Georgia State and Georgia Tech, President Knapp said that the Olympic venues would create an opportunity for an estimated viewing audience of about 3 billion people. He hoped to leave a positive, lasting impression of both the University and the community with TV viewers and also with the attendants to the events. The bottom line is that the University is in excellent shape in terms of preparation.

President Knapp mentioned a couple of highlights: the necessary renovations to the Stadium began early this week, and the target date for completion is April 15, 1996. Some of the hedges had been removed from the field and the field required leveling because of a 1% crown which was not satisfactory for Olympic competition. Workmen had had to cut into the corners of the stadium to ensure the required width of the field for Olympic soccer. President Knapp assured the Board, however, that the stadium would be ready for the University of Georgia's first football game with Auburn at the end of August 1996. President Knapp remarked that the logistical challenge facing the University, more than getting ready for the Olympics, was to get the field ready for that first game. The coliseum project, he announced, was ahead of schedule. The main component of construction is the warm-up facility being built by the side of the Coliseum; the target date for completion of this facility is March 31, 1996, when the national competition for rhythmic gymnastics comes to the University. After the Olympics, there will be a set of renovations to that area basically for use by the College of Agriculture that will be funded out of Olympic revenues.

President Knapp noted that most of the agreements were pretty much in place, but that there was an issue with ACOG over the structuring of use of the Georgia Center (about whether it is to be structured as an educational facility or structured as a hotel). Operational planning, stated President Knapp, is also well under way: the University will suspend classes for one week and be in full operation except for that one week period when both soccer and gymnastic competitions are going on at same time. He mentioned that plans were being made to draw down the work force at the University during that period through a buildup of compensatory time



within the guidelines of the Federal wage hour laws and within the Regents' policy. Basically, many employees would build up comp time and take it during this period. This, noted President Knapp, presented a major logistical challenge for there are about 6500 employees at the University; while the faculty can take work home to a great extent, some staff will need to be bused in from remote parking locations. The University, with the exception of classes being suspended for one week, will be open for business during the time when 120-130,000 visitors will be on campus. Parking, he stated, is a major issue that the University has been working on closely with the city of Athens and Clark County to set up traffic and security plans. ACOG has leased many close-in spaces and others will be leased to cover some of the costs involved in the Games.

President Knapp said that the University would be mounting cultural programming sites outside of the Olympic venues - these would be at the new performing and visual arts center. Proforma budgets have been worked out in detail and balanced, thereby avoiding any drain on the assets of the University.

President Clough remarked that, through the cooperation of the Regents, the Chancellor's staff, and the diligent staff of the Georgia Institute of Technology, the campus was being prepared for the 1996 Olympics. He introduced Mr. Bill Miller, who leads the team at Georgia Tech; a team that is doing enormous work towards preparing the campus for the Olympic venues. Georgia Tech is the home of the Olympic Village; it will have 15,000 Olympic athletes and their trainers on the campus. Georgia Tech will also be the site of 5 aquatic venues and boxing. Immediately following the formal Olympics, the Paralympics will start, and Georgia Tech will be home to the Paralympic Village. President Clough distributed Olympic pins to the members of the Board of Regents. He mentioned that Georgia Tech had about 2,300,000 square feet of space either being renovated or built; this was accomplished in 2-1/2 years - a monumental undertaking. During the same time, while the Olympic building was going on, many of the fraternities decided to renovate. Several campus ministries are also being renovated. Olympic construction is 90% on schedule. One new residence hall, the Sixth Street facility, has fallen behind schedule and remains to be completed; however, GSFIC is convinced that project will be completed in late February. Two residence hall renovations are in process and should be completed by May. Because the Sixth Street residence could not accommodate students from Glennon Towers, they are occupying the G88 apartments. President Clough thanked President Patton for his cooperation and Dr. Desrochers and the Board of Regents for their help in this regard.

President Clough stated that there were many other projects on campus: just completed is a major plaza project where all TV cameras will be focused during the time that the Olympics is taking place; a plaza is being developed where all the Olympic teams will be received by the mayor of the Olympic Village; and, a very beautiful area with a large fountain and campanile is being developed. In addition, a parking deck is under construction and will be finished by May. FutureNet, one of the special initiatives funded last year, is under construction and will be completed by June; it will be used during the Olympics to provide information to athletes. The Alexander Memorial Coliseum renovation is to be completed by Jan. 20 when Georgia Tech will play Virginia, and President Clough invited all present to attend the game. In the Aquatic Center, although the physical structure was finished, President Clough stated that solar cells were being put on top which will help heat the pool and save \$30,000 a year in energy bills. He noted that Georgia Power and the Department of Energy had put up the funding for the installation of these

solar cells and that the ♥Center will serve as a research facility after the Olympics.

President Clough announced that, during the spring of 1996, ACOG will come on campus and do some temporary construction: they plan to put 13,000 additional seats into the Aquatic Center and will build a temporary pool for water polo - both the pool and the seats are will be removed after the Olympics takes place. The city of Atlanta will be replacing a sewer built in 1896, thereby closing a main campus artery and blocking a campus entrance until this construction is complete. Olympic construction at Georgia Tech represents a major undertaking; approximately \$159,000,000 is being invested in Olympic facilities (not counting other projects that are under way). A breakdown of the \$159 million would include: \$108,000,000 in new housing, \$17,000,000 for housing renovation, \$20,000,000 for the Aquatic Center, and \$2,000,000 for the Georgia Tech Plaza project (which was raised almost exclusively from private funds - primarily Georgia Tech alumni). Of the \$159,000,000, \$42 million comes from ACOG, \$98 million is state payback bond-indebtedness, and the remaining \$19 million comes from private sources - primarily donors, friends and corporations.

As Georgia Tech prepares for the Olympics, stated President Clough, its main priority certainly has not been shortchanged; he explained that that priority was composed of the Georgia Tech students and the Georgia Tech curriculum. He further explained that all of the construction is geared toward the idea of using it afterwards for the students, and that Georgia Tech had been mindful of that as the design moved forward. A commitment was made to students that the Campus would not be shut down and that a summer session would be offered to co-op students. Georgia Tech will offer a special summer session which will begin on August 12 and end on Sept. 27: this would be a short seven-week-quarter session, which may also help get everyone ready for the semester conversion. President Clough noted that there would be an interesting exercise in logistics, because students will be on Campus three days after the Olympics are over. Georgia Tech will have between 2500 and 3500 students moving onto the Campus as the world moves off the campus. In addition, the Paralympics will run on the Campus concurrently with summer session. All Paralympic athletes will occupy the west residence hall. President Clough mentioned that it would be good to have the Georgia Tech students interact with the great Paralympic athletes. He stated that plans were in place to keep the Campus open for research activities and that will be a challenge.

Georgia Tech is also building curricula offerings that utilize the facilities that are being put in on the campus: special efforts are being made, particularly to allow networking to be used in a creative way to enhance design efforts between students to simulate what is going on now. Because the summer session will end later than usual, the fall session will begin late - it will begin on October 9 and end on December 21, 1996. He remarked that a lot of progress had been made but that issues remain - particularly operational issues. President Clough stated that ACOG had guaranteed in their contract that they would provide parking for all Georgia Tech faculty and staff and students who needed to access the Campus to keep their research projects going, but there has not yet been a positive response as to how exactly that issue would be dealt with. Also, a number of regular staff were to be picked up by ACOG because they literally could not do their jobs during the time of the Olympics. President Clough explained that these people are employees of the State of Georgia, their buildings are being completely taken over by the Games, and they cannot take two months of vacation. He explained that ACOG has asked their employees to work 60 hours a week which would not be possible for state employees to do - this was an issue remaining to be worked out. On Olympic construction that ACOG has proposed,

President Clough remarked that it has caused some concern because some of the temporary construction is very substantial. He mentioned that, for instance, the Plaza project was just completed, and ACOG's plans for banner systems would require large holes in the pavers of the Plaza; an attempt is being made to find an alternate plan to deal with this. Another issue is that of accreditation - an important issue as 2,500 people have requested this. While it was hoped that the process would take place on Campus, it will now have to take place downtown. Georgia Tech has asked ACOG for help with busing people downtown for the credentialing process. The Institute has also been working with ACOG to ensure postal delivery through the secure system that the Olympics will have in place. President Clough stated that the Campus will be turned over to ACOG a full month before the Olympics begin; thus, Georgia Tech's time schedule is shortened by one month in comparison to the other University System institutions. President Clough declared that he was excited about having the 1996 Olympics at the Georgia Institute of Technology, and that the great new facilities will add tremendously to Georgia Tech's academic effort.

Mr. Youmans noted that there were still contracts waiting for completion. He referred to a supplemental agreement at the University of Georgia which had been previously approved by the Board and the Attorney General's Office and upon which there were attempts to complete minor language changes. Mr. Youmans said that ACOG's attorneys were working on the agreement and that it should be ready for the Chancellor's signature during the week of January 15-19, 1996. President Knapp, of the University of Georgia, mentioned an agreement with the Georgia Center and attempts to keep it as simple as possible; the Attorney General's Office had been giving guidance on this agreement to move it in the right direction. Mr. Youmans noted that at Georgia Tech, two major contracts remain to be completed: negotiations are approximately 90% complete on the summer school contract, and there were plans to bring it to the Board for review and approval at the February meeting of the Board of Regents. He said that no major problems were anticipated with that contract. Mr. Youmans announced that slow progress was being made on a major agreement for the Paralympics; this agreement was held up while waiting on an agreement between ACOG and APOC. That agreement was signed in December, so Mr. Youmans said that he expected to bring the agreement for the Paralympics to the Board for review and approval at the March Board of Regents meeting. He noted that plans were moving along very well and that he anticipated no major problems for all parties continue to negotiate in the spirit of the original venue agreement. Mr. Youmans acknowledged that there were many complex sets of issues with very complicated requirements and that there were issues on both sides, but he said that all parties are cooperating to insure that both BOR and ACOG are treated fairly throughout the process. Mr. Youmans then noted that Regent Rhodes had asked that another tour be arranged for the members of the Board of Regents and that he hoped to have a tour of the facilities at Georgia Institute of Technology and the G88 complex of Georgia State University set for either the February or March 1996 meeting.

#### Comments:

Regent Cannestra queried whether the field at Sanford Stadium would have the 1% crown restored or would it be left level. President Knapp said it would not be necessary to restore the crown - it would be left level.

Chairman Baranco thanked Regent Rhodes and all on his

Committee for their commitment and leadership. She also thanked the Presidents and Mr. Youmans for their fine presentations.

Regent Rhodes asked President Clough whether members of the Board of Regents might visit the Georgia Tech campus before the Olympics to view the special facilities. President Clough answered that the Board would be welcome and that special access can be provided through short-term credentials.

Regent Cannestra commented that when Los Angeles hosted the Olympics, the major corporations there concluded that the single most important thing was for the city to keep the trucks out of the city during the Olympic hours. He suggested that the city be encouraged to be more firm about keeping trucks from interrupting the Olympic happenings. President Clough noted that the Georgia Highway Department, along with ACOG, had come to Georgia Tech to discuss the issue; they found one solution was to use helicopters to make deliveries of freight. He noted, too, that the federal government had funded this as a research project. This funding had helped the Georgia Department of Transportation to build a command center similar to an air traffic control tower at an airport; this center would be instrumental in tracking traffic on all thoroughfares. This, President Clough noted, was an opportunity to get in on the research side of the traffic issue. Chairman Baranco wanted to know whether the helicopters would present a security problem, but President Clough said they would be specially designated helicopters and probably used minimally.

Regent Rhodes thanked the Presidents for taking time from their very busy schedules to come and speak to the Board.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Chairman Baranco announced that the Audit Committee would be chaired by Regent Coleman, with Regents Cannestra, Elson, and Turner to serve as members of the Committee. The Committee would receive and review the proposed charter and produce a final charter draft and master operating plan for audits for approval by the Board.

Chairman Baranco then asked Secretary Weber to present the calendar for FY1997. Ms. Weber announced that the Chancellor, the Chair and the Vice-Chair had approved the schedule. Chairman Baranco pointed out that, for the July 9 Board of Regents meeting (which would take place during the Olympics), plans were being discussed for a meeting via the GSAMS network. Chancellor Portch and his staff would identify some sites throughout the state which would be convenient to the Regents and others who would congregate at those sites, and the meeting would be conducted electronically. There will be no meeting in August. The Chairman also noted that the Board had discussed having two out-of-town meetings during each fiscal year: in April 1996, the Board will meet at DeKalb College (the second out-of-town meeting to be held in FY1996);

in October 1996, the plan is to have a meeting at East Georgia College; and, in April 1997, the Board plans to meet at Atlanta Metropolitan College. Ms. Weber noted that this would be the Board of Regents' very first visits to both East Georgia College and Atlanta Metropolitan College.

SCHEDULE FOR BOARD MEETINGS THROUGH JUNE 1997

1996

February 13, 14	Board Room, Atlanta
March 12, 13	Board Room, Atlanta
April 9, 10	<b>DeKalb College</b>
May 7, 8	Board Room, Atlanta
June 11, 12	Board Room, Atlanta
<b>Tuesday, July 9</b>	<b>GSAMS Meeting at Several Sites</b>
August	<b>No Meeting</b>
September 10, 11	Board Room, Atlanta
October 8, 9	<b>East Georgia College</b>
November 12, 13	Board Room, Atlanta
December 10, 11	Board Room, Atlanta

1997

January 7, 8	Board Room, Atlanta
February 11, 12	Board Room, Atlanta
March 11, 12	Board Room, Atlanta
April 8, 9	<b>Atlanta Metropolitan College</b>
May 13, 14	Board Room, Atlanta
June 10, 11	Board Room, Atlanta

The Chancellor then passed out copies of a photograph of the Board of Regents to each member of the Board, noting that this was to be the beginning of a rogues' gallery in the Central Office. He stated that there would be an official portrait of the Board of Regents taken each year and displayed in the Central Office.

There being no further business to come before the Board, by motion of Regent McMillan, and without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 A.M. on January 10, 1996.

s/GAIL S. WEBER

Gail S. Weber

Secretary

Board of Regents

University System of Georgia

s/JUANITA POWELL BARANCO

Juanita Powell Baranco

Chairman

Board of Regents

University System of Georgia