

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA  
HELD AT  
270 Washington St., S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia  
September 7 and 8, 1999**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, September 7 and Wednesday, September 8, 1999 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Kenneth W. Cannestra, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 7. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Cannestra, were Regents Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Joel O. Wooten, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey.

**ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, September 7, 1999 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. and Juanita P. Baranco had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day. Chair Cannestra noted that Vice Chair Coleman's wife had passed away. Regents Howell, Leebern, NeSmith, and White attended the funeral, as well as Chancellor Portch, Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers, Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning, Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber, and Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on August 10 and 11, 1999 were unanimously approved as distributed.

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

Chair Cannestra next convened the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. He explained that at this meeting, the Board would review and approve the fiscal year 2001 budget. He then turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent White.

Chair White noted how the approval of the budget signals that fall is right around the corner. At this meeting, the Board would be hearing a presentation by the Chancellor and his staff. Chair White asked that the Regents hold their questions and comments until the end of the presentation.

Regent Cannestra noted that there were extra copies of the budget available for the Regents in case they had not brought their own.

Chair White stated that the budget is the culmination of a great deal of hard work. The process begins with the presidents of the institutions who work with Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers and her staff. Chair White recognized Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes and Budget Director Shelley Nickel, who had worked very hard to create the budget. They began their work in May, because it is not an easy task to have the budget completed by September. At this meeting, the Board would be reviewing the budget that will be sent to the Governor for him to review and hopefully present to the legislature in January 2000. Chair White remarked that he worked very closely with Dr. Desrochers and the Chancellor in the creation of the budget and he felt that it was well done and represents the Chancellor’s best judgements about important budget themes and strategies as they relate to the overall strategic plan of the Board. He was satisfied that the recommendations that would be presented at this meeting were thoroughly researched and analyzed. With that, he turned the meeting over to Chancellor Portch.

Chancellor Portch explained that there would be several people involved in this budget presentation to the Board, including Dr. Desrochers; Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs James L. Muyskens; Presidents Lisa A. Rossbacher (Southern Polytechnic State University [”SPSU”]), Carlton E. Brown (Savannah State University [”SSU”]), and Peter J. Sireno (Darton College [”Darton”]); Dr. Karen Holbrook, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost (the University of Georgia [”UGA”]); Dr. Matthew K. Kluger, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies (the Medical College of Georgia [”MCG”]); and Student Advisory Council (“SAC”) President John M. Fuchko III. The various people involved in this presentation were indicative of the team approach the staff used in creating the budget.

For the benefit of the new Regents in particular, the Chancellor wanted to explain the budget cycle. At this meeting, the Board is to review and approve the fiscal year 2001 budget request to be forwarded to the Governor’s Office. In January 2000, the Governor will recommend the budget request to the General Assembly. The Chancellor noted that during the process with the legislature, there is a great deal of give and take in the form of appropriations committees hearings and subhearings. In January and February, the System budget staff will have discussions with the System institutions. In March, the legislature will approve the fiscal year 2001 State budget. In April, the Board will approve the fiscal year 2001 budget allocations of State appropriations to the institutions. Finally, in June 2000, the System’s fiscal year 2001 budget recommendations will be approved by the Board. Between June and September, the budget staff will again develop the next fiscal year’s budget.

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

The membership of the Presidential Advisory Committee is rotated every year to get the best representation of the System, explained Chancellor Portch. This year's Committee includes Presidents Hugh C. Bailey, Valdosta State University ("VSU"); Clifford M. Brock, Bainbridge College; Carl V. Patton, Georgia State University; Oscar L. Prater, Fort Valley State University ("FVSU"); Lisa A. Rossbacher, SPSU; and Peter J. Sireno, Darton. The staff rely on the presidents to help them forge both the budget entities and strategies. After the staff has met with the Presidential Advisory Committee, they meet with all of the presidents, usually sometime in July, and have discussions, agreeing to speak with one voice for the System's budget.

Chancellor Portch remarked that the budget process is a lot like white water rafting, because just as the Board finishes in June 2000 with the budget it is working on at this meeting, the following week, a new group of presidents will be named to serve on the next Presidential Advisory Committee. So, it truly is a continuous annual cycle, but this is the first, most important formal step in the process. The major themes and issues in this budget include maintaining the momentum, enhancing the System's regional and national competitive position, exploring the educational use of technology, cultivating the System's role in economic development, and attracting and serving under-represented populations. The action that the staff were requesting that the Board take after this presentation was Item 1 on the agenda of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations (page 17). It is the approval of the fiscal year 2001 operating budget and capital budget requests and the fiscal year 2000 supplemental budget request. The Chancellor explained that the Governor and State officers are typically conservative with revenue projections each budget year in case there is an economic downturn. So, the first thing that will happen in the session will be an analysis of how much money is available, how much the estimate was under last year, and how much is available for the supplemental budget. The supplemental budget contains one-time expenditures that must be expended in this fiscal year. In a downturned economy, the State would not have a supplemental budget but, at the same time, might be able to negate how much negative impact there would be from a downturned economy. So, this is a wise strategy from the State's point of view and that is why there is a supplemental budget request as well. Next, the Chancellor called upon Dr. Desrochers to discuss the specifics of the budget.

Dr. Desrochers thanked Chancellor Portch. She also thanked Chair White for his time in reviewing the budget and asking complex questions. She then thanked Regent Cannestra, whose leadership of the Board will be greatly cherished just as his leadership of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations was cherished for many years. Dr. Desrochers also recognized Mr. Bowes and Ms. Nickel, who put the budget together for the Board. She thanked Ms. Sherea Timmons, Senior Administrative Coordinator, who had put together the budget PowerPoint presentation for the Board. Finally, Dr. Desrochers thanked the presidents of the institutions, who had worked as a team in the budget process.

In her presentation, Dr. Desrochers would be discussing formula funding, the redirection strategy, the enhancement strategy, the fiscal year 2000 supplemental budget request, the capital outlay budget, the major capital projects, the minor capital projects, and payback projects. She explained that the Regents' notebooks contained a detailed summary of the budget document. Every year, the System begins with a budget base in the amount of the previous year's budget, in this case, \$1.4 billion. Governor Barnes, like Governor Miller before him, has established certain guidelines for budget creation. One guideline is that 5% of the base budget should be used for redirection within the System or possibly out of the System. The budget staff asked the institutions to examine all of their priorities and to identify 5% where they can redirect funds. She said that the System hopes to be able to preserve its full 5%, \$70 million, within its budget.

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Another element of the budget is formula adjustment, explained Dr. Desrochers. This year, there is a formula adjustment of approximately \$16 million, which includes health insurance, other fringe benefits, major renovation and rehabilitation ("MRR") funds, new space funds, and a few other items. The health insurance item requires a \$2.8 million increase, and in October, the Board will be seeing the items related to that increase in terms of health insurance for the System's employees. Also included in the formula adjustment is \$5.8 million for fringe benefits, such as FICA and workers' compensation. The rates for these particular fringe benefits are set by the Department of Administrative Services, which gives the staff the data with which to create these figures. Within the \$16 million is also an increase of \$1.5 million for MRR. Dr. Desrochers explained that it has been a particular concern of this Board to see that amount grow and aid the institutions to repair the basic infrastructure and buildings they already have. Additionally, about 760,000 square feet of space have been added in the System in the last year. As a result, the System needs an additional \$3.4 million based on the formula to perform the daily maintenance and upkeep of this space to prevent the long-term problems that result from lack of upkeep. Adding the \$16 million adjustment to approximately \$33 million in budget enhancements brings the total requested budget increase to approximately \$49 million. The enhancements section of the budget would be further explained by Dr. Muyskens and a number of presidents and a vice president who were involved in the budget process. Dr. Desrochers noted that the Governor's second guideline, in addition to the 5% redirection, is that the System is permitted to ask for up to 4% of its base budget for enhancements, enrichment, strategic initiatives, etc. This year, the total enhancement request of \$33 million is only 2.4% of the base budget. So, it is a modest request. The base budget of \$1.4 billion plus the requested increase of \$49 million brings the total fiscal year 2001 budget request to approximately \$1.45 billion. Dr. Desrochers then turned the floor over to Dr. Muyskens.

Dr. Muyskens thanked Dr. Desrochers. He reminded the Regents that the theme of the budget is to continue the momentum as well as make good investments. This theme is most vividly illustrated by the items in the budget enhancements: technology (Georgia Global Learning Online for Business & Education ["Georgia GLOBE"], technology master planning, Connecting Students & Services, Georgia Library Learning Online ["GALILEO"], Electronic Crossroads, Connecting Teachers & Technology), the Georgia Eminent Scholars Program, investing in historically black universities, investing in UGA and MCG biomedical sciences, Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ["ICAPP"] rural economic development, South Georgia's regional engineering programs, and the Hispanic Task Force recommendations. Dr. Muyskens then called upon President Rossbacher to discuss technology.

President Rossbacher thanked Dr. Muyskens. She remarked that the Board of Regents' guiding principles address issues of quality in and access to the University System. The Board has also adopted technology principles as a vehicle to accomplish the Board's vision for the System. The principles are categorized to address expanding access, enhancing learning, enriching opportunities, and effective financing and innovative governance. These principles guide the System's fiscal year 2001 budget request in the area of technology. The budget proposals were developed through numerous conversations with System presidents and information technology staff both on the campuses and at the Central Office. President Rossbacher explained that the extent of the impact of the technology projects will range in scope from global, such as Georgia GLOBE, to the individual campuses as local networks are upgraded to become more effective and efficient. The entire technology plan for the next year begins with the technology master plan. It takes advantage of the economy of scale, coordination, and the collective wisdom of the University System in planning for the common technological future. It will not only provide a plan for the System, but it will also **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

be linked to and coordinated with specific academic, fiscal, and physical plans on each campus. President Rossbacher asserted that the most important thing in technology today is bandwidth. She explained that a proper analogy to bandwidth is pipelines. A small cottage in the country probably only needs a very narrow diameter pipeline for water and sewage. However, a huge community with a very dense population needs a much larger diameter pipeline to meet the demand. Bandwidth is the electronic equivalent of that pipeline. As the System increases its use of technology, it needs to increase its capability. So, this is an important consideration for the System. The technology initiative for increased bandwidth is listed in the Regents' budget as the Campus Electronic Crossroads and Local Campus Network Upgrade. This capability is needed throughout the System to fully use available resources and to expand its capability to provide distance education. GALILEO is an ongoing effort to increase the availability of information through access rather than through ownership. The next phase for fiscal year 2001 is a digital collection of frequently used materials to provide a strong support for instruction throughout the System. Supporting Georgia GLOBE provides direct savings to students as the University System increases access online for full-fledged degree programs. An aspect of Georgia GLOBE that is needed for its full success will be providing student services online. The full range of support for students online will mean that they have access to everything they need on campus without having to actually come to the campus. Another piece of the technology master plan is instructional technology development for faculty and staff. This will be an important contribution to the quality of students' educational experience whether it is happening on campus or at a distance. In closing, President Rossbacher reiterated that all of the initiatives address the technology principles that the Board approved in April 1999.

Dr. Muyskens added that the Board would be discussing the technology master plan the next day at the full Board meeting. He would now be discussing the Georgia Eminent Scholars Program, which was established by the General Assembly in 1986. The objective of the program is to provide funding for endowed chairs under the University System of Georgia Eminent Scholars Trust Fund. The program has experienced enormous success in bringing exceptional talent to the System, he stated. It matches private funds raised by the institutions with State funds, making it possible for the System to have endowed chairs. The total amount for any endowed chair must be \$1 million. This time around, 15 institutions have raised the funds for their chairs. Dr. Muyskens referred to the full list of these chairs in the Regents' budget materials and remarked that it is very impressive. He further remarked that this is a remarkably effective investment and a great partnership between the System and the State, and he stressed the long-term effect the program will have on the various departments at the institutions. In closing, Dr. Muyskens introduced President Brown of SSU, who would be discussing investing in historically black institutions.

President Brown thanked Dr. Muyskens and explained that this budget enhancement item is a strategic investment in the three historically black institutions in the System to enable them to reposition themselves for the future and to provide a greater level of service and marketability within the State. The investment would take place in basically three categories: star academic programs, institutional infrastructure, and capacity building. Star academic programs are strategic efforts to enhance and develop academic programs within each of the institutions that will also lead them to higher levels of professional accreditation at both the undergraduate and graduate levels as well as some enhancements in science and engineering. In the category of institutional infrastructure, several issues are related to the upgrade of technology and upgrading institutions' capacity to utilize and advance their own technology needs for the improvement of student services. In capacity building, the effort is about broadening and diversifying markets and increasing the attractiveness of the institutions to a greater diversity of students. There is also some effort to enhance the **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

capacity to secure external funding and to improve the level of student services as well as to address a number of the pipeline issues. Additionally, for FVSU, which is the only historically black land grant institution in the System, this initiative includes a \$1.5 million match of the federal investment. All of

this is benchmarked very heavily, and each aspect of this program is laid out with distinct goals and clear outcome measures. The institutions will use these efforts to diversify the student populations and to achieve the institutional enrollment targets. In closing, President Brown thanked the Regents.

Dr. Muyskens explained that the next item on the enhancements list is a partnership between UGA and MCG. Dr. Muyskens acknowledged that President Michael F. Adams of UGA and President Francis J. Tedesco of MCG were present at the meeting. He noted that this particular initiative came out of the efforts of the Blue Ribbon Commission of MCG. He then called upon President Tedesco to introduce someone to the Board.

President Tedesco introduced Dr. Kluger to the Regents and remarked that the UGA-MCG biomedical sciences initiative, which followed the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendation on promoting inter-institutional research within the University System, will enhance existing research strengths by combining faculty in areas of mutual strength and interest, which could potentially result in higher federal and other non-federal funding opportunities in the future.

Dr. Muyskens thanked President Tedesco and then called on Dr. Holbrook to speak.

Dr. Holbrook remarked that health is one of the most important social concerns of the nation and the State. This is underscored by the level of federal funding for health-related research. Over the past several years, the National Institute of Health ("NIH") has increased its budget to nearly \$16 billion. The percentage of that budget that comes to the State of Georgia, however, could possibly be increased by developing a partnership between these two strong research institutions to go forward in collaboration in biomedical research. The mission of the cooperative biomedical and health sciences initiative is that it will bring together basic scientists, social scientists, and clinicians from UGA and MCG to carry out research directed toward understanding, recognizing, treating, curing, and preventing human disease. The partnership will foster, nurture, and advance research, teaching, and service in areas related to the health and welfare of the citizens of the State and at national and international levels. The program will be very comprehensive beginning at the very basic level of biomolecular sciences where both institutions already have very strong programs and proceeding to an area where the institutions will develop a number of programs in public health and health policy. The initiative will work in both the biomedical arena and the public health arena, bringing in behavioral and social sciences in addition to core laboratory sciences. This initiative will be more than just a partnership between two institutions. It will be a Statewide network including other entities such as the State and federal governments and private industry. The program will be strengthened by taking advantage of these entities and collaborative projects. So, while the initiative will begin as a partnership, it will ultimately become a network. It will also ultimately have a technology transfer component and help in the economic development of the State. The kinds of mechanisms that have been or will be put in place for the institutions to work together are a interdisciplinary, inter-institutional grants program; a dual mentorship graduate program; a postdoctoral program; joint lectureship symposia/workshops; teaching exchanges scholar-in-residence programs; an undergraduate research program; a technology transfer liaison; and strategic faculty recruitments. In closing, Dr. Holbrook stated that both institutions look forward to this partnership and to reaching out to others in a network environment.

#### **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

President Sireno next approached the Board. He explained that he chaired the ICAPP subcommittee on rural economic development. The rural counties in Georgia do not enjoy the same economic opportunities as the metropolitan areas experience, and they lag in several economic indicators. For example, they have the largest number of single-parent households, they have the largest percentage of

unemployment, and their per capita income is way below the State average. To address this problem, the subcommittee proposed five rural economic development programs that will complement the Rural Economic Development Commission's strategies, that will best utilize the University System's assets, and that will bring together the resources of Georgia's business, government, and academic sectors, as well as the communities and citizens while utilizing the most efficient and effective technology available. The first program is the Jumpstart Program, which the Board approved last year as a pilot program. The enhancement budget is requesting \$336,000 for continuation of this program. The program provides laptop computers, software, and one year of training for the lead economic development agency within rural counties. Last year, 10 of 53 tier-one counties were served by the program. This year, the other 43 counties will be served. The Georgia Institute of Technology as well as UGA teamed in this proposal. The second program is a companion program called E-Commerce/E-Business in Rural Georgia. It is a one-year project that will build E-commerce capabilities among Georgia's businesses, and it will build upon the partnerships that the System already has with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, the Georgia Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism, and the Department of Technical and Adult Education. President Sireno stated that this program will help provide a level playing field for the small businesses that compete with larger businesses. The third program is marketing for the Georgia Career Information System ("GCIS"), which was developed but has not been utilized to its full potential. The purpose of this enhancement request is to market GCIS to more businesses, educators, and citizens so they will be aware of the system and the job opportunities available through it. The fourth program is the ICAPP Rural Economic Development Program ("REDP") and its leadership initiative. This program will provide funding to support the REDP and to develop Southwest Georgia's leaders and utilize Atlanta's leadership institute model. The fifth and final program is the ICAPP Rural Economic Development Region Pilot Project, for which the request is \$945,000. It is a pilot program designed to leverage the assets of the System to benefit rural economic development in one of Georgia's rural regions. That region will be selected based on a competitive process and will be selected on criteria that will determine how much collaboration is occurring, the partnerships that are being developed, and what proposal is the most effective and most efficient with regard to the results-oriented process within the proposal. President Sireno then stepped down.

Dr. Muyskens stated that the next item to be discussed was South Georgia's regional engineering initiative. He reminded the Regents that in June 1998, they charged the staff with creating this program, and so much has happened since then. Phase I has essentially been completed in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration. In the budget request, the initiative is being moved into phase II. In particular, this means renovating and providing computing equipment for labs at Georgia Southern University, SSU, and Armstrong Atlantic State University.

The last initiative in the enhancements that Dr. Muyskens wanted to discuss came from the "Report of the Hispanic Task Force" and its recommendations, which the Board adopted in August 1999. He noted that both President Rossbacher and Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning were present at the meeting and would be happy to answer any questions the Regents might have. The funds being requested in the budget enhancements are for preparing more teachers, social workers, and counselors with language skills and cultural understanding so that they can work with the growing population **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

of Latino students in the State. Cultural and language training is also planned for University System personnel to enhance their ability to work in the Hispanic community. Finally, outreach activities will be funded, including a marketing program to encourage young Latinos to stay in high school and to consider post-secondary education. Dr. Muyskens then turned the floor over to Dr. Desrochers.

Dr. Desrochers explained that there were two final elements to the budget presentation: the supplemental

budget and the capital budget. There are four basic components to the supplemental budget. The first component follows what Dr. Muyskens and President Rossbacher had said with respect to technology; those costs that are one-time costs that the System could request the State to fund in the current budget year are categorized under instructional technology in the supplemental budget request and are detailed in the Regents' budget document. The next item was a very important piece relating to the fiscal issues at the MCG hospital and clinics. It is a one-time request for \$5 million to ensure that the hospital and clinics have adequate operating funds. The third component of the supplemental budget relates to UGA. There are a number of issues regarding environmental hazardous sites; two of them are on track for remediation. Within the supplemental budget request, \$3.4 million is allotted to those sites at UGA. Dr. Desrochers asserted that this is a wise strategy to aggressively address this situation. The fourth and final component is equipment for six major capital projects. Last year, when the legislature and Governor funded the System's major capital projects, they chose to fund the construction but not the equipment. In the supplemental budget, the System is requesting approximately \$13 million to equip those buildings, which will be built in the next year to 18 months.

Next, Dr. Desrochers discussed the capital budget request for fiscal year 2001. In June 1999, the Board heard presentations by the System presidents and voted on the major capital projects to be submitted to the State in this budget. They also voted on the payback projects to be submitted. The third item in the capital budget request is the minor capital projects list. Dr. Desrochers remarked that the minors list is a very important part of the overall capital budget, and there are great advantages to doing these projects, which range between \$1 million and \$5 million and include renovations and infrastructure issues. The minors list was detailed for the Regents in their budget document, but she highlighted a few projects as examples. For instance, Georgia College & State University has a need for a major central chiller plant replacement, a \$3.9 million project. Also, in the acute category, VSU's Nevins Hall renovation project can add significant upgraded space for instruction at \$4.5 million. Finally, the C list includes a number of projects, such as Atlanta Metropolitan College's performing arts and continuing education building construction and South Georgia College's ("SGC") classroom gymnasium facilities renovation. The latter project is related to the goal of the Board to help SGC create a better environment for students at that campus. Dr. Desrochers noted that the gymnasium dates to 1936. She then turned the floor back to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Portch remarked that the Board had heard from presidents and staff during the course of this presentation, but he had also invited Mr. Fuchko, Chair of SAC, to give a student's perspective on this budget request. Because it is fundamentally for the students that the Board makes the budget request, the Chancellor thought it was appropriate to hear from a student representative.

Mr. Fuchko thanked Chancellor Portch and greeted the Regents. He had looked over the budget document and wanted to emphasize the issue of technology. He stressed that this is something that students take advantage of all the time in computer labs and other places. He thanked the Regents on behalf of the students for the support they have given in this area. When the budget is presented to the legislature, the SAC is committed to helping support the Board, particularly because of its emphasis on technology.

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

The Chancellor remarked that he felt the students should have the last word in this presentation to the Board.

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

Regent Leebern asked Dr. Holbrook and President Tedesco what they expect in leveraging the cooperative agreement they have.



President Tedesco responded that UGA does very well in the area of research, despite the competitive disadvantage that UGA does not have a medical school or an engineering school. Currently, the NIH is the biggest source of funding available. As a cooperative effort, MCG and UGA could see a significant increase in research funding. Even a small percentage increase would translate into a great increase in monies to Georgia, and that does not include the spin-off money that could be anticipated from that increased funding. This funding would be the basis for an economic spin-off in the start-up companies and collaboration this initiative would create. This would have a tremendous effect on the State as well, he said, in terms of infrastructure for new jobs.

Dr. Holbrook added that a key word in all of this is inter-disciplinary. She noted that inter-disciplinary projects often win funding from the NIH. That means that molecular biologists will be working with mathematicians, engineers, social biologists, and ethicists to solve problems together quickly in a collaborative effort. It is important for the System to put money into leveraging this kind of initiative by putting together these inter-disciplinary teams. While UGA has the basic scientists, social scientists, and mathematicians, it does not have the clinicians. The interdisciplinary approach is what this initiative is about.

Chancellor Portch noted that another exciting element of this initiative is that it involves undergraduates in this research. For UGA to have the opportunity for honors students to work in a lab with someone working on a cutting-edge medical research project is a tremendous opportunity that most undergraduates do not have and it gives them an advantage when they go on to graduate school. In that way, this is not just a research project, but also an undergraduate education experience as well.

Chair White asked if there were any further questions, and there were none. He commended the staff and the presidents for their hard work on the budget. He then asked for a motion to approve the fiscal year 2001 operating and capital budget request as well as the supplemental budget request.

Regent Leebern made the motion, and Regent Jones seconded it. Chair White then took a vote. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the budget requests.

Seeing that there was no further business to come before the Committee, Chair White recessed the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole.

Chair Cannestra remarked that the meeting was very good and thanked everyone involved in the budget process. He then recessed the Board into its regular Committee meetings. After Committee meetings, the Board would be recessed until 9 a.m. Wednesday, September 8.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, September 8, 1999 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Kenneth W. Cannestra, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Cannestra, were Regents Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Joel O. Wooten, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey.

## **INVOCATION**

The invocation was given on Wednesday, September 8, 1999 by Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr.

## **RESOLUTION**

Next, Chair Cannestra asked that a resolution be added to the minutes to Vice Chairman J. Tom Coleman upon the death of his wife, Mary Coleman, on Wednesday, September 1, 1999. With motion properly made, duly seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the addition of this resolution, which reads:

On behalf of the entire Board of Regents, Tom Coleman's second "family," I would like Regent Coleman to know that we grieve with him at this time and offer our heartfelt and sincere condolences to him and his family.

s/ KENNETH W. CANNESTRA  
Chair, Board of Regents

## **ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, September 8, 1999 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. and Juanita P. Baranco had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

## **INTRODUCTION OF NEW PRESIDENT OF GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**

Chair Cannestra next called upon Chancellor Portch to introduce the new president of Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”).

The Chancellor first thanked Dr. Harry S. Carter, the new Provost and Academic Vice President at the Citadel, for his former role as Acting President of GSOU. He was also Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at GSOU for many years. He is an alumni of GSOU, and his family has given generously in the creation of an eminent chair. He actually had two stints as Acting President over a decade apart. Dr. Carter was always a good citizen of the University System. He could be relied upon to do Systemwide projects and to bring a System perspective to some complex tasks. Last year’s service as Acting President was one of special importance. Dr. Carter brought the campus and the community together, and he positioned GSOU superbly for a new president. Chancellor Portch remarked that Dr. Carter is one of the “truly good soldiers of the System” as well as a product of the System. He asked the Board to join him in thanking Dr. Carter for all he has done for the System.

Chancellor Portch remarked that the search for a president was an extremely successful one done in a very open climate to bring the community and the campus together in the process. The GSOU Presidential Search Committee was chaired by Dr. Luther T. (Trey) Denton, Associate Professor of Marketing at GSOU. The Chancellor remarked that marketing is an extremely good background to bring to a search process. Too often, search and screening committees spend all of their time screening candidates and not much time searching for candidates, whereas the search part is actually more important. Dr. Denton was involved in a marketing plan for GSOU and is heading up the university’s strategic planning efforts this year, and his focus has been on marketing the institution, the region, and the opportunity. That special perspective was enormously important, said the Chancellor. Dr. Denton has received awards for his excellence in instruction, he lived in Hong Kong from 1989 to 1991, and international marketing is a particular area of his expertise. Chancellor Portch lauded his job chairing the Committee. He added that Dr. Denton’s wife, Kathryn, is the education coordinator of the Raptor Center and that the Dentons have three children, four horses, one cat, three dogs, two snakes, and two red-tailed hawks. He then asked the Regents to join him in thanking Dr. Denton for chairing the Committee.

President Bruce F. Grube comes with a strong academic pedigree with degrees from the University of California - Berkeley and the University of Texas at Austin, two very fine institutions. He served as President of St. Cloud State University in Minnesota, Provost of the University of Southern Colorado, and Provost and Academic Vice President of California State Polytechnic University, where he had also served as Associate Vice President of Planning and a Faculty Member. The Chancellor remarked that his experience was a case study for his new position. He brings expertise and strength, as well as a commitment to being part of the System team. GSOU has a great opportunity going forward to create its identity for the future and to market that identity. The Chancellor remarked that the theme for his presidency has been well set by the football coach. The team had a 76 to 0 victory the past weekend, and when asked about it, the coach remarked, “We’ve got to get better. If we are going to compete in the leagues we have to compete in, we have to improve in specific areas.” Chancellor Portch said that this is the challenge for President Grube at GSOU. It is a fine institution, but it must improve and keep growing in quality and service to the region, and President Grube has the ability to accomplish this. The Chancellor noted that on his visit to St. Cloud, he met with Mrs. Grube and could see that her contributions both to the community and the institution were enormous. She was the “secret weapon” in recruiting President Grube, as the Committee talked mainly to her about climate, sailing, and other good Southern qualities, because she is a Southerner herself. He welcomed her to the University System as well and then called upon President Grube to address the Board.

## **INTRODUCTION OF NEW PRESIDENT OF GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**

President Grube greeted the Regents and stated that it was a pleasure and a privilege to address the Chancellor and the Board. The University System of Georgia is now recognized as one of the best in the nation, and that recognition was one of the most attractive things about this opportunity. This decade has brought a fortunate confluence of the right leadership in the System, the legislature, and the Governor's Office to move higher education in Georgia to its rightful place in the national forefront. President Grube said it is now his good fortune to move to his next level of professional experience in the University System. He stated that there was nowhere else he would rather be and nowhere else he would rather go. In the next decade, the System will see even greater things, he added. President Grube was honored and humbled that the Board sees him as a president who can contribute to the quest for excellence that the System has set before itself. He pledged to honor the Regents' confidence by doing his utmost to follow their example at GSOU. His vision, he said, is completely congruent with the Board's. He wants to take GSOU to its next level of excellence, ranked as one of the best comprehensive regional universities in the nation, benefitting one of the best university systems in the country. It was inconceivable to him that other Southern states would have comparably comprehensive universities in the top tier of national rankings, such as Virginia's James Madison University and North Carolina's Appalachian State University, and yet Georgia would have none. He asserted that Georgia should be there, GSOU will be there, and it will be there in the next decade. His game plan for the institution is to work hard with the University System, the Board, the Chancellor, and other institutions. GSOU will be a team player, the position will be comprehensive regional university, and it will strive to become a national all-star playing that position in the University System of Georgia. After two months and one week on the job, President Grube was satisfied that GSOU has the assets to be that rising star. It has the comprehensiveness of programs, the critical mass of students to support those programs, the array of national accreditations to demonstrate quality, an outstanding faculty with a strong teaching ethic and genuine devotion to the students' success, a growing base of private funding that is building the endowment of the university that is absolutely essential to realize the margin of excellence in the next century, a commitment to uplifting the region, and a dedication which grows from its heart and history as a rural South Georgia university that achieves Statewide success beyond the dare of dreams. These great dreams are embraced on one of the most naturally beautiful campuses anywhere, he added. President Grube acknowledged that GSOU has a great deal of work ahead in preparation for the future. As president, his challenge is to organize its considerable assets in a plan that is both strategic and systematic in advancing the university in the direction of quality. That begins with the academic profile of the student body. In the first phase of his administration, President Grube has identified six platforms upon which to build a comprehensive strategic plan: academic distinction; a continued strong emphasis on student-centered values; cutting-edge technology; international, multicultural opportunities for students; productive public and private partnerships, including active participation in economic development; and continuing to build the physical environment that provides the best possible place for people to teach and to learn. He added that these themes are currently being developed in campus discussions, but that he hoped to have other opportunities to elaborate in greater detail at a later date. In closing, President Grube said, "No institution, no university ever became great without expecting to be great, and we have great expectations for Georgia Southern University." GSOU expects to bring great pride to the System, the State, and the citizens of Georgia. He thanked the Regents for the opportunity to be a part of a system that is greater than the sum of its parts and said he was honored by the confidence they have given him to contribute to the System through GSOU.

Chair Cannestra thanked President Grube and welcomed him to Georgia and the University System.

### **INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSIONER RUSS HINTON, STATE AUDITOR**

Chair Cannestra remarked that the Regents certainly remember former State Auditor Claude Vickers, particularly those who served on the Audit Committee, as well as the fine contributions he made and the

strong relationship that was established. At this meeting, Chair Cannestra had the pleasure of introducing Mr. Vicker's successor, Mr. Russ Hinton. Mr. Hinton was appointed to the position of State Auditor by Governor Roy Barnes in June 1999. Chair Cannestra wanted the Regents to have the opportunity to meet him and hear a few words from him. The Department of Audits and Accounts (the "Department") has expanded in both size and responsibility to include financial, performance, and specialized audits for Georgia's State agencies, colleges and universities, and local boards of education. Prior to his appointment as State Auditor, Mr. Hinton served as the director of the Professional Practice Division of the Department. Mr. Hinton is a native Georgian who graduated with honors from the University of Georgia in 1974. In closing, Chair Cannestra welcomed Mr. Hinton to this meeting of the Board of Regents.

Mr. Hinton thanked the Regents for the opportunity to speak to them and said that he looks forward to a continued and prosperous coordination of efforts with the Board working through the Audit Committee. For several years, the Department has been very closely aligned with work that Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark has done in putting his internal audit plan together, and the Department coordinated its efforts with the audit efforts of the Board of Regents to come to agreements on audit findings. The Department has some particular challenges ahead with the proposal by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("GASB") that they are going to change the accounting model for colleges, and that comes at a particularly inopportune time in that the Board of Regents is now moving to a new accounting system throughout the University System. Mr. Hinton has been very pleased to work with Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers since his appointment with regard to working out positions to make their feelings known with regard to the new accounting model to GASB. In closing, Mr. Hinton stated that he looks forward to a long and fruitful relationship with the Board of Regents.

Chair Cannestra thanked Mr. Hinton for speaking and stated that the Board also looks forward to working with him.

## **PRESENTATION OF 35-YEAR UNIVERSITY SYSTEM SERVICE AWARD TO JUDY WILDER**

Chair Cannestra next called upon Chancellor Portch to make a special presentation.

The Chancellor said, “Mr. Chairman, Chancellors come and Chancellors go, but underneath Chancellors are always people who give tremendous service.” He stated that the support staff do not get heralded often enough, but at this meeting, he wanted to recognize an employee who has been with the University System for 35 years. Ms. Judy Wilder graduated in 1964 from West Georgia College, which is now the State University of West Georgia (“SUWG”). She began her career with the University System of Georgia in July 1964 at SUWG and then joined the Board of Regents facilities office staff in July 1971. She assumed the position of Contracts Administrator in November 1989 and was promoted to Senior Contracts Administrator in June 1998. Judy’s daughter, Sheree Srader, was a HOPE Scholar and is a recent graduate of SUWG. She, too, is currently employed in the Board of Regents Central Office in the Office of Human and External Affairs. The Chancellor stated, “We will have many more Chancellors come and go while there are Wilders at work in the System.” In closing, he asked Ms. Wilder to come forward to be recognized for her quality of service as well as her length of service.

Next, Chancellor Portch introduced Dr. Madlyn Hanes, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor. He reminded the Regents that Drs. Sidney Bremer, Sharon James, and Martha T. Nesbitt had formerly consecutively been in this position. For the last two years, he has not had anyone in this capacity because he was waiting for the opportunity to bring Dr. Hanes on board. She has an enormous reputation and degrees from the University of Florida. She has been a tenured faculty member in speech pathology and campus executive officer of the Penn State Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies. The Chancellor expressed that he was especially pleased to welcome her to his office and asked her to stand and be recognized. He noted that Dr. Hanes is married to President Michael L. Hanes at Georgia Southwestern State University.

Finally, the Chancellor introduced Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Director of Yamacraw Educational Programs. Dr. Papp is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Dartmouth College with a doctorate from the University of Miami. In 1973, he joined the faculty of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) and has served in several senior administrative positions there. He was also selected as a Distinguished Professor at GIT and also served as Interim President at Southern Polytechnic State University. Chancellor Portch explained that the Yamacraw Project, Governor Barnes’ high-technology initiative, is vitally crucial to the new knowledge economy of the State, to the success of the Barnes administration, and to the System. So, the project required someone of Dr. Papp’s skills to head up the effort. He has already made tremendous strides in working with the institutions involved in the project. The Chancellor remarked that he feels very confident about the success of the Yamacraw Project under the leadership of Dr. Papp. He then asked Dr. Papp to stand and be recognized.

The Board then moved on to the Committee reports.

## **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, September 7, 1999 at 10:00 a.m. in room 7005. Committee members in attendance were Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Vice Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, and Regents Connie Cater, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, and Joel O. Wooten. Mr. Larry Whitaker, Deputy Director of Financial Audit Operations at the State Department of Audits also attended this Committee meeting. Chair Howell reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed five items, none of which required action. One item was withdrawn from the agenda before the meeting. Those items were as follows:

### **1. Historical Overview**

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers presented a historical overview of the Audit Committee for the benefit of its new members. In 1995, Chancellor Portch and Dr. Desrochers discussed strengthening the audit function of the University System with the Regents' leadership. In 1996, the Committee was established during Regent Juanita P. Baranco's tenure as Chair of the Board of Regents. The University System Audit Charter was adopted by the Board. In 1997, the audit staff developed its annual plan concept based on risk analysis. In 1998, the Committee approved the audit plan for fiscal year 1999 based on risk assessment and priorities. In 1999, a new University System auditor was recruited, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark. Mr. Stark emphasized refining audit findings, and he developed the code rating system to improve the reporting of audit findings.

Dr. Desrochers also explained that the audit function of the University System is a three-way partnership between the campus auditors, the Board of Regents auditors, and the State auditors. The goals of the audit function are to improve the financial and other business practices within the System; to give the Board, the Chancellor, and the Senior Vice Chancellors a window on management at different levels within institutions; and to uncover fraud, theft, or other illegal behavior in relation to System business. Through systematic and risk-based auditing, the System can reduce the likelihood of the latter. Audits examine Board policy compliance; State, federal, and other rules, regulations, and laws' compliance; relevant Government Accounting Standards Board's accounting requirements; conformance with generally accepted best business practices; and internal controls for financial integrity.

### **2. Fiscal Year 2000 Audit Plan**

Mr. Stark reported to the Committee on the development of the annual audit plan. During phase I, the staff select the institutions to be audited. In phase II, the staff determine the scope of the audit coverage. In phase III, the audit resources are allocated. Mr. Stark discussed the specifics of the audit plan and explained which institutions would have audits, as opposed to reviews, to ensure that the staff examine carefully all of the high-risk areas.

In addition to auditing, the staff also perform advisory services. For instance, this year, they are performing a special review of the year 2000 ("Y2K") computer problem and the System's compliance with Y2K standards. The System is also contracting with consulting companies in this effort.

## **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

### **3. Summary of Audit Findings — Database**

Mr. Stark explained that the staff have created a database of all audit findings of the System beginning with fiscal year 1999. This will allow the staff to monitor audit findings and observe changes in them to ensure that the issues brought to the Board are accurately represented and have proper follow-up.

### **4. Update on State Audit Findings, Savannah State University**

Withdrawn.

### **5. Update on State Audit Findings and Outside Consultant Study, Fort Valley State University**

Mr. Stark updated the Committee on the audit findings at Fort Valley State University, which was ranked a Code 5 in fiscal year 1999. Code 5 indicates that there were several significant findings or one or more major findings. It could also indicate that there are poor internal controls, significant risks for noncompliance with regulations, and/or serious violations of laws. As a result of the audit findings that were presented to the Committee in May 1999, an independent consultant was hired to review the function of the financial aid office and other controls. The report from the consultant is anticipated to be presented at the next Committee meeting in November 1999. The Office of the Inspector General is also reviewing the case.

### **6. Update on State and Board of Regents Audit Findings, Southern Polytechnic State University**

Mr. Stark updated the Committee on the audit findings at Southern Polytechnic State University, which was ranked a Code 4 in fiscal year 1999. Code 4 indicates that there were several notable findings or few significant findings and no major findings. It also indicates that controls were weak in one or more areas and that noncompliance with regulations may put the institution at risk. While Code 4 indicates that there may have been a violation of laws, this violation is not deemed serious. Mr. Stark noted that there had been improvement in reconciling accounts receivable and that President Lisa A. Rossbacher has been personally involved in rectifying the situation.



## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, September 7, 1999 at approximately 1:55 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Glenn S. White, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Chair White reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed three items, one of which was reviewed by the Committee of the Whole and all of which required action. Four agenda items regarding health insurance were withdrawn before the meeting. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Fiscal Year 2001 Operating and Capital Budget Request**

Approved: The Board of Regents approved the fiscal year 2001 operating and capital budget request. (The budget request document is on file with the Office of Capital Resources.)

This item was considered by the Committee on Business and Finance Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 2 to 9.)

### **2. Acceptance of Gifts, Kennesaw State University**

Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of Kennesaw State University ("KSU") gifts-in-kind of \$1,100,000 from the following donors:

<u>Donor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Department</u>
Goldkist	\$ 100,000	Mathematics/Science
Ann and John Clendenin	\$1,000,000	Mathematics/Science

Background: KSU received notification of two gifts, both intended for use in connection with construction of the new computer science and mathematics building. The agenda for the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities contains two items related to these donations. One concerns the expansion of the project scope to take advantage of donated funds, the other concerns naming of the facility itself. Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents.

### **3. Approval of Tuition for the Executive Master of Science in International Logistics at the Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the tuition for the proposed executive master of science in international logistics at the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") at \$50,000 for the 18-month program.

Background: Pending approval from the Committee on Education, Research and Extension, the 18-month, 30-semester-hour executive master of science in international logistics is proposed to

come online in January 2000. The requested tuition is \$50,000. This fee will support the following expenses: instruction costs, administration of the program, equipment and facility costs at GIT and abroad in Europe and Asia, course materials (books, cases, software, etc.), room and board expenses for the 5 two-week residences, and a COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

**3. Approval of Tuition for the Executive Master of Science in International Logistics at the Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)**

portion of the travel expenses associated with the foreign residences. It is estimated that first-year enrollment will be 30 students and total tuition revenue will be \$1,500,000.

When compared with programs delivered in a similar format, such as Duke University's GEMBA program and other prestigious executive master of business administration ("M.B.A.") programs, tuition cost is consistent if not lower than such programs. Other executive M.B.A. programs in the University System include Georgia State University (\$38,000) and Kennesaw State University (\$26,500). However, of the 141 executive M.B.A. programs included in the 1997 Executive M.B.A. Council Membership Directory, 33 charged tuition of \$45,000 or more. For example, Duke University's GEMBA program costs \$85,000 per participant and follows a very similar international residence format.

**4. Approval of Health Benefits Administrative Services Only Contract With Blue Cross Blue Shield**

Withdrawn

**5. Approval of the Dental Benefits Administrative Services Only Contract With Blue Cross Blue Shield**

Withdrawn

**6. Approval of Health Maintenance Organization Contracts**

Withdrawn

**7. Approval of Unicare Renewal Contract**

Withdrawn

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, September 7, 1999 at approximately 2:05 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Charles H. Jones, Vice Chair Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Chair Jones reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 10 of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Naming of Fred L. "Bud" Suddath Courtyard, Georgia Institute of Technology**

**Approved:** The Board approved the naming of the west courtyard of the recently completed bioengineering and bioscience building at the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") the "Fred L. 'Bud' Suddath Courtyard" in honor of Fred L. "Bud" Suddath.

**Background:** The courtyard is a part of the bioengineering and bioscience building scheduled for opening October 12, 1999. The lease of this building was approved by the Board in August 1999.

Biography of the life and contributions of Fred L. "Bud" Suddath.

- Dr. Suddath received his bachelor's degree (1965) and doctorate (1970) from GIT in chemistry.
- In 1985, he returned to GIT as Professor of Chemistry and Director of the Supercomputer Support Group within the Office of Computing Services. His efforts there ultimately led to a set of protein growth experiments aboard the space shuttle in 1990.
- In 1989, Dr. Suddath accepted the position of Vice President for Information Technology and maintained an active research group in the School of Chemistry and Biochemistry. His administrative and technical success led to his selection as Executive Assistant to the President in early 1992.
- Throughout his academic career, Dr. Suddath received accolades for his teaching and student advising. His personality was just as important to his success as his intellectual brilliance. His unassuming friendliness and sense of humor gave him an air of approachability that made people want to be close to him. His unselfishness and willingness to cooperate were worthy of special remark. He personified the best of GIT: a strong work ethic, broad-based intellectual leadership, and a concern for the well being of the institute as a whole.
- Dr. Suddath was the recipient of numerous honors, awards, and recognitions. He was a member of many professional and honor societies and sat on several review panels.
- F. L. Suddath died June 17, 1992 at the age of 50.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **8. Naming of the Ann and John Clendenin Computer Science and Mathematics Building, Kennesaw State University**

Approved: The Board approved the naming of the computer science and mathematics building at Kennesaw State University the “Ann and John Clendenin Computer Science and Mathematics Building” in honor of Ann and John Clendenin.

Background: During his career of 41 years in the telecommunications industry, Mr. Clendenin worked for Illinois Bell, Pacific Northwest Bell, AT&T, Southern Bell, and, finally, for BellSouth, where he served as chairman and chief executive officer from 1984 through 1996 and as chairman through 1997.

With active spousal participation from Mrs. Clendenin, Mr. Clendenin was always involved in community affairs. During the 16 years they lived in Atlanta, he served variously as chairman of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the United Way Campaign and the United Way Board, chairman of the Woodruff Arts Center, president of the Atlanta Council of the Boy Scouts, and co-chairman of the 1994 Atlanta Super Bowl.

On a national scale, Mr. Clendenin served as chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the National Alliance of Business, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, national president of the Boy Scouts, national chairman of Junior Achievement, a member of the board of governors of the American Red Cross, and national chairman of the U.S. Savings Bonds Committee. In all of these involvements, Mrs. Clendenin played an active and visible support role.

Mr. Clendenin remains active in the business arena as a member of several corporate boards, including The Home Depot, Coca-Cola Enterprises, Equifax, National Service Industries, The Kroger Company, and Wachovia.

Ann and John Clendenin have created a charitable trust that focuses on supporting education.

### **3. Demolition of Buildings, Medical College of Georgia**

Approved: The Board declared Building Numbers AN – Public Safety and HE – Print Shops, on the campus of the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) to be no longer advantageously useful to MCG or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of these buildings.

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

## COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

### 3. Demolition of Buildings, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)

Background: Both buildings are vacant and described as follows:

<b>Bldg. No. and Name</b>	<b>Date Built/ Date Acquired</b>	<b>Size / Type of Construction</b>
AN – Public Safety	1950 / 1976	4,500 sq. ft. Brick and Block
HE – Print Shops	1941 / 1983	4,300 sq. ft. Brick and Block

The services that were located in these buildings have moved to the newly renovated Annex II. Building AN is on the site of the proposed health sciences building which is #13 on the Regents' priority list. Building HE is of a size and age that the cost for renovation would be prohibitive.

The appropriate Phase I Environmental Report has been completed. An underground storage tank will be removed, and site remediation will be done by the Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority at no cost to MCG.

The cost estimate for the demolition of the two buildings, including removal of asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint abatement, is \$51,000 to be paid from the institution's interest income.

After demolition, parking and landscaping improvements will be made.

### 4. Increase in Project Budget, Project No. I-56, "Classroom Expansion," Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board authorized an increase in the project budget for Project No. I-56, "Classroom Expansion," Kennesaw State University from \$4,050,000 to \$5,150,000 using private funds.

Background: The Board approved this minor capital project at the September 8-9, 1998 meeting. The original project included 28,000 gross square feet at \$107/sf. The project now includes 36,400 gross square feet at \$107/sf.

Funding for the project includes the following: State funding, fiscal year 1999 supplemental budget - \$150,000 (design funds); anticipated State bond funds fiscal year 2001 - \$3,900,000; and private funds - \$1,100,000.

The funding will allow for additional classrooms and offices for the Mathematics and Computer

Science Departments. The funding will also be used to equip the building with modern classrooms and various instructional delivery systems.

The Mathematics Department is one of the largest on campus, while the Computer Science Department is one of the fastest growing programs at Kennesaw State University. The computer science classes have grown and are 92% filled each semester. The additional instructional demands will be accommodated in the space provided by the proposed funding.

#### **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

#### **5. Increase in Project Budget, Amendment of Architectural Contract, Project No. I-49, "Alumni Development Center," the University of Georgia**

Approved: The Board authorized an increase in the project budget for Project No. I-49, "Alumni Development Center," the University of Georgia ("UGA"), from \$23 million to \$29 million using private funds.

The Board also authorized the execution of an amendment to architectural contract for Project No. I-49, "Alumni Development Center," the University of Georgia, increasing the stated cost limitation from \$16,800,000 to \$22,750,000.

Background: The Board originally approved this project at the September 8-9, 1998 meeting. The facility requested was to house the External Affairs Division, a multi-function alumni center, the administrative headquarters for the National Alumni Association, and the administrative headquarters of the UGA foundation. Many of these existing functions are housed in leased space, which will be terminated. Other functions will vacate spaces that are co-located with other university activities which will expand into the vacated space.

All funds for this project are from private sources.

The new administration has reassessed service capabilities and determined that better service to students can be provided if career planning and placement functions are part of the External Affairs Division. The program for the facility has been revised to include co-locating these functions with the remainder of the External Affairs Division. This will ensure that students, alumni, and recruiting employers have improved access to the career services that the university provides while fostering a lifelong relationship with alumni and their career development.

#### **6. Authorization of Project No. BR-30-0001, "Renovation of Fulmer Residence Hall," the Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-30-0001, "Renovation of Fulmer Residence Hall," with a total project budget of \$2 million from Georgia Institute of Technology auxiliary housing funds.

Background: The Georgia Institute of Technology's "Student Housing Comprehensive Plan - 1998" assumes one building a year will be renovated through fiscal year 2008. Eleven buildings were identified for renovation post-Olympics. These buildings did not receive upgrades prior to the Olympics. Harrison and Howell Halls were the highest priority projects and were approved in fiscal year 1998 and fiscal year 1999, respectively. The Fulmer Hall renovation is the next priority renovation project scheduled for construction in winter 2000.

Fulmer Hall was constructed in 1969. The project will involve the renovation of approximately 15,600

gross square feet. The facility has a total capacity of 60 beds. The scope of work includes mechanical, plumbing, and electrical system replacement, as well as interior finishes and furniture upgrades. The existing room style and ancillary area configuration will remain the same.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **6. Authorization of Project No. BR-30-0001, “Renovation of Fulmer Residence Hall,” the Georgia Institute of Technology** (Continued)

The total project cost is \$2 million. The fund source is the Georgia Institute of Technology, auxiliary housing. The estimated construction cost is \$1,539,000 (\$98.61/gsf).

Staff, in conjunction with Georgia Institute of Technology, will proceed with design of the project with professional engineering consultants in accordance with the building project procedure of the Board of Regents.

### **7. Demolition of Buildings, Savannah State University**

Approved: The Board declared Building Numbers 0108 - Wright Hall Dormitory, 0110 - Peacock Hall Dormitory, 0116 - Lester Hall Dormitory, 0123 - Lockette Hall Dormitory, and 0139 - Antonio Orsot Faculty Housing on the campus of Savannah State University (“SSU”) to be no longer advantageously useful to SSU or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of these buildings.

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

The demolition of these buildings is subject to completion of a Phase I Environmental Assessment indicating no significant issues. If any hazardous materials are identified, they will be properly abated prior to demolition.

Background: The buildings are described as follows:

<b>Bldg. No. and Name</b>	<b>Date Built</b>	<b>Size</b>
0108 - Wright Hall Dormitory	1955	38,000 gsf
0110 - Peacock Hall Dormitory	1967	36,000 gsf
0116 - Lester Hall Dormitory	1962	22,000 gsf
0123 - Lockette Hall Dormitory	1965	36,000 gsf
0139 - Antonio Orsot Faculty Housing	1979	11,000 gsf

In February 1999, SSU presented to the Board a comprehensive student housing plan for the campus as an information item. This plan called for demolition of the four oldest of the existing seven housing facilities as part of the five-year phased plan.

The first phase includes the construction of housing on campus through a partnership with a private developer. As part of this project, Wright Hall would be demolished. The Orsot Faculty Housing structure would also be demolished, as it is on the site of the proposed private housing. The estimated

costs for demolition and appropriate abatement are as follows: Wright Hall - \$482,600, Peacock Hall - \$457,200, Lester Hall - \$279,400, Lockette Hall - \$457,200, and Orsot Faculty Housing - \$139,700.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **7. Demolition of Buildings, Savannah State University** (Continued)

Lester and Lockette Halls are on the site currently under consideration for the bond-funded housing project approved by the Board in June 1998, which received design funds in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental budget. Peacock Hall is the potential site for a future academic or housing facility.

### **8. Gift of Property, Georgia Southwestern State University**

Approved: The Board accepted title to approximately 45 acres of land located to the east of the campus and commonly referred to as the Bowen property for the use and benefit of Georgia Southwestern State University ("GSSU").

The legal details involved with this gift will be handled by the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: The 45 acres of undeveloped land was acquired by the GSSU foundation in December 1997 as a gift. The campus intends to use the property as a protected nature preserve for the departments of biology, chemistry, and geology for the instruction and study of nature and environmental issues and understanding the impact of urbanization on a natural wetland. It is unlikely that this property can be economically developed due to the existing topography and wetlands.

A Phase I Environmental Assessment, dated November 1997 and updated in April 1999, has been completed by Catlin Engineers and Scientists, indicating no significant problems.

Appraisals of the property have been performed indicating a value of \$132,000.

There are no restrictions or reversions on the gift by the donor. There are no known easements or restrictions on the property.

### **9. Exchange of Property, the Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board declared approximately .127 acre on the campus of the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") to be no longer advantageously useful to GIT or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the exchange of this property for approximately .1271 acre located on the southeast corner of Fifth Street and Techwood Drive, Atlanta, owned by Alpha Sigma Housing corporation, for the use and benefit of GIT.

The legal details involved with the exchange of this land will be handled by the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: GIT's campus master plan proposes improvements to the Fifth Street or east entrance to campus. An element of the proposed enhancement is the widening of Fifth Street to accommodate additional vehicle traffic and shuttle service as well as a properly designed bike lane. Property acquired from the Alpha Sigma Housing Corporation (appraised value of \$80,000) will permit the widening of the street from the Interstate (I-75/85) and Techwood Drive.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**



## **9. Exchange of Property, the Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)**

The Kappa Alpha Sigma Fraternity house was located at 801 Techwood Drive (the southeast corner of Fifth Street and Techwood Drive). The previous house was built in 1955 and was demolished by the fraternity when it was deemed unsuitable for use. The Alpha Sigma Housing Corporation desires to replace the house for the Kappa Alpha Sigma Fraternity. The property acquired from the Board of Regents (appraised value of \$43,000) results in a more effective design of the house and access to parking for members.

## **10. Information Item: Master Plan, Southern Polytechnic State University**

Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”) and the Office of Facilities proposed a master plan for future development of the campus. Director of Planning Gita Hendessi presented an update of Systemwide physical master planning and introduced President Lisa A. Rossbacher, who presented the SPSU master plan to the Committee. Consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the campus mission statement, the strategic plan, academic programs, support programs, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented planning concepts for facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian patterns, and campus beautification. Based on the consultants’ findings, SPSU’s master plan recommendations included the following:

- Utilize effectively the existing campus property and acquire additional property contiguous with the main campus as the opportunity may arise
- Replace several of the original campus buildings with modern facilities over time
- Preserve the existing character of the campus core and loop drive and improve perimeter surface parking distribution
- Preserve environmentally sensitive wetlands and outdoor recreational spaces
- Create and enhance common outdoor areas and pedestrian circulation

## **11. Information Item: Bartow Center**

Background: In 1972, the Board of Regents obtained approximately 300 acres of land in Cartersville, Georgia upon the dissolution of the Institute of Genetics. In 1995, approximately 50 acres south of Georgia Highway 20 was sold to JDN Development and is now the site of the Lowes and Walmart Shopping Center.

In September 1997, the master plan for Floyd College was completed. This master plan included a conceptual plan for the Bartow Center to be located on the Cartersville property after review of several potential sites. In December 1997, the Board approved the Bartow Center as an off-campus site. Bartow County is to provide funds for the buyout of the trust requirements, thus freeing up the Cartersville property for use by Floyd College.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **11. Information Item: Bartow Center (Continued)**

The support and cooperation of Bartow County in establishing the Bartow Center at this location were discussed with the Board in September 1998. To enhance the site, Bartow County has pledged to relocate Cline-Smith Road and Roving Road. Additionally, Bartow County will provide an access road to the site of the Bartow Center. Bartow County also supports, and is helping to facilitate, the State Department of Transportation plan in relocating Georgia Highway 20 to provide enhanced utility to the Board of Regents property.

The staff updated the Committee on the further development of this center. While there was no action taken on this item, Chair Jones reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee held the strong opinion that any commercial considerations that would entail the sale of any portion of the property be put on hold until the Board at some later date decides otherwise.

### **12. Authorization of Project No. BR-30-004, “#95 Pettit Building Cleanroom Addition,” Georgia Institute of Technology**

The Committee unanimously voted to add this item to its agenda during the Committee meeting.

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-30-004, “#95 Pettit Building Cleanroom Addition,” Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) with a total project budget of \$1,500,000 from GIT and private/corporation research funds.

The project meets the current and future facility needs for the support of the Wafer Level Batch Packaging Research Facility (the “Facility”). The focus of these activities is high-quality technology research within the Facility, which will provide an interconnection frame work for integrated circuits (“IC”) so that before dicing the wafer, each die has all the functions (e.g., external electrical contact encapsulation of the finished silicon) of a conventional, fully packaged IC. The success of the programs will yield multiple government and private industry developments, marketing and research programs, and contracts.

The project will involve the renovation of up to approximately 1,400 gross square feet of lab space into advanced cleanroom research facility. The additional facility will be an addition to the cleanroom facilities located at the Pettit Microelectronics Building located on GIT campus.

The total project cost is up to \$1,500,000. The estimated construction cost is \$1,259,955 (\$900.00/gsf).

Upon Board of Regents approval of this renovation project, the contract process was initiated.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, September 7, 1999 at approximately 2:00 p.m. in room 7014, the Education Committee Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Vice Chair McMillan reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed ten items, eight of which required action. Additionally, 301 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Establishment of the Joint Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering With Emory University, the Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish the joint doctor of philosophy in biomedical engineering with Emory University, effective September 8, 1999.

Abstract: The proposed joint doctor of philosophy in biomedical engineering with Emory University is a concept developed upon the creation of the Joint Department of Biomedical Engineering by the Board of Regents in March 1998. Then, GIT was granted approval to offer a joint doctorate of philosophy ("Ph.D.") in bioengineering with Emory University. The unique and innovative joint Ph.D. in biomedical engineering is the integration of engineering and biomedical sciences whereby a biomedical engineer has the skills to integrate knowledge into systems, whether at the cellular or organ levels. The discipline of biomedical engineering is based on quantitative approaches to the study of biology. The new degree program is not intended to replace the existing Ph.D. in bioengineering. The current bioengineering degree was designed for students with an engineering background who wish to apply engineering to biological problems. The Ph.D. in bioengineering is not as intensive in the biomedical sciences or the integration of biology and engineering as the proposed degree.

Need: The 1990 National Research Council Report entitled "Interdisciplinary Research: Promoting Collaboration Between the Life Sciences and Medicine and the Physical Sciences and Engineering" documented the increased demand for biomedical engineers with advanced degrees. The discoveries in the biological sciences in the past two decades have had a major influence on medicine and healthcare delivery and will be the science that drives future technological innovations. The call for proposals by the Whitaker Foundation addresses the need for graduates in biomedical engineering and heralds plans by the U.S. Congress to double the National Institute of Health's budget through the Bioengineering Consortium. In addition, Atlanta is becoming a focal point for biomedical technology and research. Examples are the activities involving the Centers for Disease Control and the American Cancer Society. The Georgia Research Alliance has an interest in biotechnology through its funding initiatives in terms of Biotechnology and telecommunications. Graduates from this program will be well qualified for positions in academe, the biomedical industry, policy/research think tanks, and government agencies at both the national and international levels.

Objectives: The general objectives of the proposed program are to position GIT and Emory University to play a proactive role in meeting the biomedical engineering labor needs of the State and to contribute to the discipline at an international level; to educate doctoral students who can promote research in biomedical engineering that will affect healthcare and the economic growth of the State and region in the field of

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **1. Establishment of the Joint Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering With Emory**

## **University, the Georgia Institute of Technology** (Continued)

biomedical technology; and to enhance the inter-university cooperation and collaboration between GIT and Emory as envisioned by the State and the Georgia Research Alliance. The fundamental basis of the graduate curriculum is the integration of life sciences, engineering, and mathematics.

**Curriculum:** The 48-semester-hour program incorporates a rigorous and innovative core curriculum that combines problem-based learning, new educational/learning technologies, and a wide spectrum of interdisciplinary research. The breadth and depth of the program will concentrate on five areas: cardiovascular biomechanics and biology, cellular and tissue engineering, neuroscience engineering, biomedical imaging, and biomedical modeling and computing. Thesis projects will involve faculty members from both institutions. Students with undergraduate degrees in engineering and/or the biomedical sciences will be recruited into the program. Course evaluations and enrollment data will be collected and reviewed as part of the ongoing assessment of the program.

**Joint Delivery/Administration:** The proposed program will be administered through the joint Department of Biomedical Engineering. The department chair will appoint an associate chair for graduate studies, a tenured biomedical engineering faculty member from either institution, to administer the program. The Ph.D. will be awarded jointly by the College of Engineering at GIT and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Emory. At Emory, the graduate program of the Joint Biomedical Engineering Department will be a freestanding division in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. There will be a biomedical engineering faculty member who will have responsibility for the administration of the curriculum and academic requirements of the program. The program faculty will elect a six-member graduate studies committee for a three-year term to administer the proposed degree program. The committee will have responsibility for decisions regarding admissions, reviewing programs of study, handling and acting on student petitions, appointing each student's qualifying exam committee, and approving the thesis committee based on recommendations from the thesis co-advisors. The biomedical engineering academic program will interact directly with other academic and administrative units/divisions at GIT and Emory University. The biomedical engineering courses will be team taught by faculty at both institutions. Responsibility for organizing the core courses will reside with the primary biomedical engineering department faculty and their teaching duties will be assigned by the chair and associate chair of the graduate studies committee. Teaching assignments for the other biomedical engineering program faculty will be coordinated by the graduate studies committee with appropriate schools and departments at GIT and Emory University.

**Projected Enrollment:** It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 6, 18, and 30.

**Funding:** The program will be established through the reallocation of existing funds. No new State allocation monies have been requested.

**Assessment:** The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2002, the institution and the Central Office will evaluate this program in terms of quality, viability, centrality to both institutions, and cost-effectiveness.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **2. Establishment of the Executive Master of Science in International Logistics, the Georgia Institute of Technology**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of

Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to establish the executive master of science in international logistics, effective September 8, 1999.

Abstract: The School of Industrial and Systems Engineering at GIT requests approval for a new executive master of science in international logistics to help develop tomorrow’s leaders in logistics. Globalization, electronic commerce, changing customer demands, and shorter product life-cycles have contributed to the new emphasis on logistics. An effective logistics strategy gives an organization competitive advantage by reducing transportation and inventory costs while providing better customer service. Customers in more diverse and distant markets are demanding a wider range of products. Product life cycles are shortening, while demands for high quality and low price are increasing. As electronic commerce grows, it continues to change the environment in which products are sold, produced, and delivered. Customization and the accompanying delivery demand will alter production scheduling and logistics strategies for meeting customer expectations.

Need: In October 1997, *U.S. News and World Report’s 1998 Career Guide* identified supply chain/logistics management as “one of the 20 hot job tracks in the country.” The executive master of science in international logistics program is consistent with the needs of Georgia’s current and future industrial base. Atlanta is connected to many firms with logistics operations, including but not limited to, UPS, Siemens, Lucent Technology, the SABRE Group, the United States Postal Service, Hewlett-Packard, Michelin, Amazon.com, Ryder Integrated Logistics, IBM Corp., the American Red Cross, BellSouth Telecommunications, and the Georgia Freight Bureau.

Objectives: The program’s objective is to prepare high-potential logistics practitioners for the responsibilities associated with building and managing a global supply chain. The program is designed to provide students with engineering skills required to design and operate supply and distribution systems capable of achieving strategic goals; tools for facing the logistics challenges resulting from the growth of electronic commerce; understanding of the economic and financial framework of the business organization; perspectives required to formulate effective logistics strategies; insight and understanding of cultural, commercial, political, and legal differences that influence regional and global logistics strategy development; vision to recognize mutually beneficial opportunities across organizations participating in the global supply chain; and the knowledge of the role of logistics in achieving and sustaining competitive advantage.

Curriculum: The 36-semester-hour program will be 18 months in duration, leading to a master’s degree conferred by the College of Engineering. It is administered around 5 two-week residential modules in the Americas, Asia, and Europe. Coursework will follow several broad themes, including logistics issues related to manufacturing, transportation, wholesaling, and retailing. Within each of these areas, coursework will vertically integrate and explore the business environment (i.e., marketing, finance, human resources, and strategy), provide analytical tools for developing logistics strategy (i.e., supply chain engineering and logistics modeling), and provide opportunities to synthesize learning through case studies. The international residencies will expose participants to the realities of selling and delivering products to a global market by learning about trade barriers, international distribution, legal constraints, and cultural and infrastructural differences.

#### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **2. Establishment of the Executive Master of Science in International Logistics, the Georgia Institute of Technology** (Continued)

Program Delivery and International Component: The three Atlanta residences held on GIT’s campus will be organized around three industry segments: manufacturing, transportation, and wholesale/retail. Within each residence, one or two principal courses integrate the topics required to provide an overall knowledge

of the industry. The two international residences (i.e., Asia and Europe) held in conjunction with international universities offer participants the opportunity to experience the legal, cultural, and infrastructural differences that influence global supply chains. While in Europe, the focus will be on labor relations and reverse logistics. In Asia, the emphasis will be on international trade and freight management. Between residences, faculty will deliver additional material via distance education media to maintain the coherence of the program and to allow participants to master additional subject matter. Students will also collaborate on cases during this time via the Internet, E-mail, and the telephone while exploring the nuances of logistics strategy and operations on each continent and globally. The program is designed to provide technical professionals who possess at least three years of work experience with a concentrated education in logistics. Participants are expected to continue working during the program with the cooperation and sponsorship of their employers, who will provide them with release time for classes and financial support for program costs.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 30, 40, and 50.

Funding: The program will be established through the reallocation of existing funds. The program will also derive support from activities associated with the Logistics Institute (the "Institute") in partnership with the National Science Foundation. The Institute's purpose is to enhance the management and design of logistics operations through its three major programs: logistics learning center, leaders in logistics, and logistics research laboratories. To offer didactic instruction at an executive level and meet the standards of comparator institutions, a fee of \$50,000 is intended to offset program costs.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2002, the institution and the Central Office will evaluate this program in terms of quality, viability, and cost-effectiveness.

### **3. Establishment of the External Master of Science in Nursing at Valdosta State University, Albany State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Portia Holmes Shields that Albany State University ("ALSU") be authorized to offer the master of science in nursing ("M.S.N.") degree as an external degree in collaboration with Valdosta State University ("VSU"), effective September 8, 1999.

Justification: ALSU's request to establish the external master of science in nursing degree with a family nurse practitioner track at VSU is cost-effective, exhibits collaboration between System institutions, and meets regional needs. The institutions are in a better position to offer requisite programming without incurring the cost of facilities construction, personnel searches, and new curricular design. The proposed program is also an example of inter-unit collaboration, maximizing the use of innovative technology.

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **3. Establishment of the External Master of Science in Nursing at Valdosta State University, Albany State University (Continued)**

Offering the external degree complies with the University System of Georgia's Guiding Principles for Strategic Action because it maximizes the economies of scale and provides greater access to educational opportunities in the State.

Program: The M.S.N. degree is an advanced degree designed to prepare individuals who are highly knowledgeable in advanced clinical nursing and whose education will enable them to make significant contributions to healthcare. The M.S.N. with a family nurse practitioner track prepares registered nurses

to meet the primary care needs of vulnerable communities. Graduates of the M.S.N. program deliver quality primary healthcare to individuals, families, and communities and provide basic healthcare to underserved populations in rural and urban settings. The major focuses of the family nurse practitioner track are health promotion, disease prevention, case management, and education.

Need: This program was established in 1994 and is presently attempting to expand to help meet a continuing severe shortage (40%) of primary care providers in southwest Georgia. The goal of the program is to improve the health of southwest Georgia residents by increasing the number of nurse practitioners providing community-based primary healthcare, disease prevention, and health promotion in rural and urban underserved communities.

Objectives: The proposed program will enable qualified students from the Valdosta area to complete coursework that would lead to a master of science in nursing degree.

Curriculum: The proposed external degree curriculum will be the same as that offered on the campus of Albany State University. The program is currently housed in the College of Health Professions and Allied Health Sciences. The 44-semester-hour program leading to the M.S.N. degree (family nurse practitioner track) will be taught by regular full- and part-time graduate faculty at ALSU. The present faculty in the Department of Nursing provide concurrent interactive instruction in professional courses via distance education and with external site groups. The didactic courses will be offered via the Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”) from ALSU to VSU. Laboratory and clinical experiences will be directed by ALSU faculty based at VSU. External site students will be encouraged to participate in selected interdisciplinary allied health courses. Two courses, Nursing Theory and Nursing Research, may be taken as transient courses from VSU faculty and will be accepted by ALSU as meeting the program requirements.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 5, 7, and 9. It is anticipated that nontraditional students who are currently employed will be enrolled in the program.

Funding: The program will be established through the reallocation of existing funds.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2002, the institution and the Central Office will evaluate this program in terms of quality, viability, centrality to both institutions, and cost-effectiveness.

#### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

#### **4. Establishment of the Major in Women’s Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, University of Georgia**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to establish the major in women’s studies under the existing bachelor of arts, effective January 2000.

Abstract: The Franklin College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Georgia requests approval for a new major in Women’s Studies under the existing Bachelor of Arts degree. Women’s Studies is an interdisciplinary enterprise incorporating topics concerning women, gender, and difference in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Coursework includes scholarship by and about women of diverse backgrounds and identities in the arts, literature, science, history, society, popular culture, politics and law.

Need: The bachelor of arts with a major in women’s studies is a liberal arts degree and as such will

prepare students for many occupations including the professions. There are over 700 U.S. colleges and universities with women's studies programs whose offerings include certificates, minors, interdisciplinary studies majors, and bachelor's degree programs (majors). Close to 150 programs offer the major. Examples of degree-granting programs used for comparison in this proposal are Ohio State University, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and the University of Washington. In addition, similar programs are offered in neighboring states such as Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Luebke and Reilly's 1995 book, *Women's Studies Graduates: The First Generation*, identified 142 bachelor's degree programs and studied the graduates of these programs. A "first generation of women's studies majors has graduated from U.S. colleges and universities and have pursued graduate education or employment in positions ranging from 'aviator to union organizer'" (Luebke & Reilly, p. 24). For example, students educated about the history, status, and needs of women will be positioned to take advanced degrees in the professions of law, education, social work, business and journalism, and research. Employment opportunities in the public sector include the fields of health education and promotion, protective and social services, women's arts and entertainment, after-school programs, and international development agencies. Private sector fields include human resources, management, marketing, advertising, public relations, and publishing. UGA currently offers a certificate in women's studies and a minor.

Objectives: The principal objectives of the bachelor of arts with a major in women's studies are to expose students to an interdisciplinary perspective on women, gender, sexuality, and difference and to encourage interdisciplinary dialogue and collaboration on these subjects among faculties across departments; to enable students to study diversity in the lives of women in terms of race, ethnicity, sexuality, social class, and age; to educate students about the condition and experiences of women worldwide by providing them exposure to international experiences and faculty, thereby contributing to the university's stated goal of expanding students' international perspectives; to equip students with critical skills to analyze and evaluate prevailing theories, methods, and research of women's scholarship and experiences; to prepare students to enter graduate programs in women's studies or other fields or professional schools of journalism, social work, law, and public administration, where women's issues are increasingly being studied; and to provide the background for students seeking employment in the public and private sectors where women make up the majority of the customer base or clientele, or in which gender is a key area of concern.



## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **4. Establishment of the Major in Women's Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, University of Georgia** (Continued)

**Curriculum:** The proposed 120-semester-hour major will be offered by the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences. In addition to core requirements, it will consist of nine hours (i.e., three courses) of foundation coursework at the 3,000 and 4,000 levels and 18 hours of major electives. Juniors will be required to take both a theory and a methods course. Seniors will be required to take a seminar or capstone course in which an integration of interdisciplinary content and methods will take place. Electives will include options for an international experience, a directed study or thesis experience, and an internship. The general electives comprise 33 hours of the overall program. All students will be required to select a minor in a single discipline to strengthen their expertise in the humanities and social sciences. Alternatively, students could double major in women's studies and another discipline.

**Projected Enrollment:** It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 10, 18, and 25.

**Funding:** Program costs will be met through redirection of funds, fund-raising initiatives, and tuition income. The university can provide both expertise and structure for the major at no cost by using courses, faculty, library, computer facilities, and equipment already in place. No new State funding will be sought for this proposal.

**Assessment:** The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2003, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

### **5. Dissolution of the Department of Academic Foundations, Georgia State University**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton to authorize the dissolution of the Department of Academic Foundations, effective September 8, 1999.

**Abstract:** President Patton has requested that the Department of Academic Foundations, which provides learning support courses, be dissolved at Georgia State University ("GSU"). With the projected decrease of students that will require learning support courses, there are administrative and budgetary efficiencies associated with the proposed alternative to a separate department for learning support ("LS"). The proposed alternative provides services for the students and academic homes for the tenured faculty in the Departments of English, Mathematics, and Middle and Secondary Education.

**Academic Foundations Realignment Plan:** Due to the increase in admission standards at research universities, GSU indicates that the number of students requiring learning support courses has been reduced and will be reduced further by the year 2001. Tenured faculty in the department are projected to devote a small fraction of their efforts on LS courses and a larger percentage of time to instruction in related departments such as English, mathematics, and middle and secondary education. The academic benefit of transferring faculty into these departments is the integration of faculty with their disciplinary colleagues. Faculty members will be evaluated by their respective chairs and deans. All continuing faculty members **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **5. Dissolution of the Department of Academic Foundations, Georgia State University** (Continued)

are tenured associate professors and professors. Each of the three groups (i.e., reading, writing, and mathematics) will be considered for promotion based on effectiveness in teaching, research, and service. All tenured faculty members will be reassigned to either the reading, writing, or mathematics departments.

The associate provost for academic programs will be responsible for administering and coordinating the learning support program, following established guidelines, and assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum.

#### **6. Establishment of the W. E. Carter Eminent Scholar Chair in Business Administration, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce F. Grube that Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) be authorized to establish the W. E. Carter Eminent Scholar Chair in Business Administration, effective September 8, 1999.

Abstract: President Grube has requested that the W. E. Carter Eminent Scholar Chair in Business Administration be established within the College of Business Administration. This chair will be funded by GSOU’s foundation and State allocations in accordance with established guidelines. The total funding meets the minimum requirement of \$1 million. In addition, the endowment will provide a \$5,000 scholarship to an outstanding undergraduate who will study with the eminent scholar. The endowment will also provide \$10,000 in travel and operating expenses for the eminent scholar and \$5,000 for a graduate assistant.

The eminent scholar will serve in one of the following areas in business administration: management leadership, management information systems, or management science. The faculty member selected for this position will exhibit a commitment to teaching in both credit and continuing education, place a high value on the application of his/her discipline to solve problems in the region served by GSOU, and be an advocate for free enterprise to students, faculty members, and the external community.

Biography: The namesake of this endowed chair, W. E. Carter, is the father of former Acting President Harry S. Carter. Ms. Mildred Jenkins, Dr. Harry S. Carter’s aunt and generous philanthropist, provided the requisite support which enabled GSOU to secure the funds according to established guidelines.

#### **7. Establishment of the William A. Freeman Eminent Scholar Chair in Free Enterprise, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce F. Grube that Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) be authorized to establish the William A. Freeman Eminent Scholar Chair in Free Enterprise, effective September 8, 1999.

Abstract: President Grube has requested that the William A. Freeman Eminent Scholar Chair in Free Enterprise be established within the College of Business Administration. This chair will be funded by GSOU’s foundation and State allocations in accordance with established guidelines. The total funding meets the minimum requirement of \$1 million.

#### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

#### **7. Establishment of the William A. Freeman Eminent Scholar Chair in Free Enterprise, Georgia Southern University** (Continued)

The eminent scholar will serve in one of the disciplines of the College of Business Administration. The

faculty member selected for this position will exhibit a commitment to teaching, place a high value on the application of his/her discipline to solve problems in the region served by GSOU, and will act as an advocate for free enterprise to students, faculty members, and the external community.

Biography: The namesake of this endowed chair, William A. Freeman, is a 1957 graduate of Georgia Teachers College, which is now known as Georgia Southern University. As president, director, and stockholder of Watkins Associated Industries, Inc., a holding company in Atlanta, Mr. Freeman's business enterprises are extensive in transportation, commercial property, banking, and insurance.

Mr. Freeman received the honorary doctor of letters from GSOU in recognition of his personal and financial support of the university. Mr. Freeman is an honorary member of the GSOU chapter of Beta Gamma Sigma, a national business honor society. He was the College of Business Administration Alumnus of the Year in 1991. Mr. Freeman serves on the Business Advisory Council of the College of Business Administration of GSOU and the Georgia Southern Boosters' board. In February 1999, Mr. Freeman was awarded a lifetime achievement award by the Georgia Southern University Alumni Association.

#### **8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions**

The following administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Education Committee Chair Juanita P. Baranco and were approved by the Board. All regular appointments are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS: 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 DATES INDICATED:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

BURGESS, EDWARD M.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 15, 1999.

HIGGINS, RICHARD J.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, EFFECTIVE SEP 15, 1999.

KENAN, RICHARD P.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, EFFECTIVE SEP 15, 1999.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

FERREE, MAURICE EDGAR: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF HORTICULTURE, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE OCT 1, 1999.

HOWETT, CATHERINE M.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

ISAAC, ROBERT ANTHONY: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF CROP & SOIL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE OCT 1, 1999.

#### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

#### **8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions**

(Continued)

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS (CONTINUED):

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA (CONTINUED)

LAHIFF, JAMES MICHAEL: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

LANE, RONALD PATON: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF HORTICULTURE,

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

POMERANCE, CARL BERNARD: RESEARCH PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MATHEMATICS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

SKEEN, PATSY LOUISE: PROFESSOR EMERITA, DEPARTMENT OF CHILD & FAMILY DEVELOPMENT, COLLEGE OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

SMITH, JOSEPH OWENS: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF MARINE PROGRAMS, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

UZES, CHARLES A.: EMERITUS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF MARINE SCIENCE, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

WHEELER, JAMES ORTON: THE MERLE PRUNTY JR PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1999.

(C) GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

CALDWELL, SLOAN D.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 8, 1999.

CHANDLER, VICTORIA: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY & GEOGRAPHY, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 9, 1999.

HAWKINS, DAVID C.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & COMPUTER SCIENCE, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 8, 1999.

POWELL, KATHRYN T.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, JOHN H. LOUNSBURY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE SEP 9, 1999.

SAYLES, JEREMY W.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF LIBRARY SCIENCE, LIBRARY, EFFECTIVE SEP 8, 1999.

TIPTON, CLYDE B.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MUSIC, DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC AND THEATRE, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 8, 1999.

(D) STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

HUNSICKER, FRANK R.: PROFESSOR OF BUSINESS ADMIN AND CHAIR, DEPT OF MANAGEMENT/BUSINESS INFOR SYSTEMS EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS SYSTEMS, ROY RICHARDS, SR. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE SEP 15, 1999.

(E) ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

AKIN, LEW SPARKS: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HUMANITIES, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES, EFFECTIVE AUG 12, 1999.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS (CONTINUED):

(E) ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE (CONTINUED)

COOPER, WAYNE LEONARD: DIVISION CHAIR AND ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION, EFFECTIVE SEP 2, 1999.

DOSS, JEANIE: EMERITA, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 2, 1999.

(F) SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE

HINSON, PATRICIA M.: ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN EMERITA, EFFECTIVE SEP 15, 1999.

LOTT, WILMA R.: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF MATHEMATICS, EFFECTIVE SEP 15, 1999.

APPROVAL OF LEAVES OF ABSENCE: THE BOARD APPROVED THE FOLLOWING LEAVES OF ABSENCE AND THE SALARIES FOR THE PERIODS RECOMMENDED AT THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HAMPIKIAN, JANET M.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF MATERIALS SCIENCE & ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, LEAVE FROM AUG 16, 1999 TO AUG 15, 2000, WITH PAY.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

CROW, SUSAN R.: PUBLIC SERVICE ASSISTANT, INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY & AREA DEVELOPMENT, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, LEAVE FROM OCT 1, 1999 TO SEP 30, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

DOZIER, GEORGE STEPHENSON: LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATIONS, LEAVE FROM AUG 19, 1999 TO DEC 17, 1999, WITH PAY.

(C) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

GILES, TIMOTHY D.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEARNING SUPPORT, LEAVE FROM AUG 1, 1999 TO MAY 31, 2000, WITH PAY.

(D) GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE

LAHAISE, WILLIAM H.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS (CLARKSTON), DIVISION OF SCIENCE (CLARKSTON), LEAVE FROM AUG 16, 1999 TO MAY 12, 2000, WITH PAY.

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:  
THE BOARD APPROVED THE FOLLOWING PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

(A) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BATTEN, ROBERT W.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF RISK MANAGEMENT & INSURANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING SEP 12, 1999 AND ENDING SEP 11, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions**

(Continued)

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CONTINUED):

(A) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CONTINUED)

BROWN, JAMES F.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUN 14, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 10, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

EL SHESHAI, KAMAL M.: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF DECISION SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING SEP 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

ELROD, ROBERT H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF DECISION SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING SEP 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

TILLMAN, FRED A.: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF RISK MANAGEMENT & INSURANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING SEP 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

ABNEY, GEORGE MORRIS: PART-TIME ASSOC PROFESSOR, HONORS PROGRAM, SR VP FOR ACAD AFFAIRS & PROVOST, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING AUG 31, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

BERDANIER, CAROLYN DAWSON: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF FOODS & NUTRITION, COLLEGE OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING DEC 31, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

BUGBEE, ROBERT ELI: ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

CLEGG, CHARLES C.: PART-TIME ASSOC PROFESSOR, BUSINESS OUTREACH SERVICES, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUN 10, 1999 AND ENDING

JUN 10, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

FLATT, WILLIAM P.: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF FOODS & NUTRITION, COLLEGE OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

GESS, LARRY R.: PART-TIME SR PUB SERV ASSOC, CARL VINSON INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

HARRISON, ROBERT E.: ASSOC PROJECT DIRECTOR, COLLEGE OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING SEP 15, 1999 AND ENDING SEP 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

HEPBURN, MARY ALLAIRE: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, CARL VINSON INSTI OF GOV'T-CTR INTL DEM GOVERNANCE, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING SEP 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

ISAAC, ROBERT ANTHONY: INTERIM ASSOC DEAN, DEPARTMENT OF CROP & SOIL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING OCT 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**10. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)**

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions**  
(Continued)

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CONTINUED):

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA (CONTINUED)

JOHNSON, BILLY JACK: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF CROP & SOIL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

KINEY, RUTH: ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY, SCHOOL OF MUSIC, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

THOMPSON, PETER ERVIN: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, HONORS PROGRAM, SR VP FOR ACAD AFFAIRS & PROVOST, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING AUG 31, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

WALKER, GEORGE: BOAT OPERATOR, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(C) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

MOBLEY, CLEON MARION JR: ASSOC PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS, THE ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

RICHARDS, BETTY JO: SECTION SUPERVISOR, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

WHITTLE, AMBERYS R.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF WRITING AND LINGUISTICS, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(D) AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

BUSSEY, DORIS: CLERK III, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

CAHOON, DELWIN D.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 9, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

ELLIS, JANE R.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 9, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

MOON, WILLIAM HAROLD: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 9, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(E) COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

JORDAN, THORNTON F.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE & LITERATURE, COLLEGE OF ARTS & LETTERS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUN 1, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 31, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

LAND, ARTHUR J.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 31, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions**  
(Continued)

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### **10. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)**

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CONTINUED):

(F) GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

WILLOUGHBY, KAY K: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, OFFICE OF ACADEMIC SERVICES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 19, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(G) GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

STIREWALT, LARRY K.: GRADUATE PROG ADMIN, (NTT) SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 2, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(H) KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

BEGGS, GEORGE HENRY: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, COLLEGE HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

HALL, TOMMY PERRY: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING, MICHAEL J. COLES COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

SPARKS, DONALD JACKSON: ASSOC PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

TATE, JAMES BARRY: ASOP EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, COLLEGE HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

TEBEEST, RONALD H.: ASST PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, COLLEGE HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 13, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(I) STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

BAUM, JAMES KENNETH: PART-TIME ASSOC PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP AND FOUNDATIONS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 10, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(J) ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

WYLES, EUGENE H.: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 12, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(K) BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE

RENTZ, BETTY J.: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF TECHNICAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 23, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(L) FLOYD COLLEGE

NORA, BELEN D.: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DIVISION OF HEALTH SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 2, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 18, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### **8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions** (Continued)

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CONTINUED):

(M) GORDON COLLEGE

BYARS, SUSAN WARE: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

DEBEAUGRINE, MARTHA A.: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES AND



## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 10. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)

DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 17, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

KEY, VIVIAN J.: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 17, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

#### (N) MACON STATE COLLEGE

ROBERTSON, JIMMIE ARNOLD: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES & MATHEMATICS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 23, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 15, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

STYONS, ROBERT BENTON: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 23, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 15, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

WILSON, MARY D.: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES & MATHEMATICS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 23, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 15, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

#### (O) MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE

ROGERS, WILLIAM BENJAMIN: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCE & MATHEMATICS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 23, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: THE BOARD APPROVED THE FOLLOWING PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBERS OVER THE AGE OF 70 PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

#### (A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

DODD, JAMES B.: PROFESSOR, (NTT) LIBRARY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

EDWARDS, HOWARD D.: PRIN RESEARCH ENGINEER, (NTT) SCHOOL OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

#### (B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

BURTON, GLENN WILLARD: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CROP & SOIL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

POLLACK, ROBERT H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 19, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 9, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 8. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS OVER AGE 70 PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CONTINUED):

#### (C) GORDON COLLEGE

HADLEY, JUANITA J.: PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 16, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY: THE BOARD APPROVED THE APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE SALARIES AND FOR THE PERIODS RECOMMENDED AT THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	21
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	26
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA	7
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	50

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**10. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)**

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	30
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	19
ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY	8
ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY	7
AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	7
CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	2
COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY	4
FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	4
GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	6
GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY	3
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY	11
NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	2
SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY	8
SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY	2
STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA	18
ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE	3
ATLANTA METROPOLITAN COLLEGE	3
COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	3
DALTON STATE COLLEGE	1
FLOYD COLLEGE	2
GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE	46
GORDON COLLEGE	3
MACON STATE COLLEGE	4
MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE	1

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**9. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training**

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

<b>Georgia State University</b>		Recreation & Sports Mgmt.	1R
Allied Health	5, 6R	Sociology & Anthropology	1
Cardiopulm. Care Science	1		
Counseling & Psych. Svcs.	1	<b>Armstrong Atlantic State University</b>	
Kinesiology and Health	4	Nursing	2
Nursing	4, 7R	Physical Therapy	2
Nutrition & Lab. Technol.	1		
Physical Therapy	1, 3R	<b>Augusta State University</b>	
Psychology	1, 1R	Nursing, Psychology, Sociol.	2
Social Work	12		
		<b>Georgia Southwestern State University.</b>	
<b>Medical College of Georgia</b>		Nursing	4
Allied Health	9, 10R		
Hospital and Clinics	5R	<b>Kennesaw State University</b>	
Medicine	3, 29	Nursing	6, 1R
Nursing	3, 1R		
Research Institute	2, 1R	<b>North Georgia College &amp; State University</b>	
		Nursing	4, 4R
<b>University of Georgia</b>		Physical Therapy	5R
Child and Family Dev.	1		
Communication Sciences	2R	<b>Darton College</b>	
Counseling & Human Dev.	3	Human Services Technology	1
Pharmacy	1, 2R	Nursing	2
Social Work	1, 2R		
		<b>Floyd College</b>	
<b>Georgia Southern University</b>		Nursing	2
Family & Consumer Sci.	1		
Health & Kinesiology	6		
Leadership & Technology	4, 1R	<b>Total</b>	<b>179</b>
Nursing	5, 3R		

R = Renewal

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**10. Information Item: Service Agreements**

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Georgia State University</b>			
Conduct the UJIMA Male Involvement project	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	6/15/99 - 5/14/00	\$30,000
Develop and deliver training for OCR	Georgia Office of School Readiness	7/14/99 - 8/11/99	\$2,400
Analyze job tasks of probation officers	Georgia Dept. of Corrections	4/15/99 - 6/30/99	\$4,950
Continue policy analysis support for Georgia EPD	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	6/7/99 - 6/30/00	\$252,000
Support Council for School Performance	Georgia Office of Planning and Budget	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$485,000
<b>University of Georgia</b>			
Conduct state judicial education program	Administrative Office of the Courts	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$434,727
Conduct Family Solutions program	Children and Youth Coordinating Council	6/1/99 - 5/31/00	\$20,000
Conduct study on utilizing cottonseed hulls as rations for horses	Georgia Comm. Commission for Corn	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$16,300
Conduct cotton field demonstration	Georgia Comm. Commission for Cotton	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$30,000
Conduct beltwide cotton conference study tour for county agents	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$15,000
Conduct cotton education programs	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$24,000
Conduct moderate chilling peach breeding project	Georgia Comm. Commission for Peaches	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$5,000
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>University of Georgia (Continued)</b>			
Study row spacing in peanuts	Georgia Comm. Commission for Peanuts	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$2,000
Study improving accuracy of	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$2,500

tomato spotted wilt risk indices			
Support travel and supplies for peanut plot work	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$2,000
Study eradication of live-stock disease 2000, Athens	Georgia Dept. of Agriculture	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$1,171,128
Support Athens program income 2000	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$383,842
Study eradication of live-stock disease 2000, Tifton	Georgia Dept. of Agriculture	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$1,955,872
Support Tifton program income 2000	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$341,158
Conduct Better Home Town program	Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$70,000
Observe and evaluate Reading First and Reading Challenge programs	Georgia Dept. of Education	5/1/99 - 7/31/99	\$125,150
Support Educational Technology Training Center	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$272,701
Purchase equipment for Georgia's Education Technology Training Cntr.	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$80,000
Conduct training for child support enforcement employees	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	10/1/98 - 7/31/99	\$17,650
Conduct Better Brains for Babies program	“ ” “ ”	6/1/99 - 11/30/99	\$43,516
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>University of Georgia (Continued)</b>			
Provide social work education for Georgia DFCS child welfare practice	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 8/1/00	\$72,158
Provide training for Georgia's Family Independence case managers and supervisors	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	4/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$40,026
Provide management and organizational development	“ ” “ ”	6/30/97 - 6/30/00	\$32,267
Conduct clinical social work intern program	“ ” “ ”	6/30/97 - 6/30/00	\$28,634
Provide statewide network of one-stop workforce development centers	Georgia Dept. of Labor	6/1/99 - 1/31/00	\$56,800
Provide Excel training	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$75,000
Revise and design policy	Georgia Dept. of Technical and	6/28/99 - 6/27/00	\$100,000

manual for DTAE	Adult Education		
Provide training	Georgia Dept. of Transportation	6/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$183,246
Assess Y2K on state and local government	Georgia Emergency Management agency	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$20,700
Provide reapportionment services	Georgia General Assembly	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$360,336
Provide legislative services	“ ” “	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$136,510
Prepare Georgia GIS hydrography base map	Georgia Information Technology Policy Council	6/15/99 - 6/14/00	\$125,574
Fulfill transportation maintenance contract	“ ” “	6/15/99 - 6/14/00	\$50,000
Perform transportation enhancements pilot	“ ” “	6/15/99 - 6/14/00	\$100,000
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>University of Georgia (Continued)</b>			
Provide state government regional training	Georgia Office of Planning and Budget	7/1/97 - 6/30/00	\$225,000
Provide finance training	“ ” “	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$200,000
Conduct Police Academy 2000	Georgia Public Safety Training Center	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$343,617
Conduct NE Georgia Police Academy	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$40
Revise qualifications handbook for state or county elective office	Georgia Secretary of State	6/28/99 - 12/31/99	\$15,503
Revise handbook for candidates for state elective office	“ ” “	6/28/99 - 3/01/00	\$12,454
Prepare compliance auditing manual	Various State Agencies	6/20/99 - 6/15/00	\$20,341
<b>Georgia Southern University</b>			
Conduct State Improvement Grant	Georgia Dept. of Education	2/1/99 - 1/31/00	\$78,770
Provide grant-in-aid service agreement	Effingham Co. Board of Commissioners	9/1/99 - 8/31/00	\$3,000
<b>Armstrong Atlantic State University</b>			
Provide hardware/software in Regional Training Center	State Board of Education	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$61,000
Operate Regional Training Center	“ ” “ ”	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$221,475
	<b>Floyd College</b>		

Provide computer training	Floyd County government	7/29-30/99	\$1,950
---------------------------	-------------------------	------------	---------

**TOTAL AMOUNT SEPTEMBER** \$ 8,351,295  
**TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 To DATE** \$11,196,397  
**TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99 (TO SEPTEMBER)** \$13,526,330  
**TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99** \$31,358,479

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, September 7, 1999 at approximately 2:50 p.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Chair McMillan reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had six applications for review; five were denied, and one was continued. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. In the matter of Chris Camela at North Georgia College & State University, concerning his request for commuter status, that the application for review be denied.
9. In the matter of Ardath Kelly at Georgia State University, concerning her removal from the Early Childhood Education Program, that the application for review be denied.
10. In the matter of Latrelle Peterson at Georgia Southern University, concerning denial of her reinstatement, that the application for review be continued.
11. In the matter of Shandria Slack at Albany State University, concerning her request for a policy exemption, that the application for review be denied.
12. In the matter of Michelle Nellis at the University of Georgia, concerning her request that she be allowed to continue her courses in Social Work, that the application for review be denied.
13. In the matter of Johnnie Hicks-Johnson, concerning her employment termination, that the application for review be denied.



## **CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS**

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

My goal: the shortest, most concise "State of the System" speech in the history of State of the System speeches.

Three things in the University System that really please me.

Three things concern me.

Things that please me:

(1) SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores of our entering freshmen. A key quality indicator.

Our goal has been to increase the quality and preparedness of students. I'm encouraged by significant jump.

First time in System history average SAT composite score for entering freshman class is above 1000 – System average of 1013.

A 14-point increase of System — 999 to 1013 — fall 1997 to fall 1998. A significant upward trend line beginning fall 1995, a 13-point jump over fall 1994.

Six institutions with average SAT composite score above 1000: Georgia Institute of Technology (1295); Georgia State University (1048); University of Georgia (1186); Kennesaw State University (1021); North Georgia College & State University (1072) and Southern Polytechnic State University (1053).

Seventeen institutions had the highest SAT scores in a decade: Georgia State University, University of Georgia, Georgia Southern University, Valdosta State University, Albany State University, Augusta State University, Clayton College & State University, Georgia Southwestern State University, Kennesaw State University, Savannah State University, Southern Polytechnic State University, Dalton State College, Macon State College, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Coastal Georgia Community College, Georgia Perimeter College, and Waycross College.

Why happy? Hard data tracking wisdom of the Board's vision statement/strategic plan. Admissions requirements, improve student preparation in K-12, etc. We will give you a full report on the impact of the new admissions policy very soon.

Good students recognize value of the University System — and HOPE has certainly helped us immeasurably.

## **CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS**

(2) National rankings.

When first started, some of us questioned the methodology used to establish these rankings, but can't deny they have a powerful influence on public perceptions. Strong indicator of perception of institutional quality and academic excellence.

*U.S. News & World Report's* latest national rankings highlights:

Georgia Institute of Technology: tenth among public research universities and third among graduate engineering programs.

University of Georgia: Twenty-second in list of best public universities — up four places from last year. Dropped from fourth to tenth in “best party schools” category — is there correlation? Tied at twenty-third for “great schools at great prices.”

Georgia State University, Georgia Southern University, Georgia College & State University all in national rankings — Georgia College & State University in particular has made great strides, which points to the value of our mission review exercise.

Individual programs also continue to receive national recognition.

Georgia Institute of Technology: first in industrial and systems engineering.

Georgia State University's J. Mack Robinson College of Business Insurance Program: second in the nation.

Georgia Southern University's graduate nursing program ranked in top 5% for two consecutive years.

Medical College of Georgia's nursing anesthesia program: sixth in the nation.

Kennesaw State University's graduate entrepreneurship programs ranked twenty-first in the nation.

*U.S. News & World Report* article, “A Reason to Choose State U.,” Tom Ludlum, Marietta native is featured. Ludlum, biology and Latin major with a 4.4 high school grade point average and a perfect 1600 on his SATs, as well as honors in football and track, chose to remain in Georgia and attend his first choice of UGA over his second choice — a small school in Massachusetts — Harvard.

Progress on quality indicators -- our highest priority. Continue to make progress on (3) Enrollment.

A year into semester conversion, we are seeing a strong recovery in the enrollment and headcount, and, albeit at a slower rate, in credit hours.

### **CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS**

East Georgia College: up 27%, fall 1998 to fall 1999, a record-level high.

Bainbridge College, Gainesville College, Gordon College, Georgia Southern University: all on track for at record-level highs.

Georgia Institute of Technology enrollment up even with semester conversion.

Just a reminder about our students — a perspective on our new freshmen coming out of high school.

Most of people who started college this fall after graduating from high school last spring were born in 1980 and ...

- Black Monday 1987 is as significant to them as the Great Depression;
- They have only known one Pope;
- They can only really remember one president;
- They were 11 when the Soviet Union broke apart and do not remember the Cold War;
- Atari predates them, as do vinyl albums. The expression, “You sound like a broken record,” means nothing to them;
- The “Tonight Show” has always been hosted by Jay Leno.

Three things that concern me.

(1) Technology -- the most exciting yet most perilous area. It is essential that we integrate into the System, our institutions, and our programs.

Fast-changing market/climate -- as soon as a technology is developed, it is outpaced by new developments.

New business models are needed.

Almost no technology predictions are right; i.e., IBM president who stated could foresee no reason for individuals to have computers in the home.

There is some anxiety among our faculty and staff — and some students — in terms of how technology will help them teach and learn and serve. But I don't know of a faculty in the country more willing to embrace and adopt technology.

Has to be seen as a tool that will increase access.

### **CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS**

Has to relate to both those technology-savvy students I mentioned above and non-traditional students who still can't program their VCRs.

We have to be the place where technology serves as a unifying force in the community and not a divider into the technology “haves” and “have-nots.” Only some 30% of Georgians have access to the Internet. And we have to be concerned with poor communities, rural areas, and other data that show minorities lag in

access.

Technology is the area that poses both the greatest challenge to the traditional system of higher education — and also the greatest arena of opportunity.

Must ensure technology helps us serve students, faculty, state, local communities, and business — it must contribute toward Board's goal of a more educated Georgia.

New Gwinnett Center is poised to give us breakthroughs in academic programming and delivery through technology.

Need to keep up the pressure to innovate, to invest, and to disseminate spread of technology throughout the System.

Glad Board took this issue on. Your attention has focused the attention of our campuses, of the legislature and public.

Your hard working already reaping dividends: Georgia GLOBE (Global Learning Online for Business & Education).

Anyone who is not concerned about technology and getting it right is not in the real world.

We need to remain both vigilant and opportunistic.

(2) Sustaining and morphing initiatives

Priority is to see initiatives succeed.

This Board has developed and approved a significant number of major initiatives that impact not only System, but educational partners, business community, and the State.

The pace has been high — demands have been very high on institutions and people.

My concern is one: must maintain the momentum we have created over past five years with these initiatives. Can't stop now -- can't rest.

Many of our initiatives are interlocked with others. Most are strategic, long-term efforts whose payoff won't be fully realized for some time.

### **CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS**

Can't lose sight of this -- must concentrate our efforts on seeing these initiatives through. It's not enough to just wind them up and get them going. Successful implementation depends on our good people at the campuses.

A related concern: as our initiatives age and as the Governor's Commission on Education proceeds, we must be prepared to "morph" initiatives in ways that ensure their success.

These initiatives were created in a climate of change — and they cannot become static. Not tablets of stone.

Our focus should not be on preserving the original form of these initiatives, but that their goals are accomplished. We need to work to ensure that we remain open and flexible in terms of encouraging the evolution of initiatives into the most appropriate form necessary for their eventual success.

How do we do this? Collaboration is key. Our partners are most important allies in this effort.

Like a marriage — easier to be single.

Any good, successful relationship is hard work. We must work diligently to ensure initiatives succeed and this means working with our partners, strengthening our relationships, and not caring who gets the credit as long as the goals are met.

Don't need to protect turf on any of our collaborations.

(3) People: how do we continue to attract the best, keep the best, motivate good people, get best out of them.

Nationally and here in the System, there is a wave of retirements coming up. System has an opportunity to attract new, talented faculty to replace those retiring and to meet projected growth.

Look at the System's budget — our biggest investment is in people.

Are we doing all we can to protect this investment?

Are we doing all we can to nurture and sustain this investment?

It's fairly easy and relatively inexpensive to replace equipment -- but replacing people has very high costs.

We need to nurture our faculty and staff -- give them the support they need to serve, to grow and to excel.

### **CHANCELLOR'S STATE OF THE SYSTEM ADDRESS**

Put aside infrastructure, buildings, etc. Our people make our national reputation. It is the quality of our people that attracts other quality people — and high-achieving students.

This is the uniqueness of the college/university environment. The sparks that fly when excellence is present.

Our challenge is how do we sustain morale in changing environment? How do we keep those sparks flying?

Obviously, our investment in infrastructure helps.

But also important is the message we send about the level of concern for our primary investment.

That's why surveys of customers important -- students, business. Will continue to conduct surveys so we can gauge how we are doing and how we can improve.

This Board has earned a well-deserved reputation for fairness, decency — treat our people with grace/dignity.

If we can motivate them, support them, show them respect and appreciation — our people — students, faculty, staff — will continue to be our greatest champions and our greatest strength.

Mr. Chairman -- as we enter another academic year, these are the key things that give me satisfaction and give me concern.

We will continue to celebrate quality, we will continue to grow, we will master technology and show concern for our people.

This Board has proven itself ready and eminently qualified to meet the challenges before us and to move forward with both its heart and its head.

The environment this Board has created for itself, its faculty, staff and students will be what makes our efforts successful.

Thank you for your time, your dedication, and your inspiration.

After the Chancellor's State of the System Address, Chair Cannestra thanked Chancellor Portch and his staff for leading and assisting the University System in its continuous improvement.

At approximately 9:50 a.m., the Board took a brief recess.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

At 10:00 a.m., the Board reconvened in its regular session, and Chair Cannestra convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. He then turned the meeting over to the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern explained that there were two items on the agenda of the Strategic Planning Committee at this meeting: 1) benchmarking for effectiveness and efficiency and 2) technology master planning. These topics will be the subjects of the Committee’s investigation and analysis over the course of this year. Chair Leebern then turned the meeting over to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair Leebern. He said that it was a pleasure for him to introduce two colleagues and friends with whom he has worked in various situations over the years. They both know higher education well. Dr. Peter T. Ewell is Senior Associate at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (“NCHEMS”). It is a research and development center founded in 1981 to improve management effectiveness in colleges and universities. It is a highly respected national organization both for its data and consulting services. Dr. Ewell himself has consulted with over 350 different colleges and universities and 24 state systems. His areas of expertise include assessment, accountability, program review, enrollment management, and student retention. He has worked a great deal in longitudinal student databases. Early in his career, he also coordinated long-range planning at Governors State University. Dr. James R. Mingle has been Executive Director of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (“SHEEO”) since 1984. Each state designates its chief executive officer for higher education, and given that some states have governing boards while others have coordinating boards and still others have unidentifiable forms of governance, Dr. Mingle works with an interesting mix of people with different levels of responsibility. Dr. Mingle recently announced that he is going to shift gears in his professional career, because he has some expertise in the area of technology. He took a year’s leave in 1995 and went to work for Educom, which is now Educause, the primary organization for information technology in higher education. He is also quite knowledgeable about benchmarking. The Chancellor said that the conversation at this meeting might alternate a bit between the topics, because both of the presenters know about both benchmarking and technology applications to higher education. He noted that they were not asked to make lengthy presentations; rather, this meeting would be more like a conversation. This conversation would help shape the work of the Strategic Planning Committee for the year, so that the Board can create a request for proposals to solicit outside help later in this initiative. This meeting would be an opportunity for the Regents to ask questions and make comments about what the Board should be doing with its benchmarking initiative. With that, Chancellor Portch turned the floor to Dr. Ewell.

Dr. Ewell thanked Chancellor Portch. He remarked that the Regents are entering a conversation about benchmarking at a rather opportune time. The Board has made some substantial investments in infrastructure lately, so it is a good time to examine where the University System is. The System is starting from an incredibly strong base with a national reputation of strength and diversity. However, the System is also entering at a point that allows it to watch what other systems have done and learn from their mistakes. Moreover, the System has some challenges in entering this conversation at all. One is the very strength and diversity of the System and its size, because one size does not fit all. The Board will have to think in terms of the various pieces of the puzzle to ensure that it does not create incentives for all the units of the System to try to do the same thing, because that would be the worst thing that could happen to the System. Another challenge is that the Board may not have as much data as it needs and may not be as much of a “numbers culture” as it may need to be to do good benchmarking. Good benchmarking requires good **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

measures, and choosing what it is that the Board is going to measure is the most difficult part of the conversation. One more challenge is that many people in industry and education get involved in conversations like this when they are in trouble. The University System of Georgia, however, is not in trouble. In some ways, getting people to really focus on the idea of benchmarking when there is no clear and present danger is going to be difficult.

Dr. Ewell noted that he was listening to the Board's first hour of business at this meeting for benchmarks, asking himself what the Board was saying about itself and what kinds of lessons are hidden in that. He stated that a 76 to 0 football score for Georgia Southern University ("GSOU") sounds pretty good. However, the question is "What is the peer group?" What are we comparing GSOU against? Who is the competition? This is a key question the Board will wrestle with. The Chancellor used the common benchmark of the Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") score of 1000. That is a good example of a fixed-point target that people strive for and is important to achieve, but inside of that is the question of where everyone ought to be. What should the distribution look like? Also hidden in the issue is the problem with any kind of hard point benchmark: 999 is not good enough, and 1001 is wasting money. It is a question of where you want to be on a continuum, he explained. So, there is a lesson there, too. The Chancellor's remarks also indicated that good benchmarking involves balance. There was the SAT score benchmark, but there was an access benchmark, too. Things must be considered in combination, or else one thing will be achieved at the expense of the other. You don't want that, asserted Dr. Ewell. You want to be able to figure out what are the core kinds of things to look for and get them in balance. When industry does this, it is called a "balance scorecard." It is a question of what can be traded off for what and how things will work together. Another benchmark Chancellor Portch used was in *U.S. News and World Report*. Dr. Ewell said that sometimes benchmarks are thrust upon us. With that in mind, he wanted to make a few distinctions and then try to engage the Regents in conversation.

There are three very different questions that are interrelated when you get into the business of benchmarking, explained Dr. Ewell. The first question is "Where are we?" It is an external question that asks how we compare ourselves to others. That means thinking about establishing peer groups for the institutions and for the System as a whole. In this case, it means comparison to others who are doing something similar. Usually, this is in terms of some kind of bottom-line measure, an outcome such as graduation rates or placement rates. It may also be done in terms of some core functions, such as comparing what we are spending on something with what others are spending on it or how much time people are spending on one kind of thing versus something else. A second, equally important question is "How are we doing?" This is a continuous improvement question. This has a different set of measurements because what is being looked at is progress over time. Many times, this concerns processes. The final question is "What is best practice?" This concerns who is doing things correctly. He suggested that the Board take the results of the first two questions and try to find someone who is doing what the System wants to be doing in a manner that it can learn from and maybe even improve upon.

There are also three levels of analysis that need to be considered when benchmarking, explained Dr. Ewell. One level is the State and System. How is the University System doing compared to other state systems or other systems of similar size and scope? He reiterated that some of that benchmarking will be thrust upon the System. He noted that the Higher Education Policy Institute, which is headed by Dr. Patrick Callan, will be issuing a "report card" on the states' higher education systems in about a year. No one knows how anyone will come out in the report, because Dr. Callan has kept his methodology securely under **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

wraps. State and system kinds of measures include access, affordability, participation rates, returns on investments in the State's economy, and matters of that nature. A second level of analysis is the given



sector of institutions. Some types of institutions are appropriate to compare with one another, and others are not appropriate to compare. He suggested that it probably makes sense to find ways of benchmarking two-year colleges and regional colleges against one another, but not the research universities. Finally, the third level of analysis is individual institutions. They need to be benchmarked not only against one another inside the System, but also with institutions outside the System. He said that the most important thing is to recognize that there is an enormous amount of diversity at the individual institution level, and the Board should not induce institutions to do business they ought not be doing and compare themselves against unrealistic expectations. Dr. Ewell then asked the Regents to consider what they mean by benchmarking and what kinds of measures would allow them to compare institutions.

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

Regent Cannestra remarked that he would like to be able to zero in on the number one function of the institutions: educating students. He wanted to see some benchmarks of how well the institutions are doing in that regard. There are other things that go along with that, such as how efficiently the System is supporting this main purpose. Also, in big business, he has found that every now and then, there is an organization or department that is there for its own edification. It creates reports, it has meetings, it does things that are bound within that group, and the group becomes irritated if someone from the outside wants it to do something germane to the main business. He would like to identify those groups, and the only way to do that is to have benchmarks that focus on the core of the business. It would be useful if that could be done at each of the institutions and better practices can be found at other institutions. From that, he would like to make the entire System better. He thought that benchmarks would help the System improve. He stated that the System seems to be well on the right path, but it could be better if it had more specific measures.

Regent White remarked that it is easy to categorize banks, but he did not think it would be very easy to categorize institutions of higher learning. Also, it is rather easy to identify some key ratios to determine the success of banks. He asked Dr. Ewell if he knew of any good measures to determine the success of an institution, such as generating good students. He asked whether there are any common measures that are used nationally to determine that type of success.

Dr. Ewell explained that in some ways, the System is analogous to a portfolio with different investments in different things that have different yields. Some have been bought for a long-term investment, some for a short-term payoff, and some because they are secure, but they all have a place in the portfolio. What is key in having this conversation is being able to clearly specify what place in the portfolio each sector has and whether there is anything in common across sectors. Some systems have noted that lower-division instruction is something all institutions do. So, getting people to the level of the sophomore year successfully is something to at least track. However, the Board should not hold institutions responsible for things that they cannot control and the Board really does not want them to control. Even though Dr. Ewell would advocate looking at student success rates, he stressed that they must be examined in context. He suggested that the Board try to get everyone to improve on that level and ask rather relentless questions about why they are not doing that. There may be a good answer, he said. The important thing is to create a dialogue. He then asked, "Is there a bottom line for learning in this country that everybody recognizes?" **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

and answered, "No." There are a number of states that are doing standardized testing at the sophomore level for rising juniors, but this was not an option he wanted to push the University System toward because it tends to reduce things to a least common denominator. He said that attainment rates are a benchmark that many systems are using, and appropriately so. There are some measures that are

beginning to get moving in terms of good practice in undergraduate education, surveys of students that indicate how much contact they have with faculty and whether they are getting their courses on time, etc. In fact, NCHEMS is engaged with a national survey design effort that is being piloted this fall to help inform the U.S. news rankings.

Regent White remarked that Dr. Ewell was getting into details that would likely come later in this initiative. However, at this point, he was interested in looking at larger issues such as graduation rates. He asked whether this was a good measure compared to other institutions in other states around the nation, because if the System has a low graduation rate, then the Board will know that it has a problem. He recognized that the System should consider the type of institutions that are being compared and ensure that the peer groups are properly established. He said that the Regents need Dr. Ewell's help where common measures are concerned.

Chancellor Portch stated that, since the Board has established its single greatest goal as a more educated Georgia, retention and graduation rates are enormously important. Nonetheless, the retention rates of Georgia State University and the University of Georgia cannot be compared. However, there is some new methodology now to create a predictor, explained the Chancellor. There are predicted retention and graduation rates that take into consideration the type of students and type of institution. So, an institution can actually benchmark itself against the prediction of its achievement. He remarked that this is probably a very reasonable way to approach retention and graduation rates.

Dr. Ewell added that New York State has had a fair amount of experience with this process, and it works quite well. He just wanted to be certain that before the Regents even go down that path, they consider what they will do when they find out that a particular institution's graduation rate is less than they would have liked it to be. That is why the second part of benchmarking is important.

Regent Cannestra said that the obvious answer would be to help the institution improve itself. The important questions are "How efficient are they? How many square feet of space is there per student? How many dollars per student? How many professors per student? How many public relations people per student?" Regent Cannestra explained that he not only wants to know how good an institution is, but also how efficient it is. There are ratios in the banking industry that help show how good a bank is in relation to other banks. He wants to be able to do the same thing for institutions of higher education, not for punishment or embarrassment, but for improvement.

Dr. Ewell stated that this is a critical point.

Regent Jones asked whether there was a profile in the nation for what the Board is discussing. He remarked that if there was not, the Board should consider copyrighting its work.

Dr. Ewell replied that so far, no one has gotten it right.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Regent Jones asserted that there must be such a profile across the nation to measure institutions of higher education.

Dr. Ewell reiterated that no state system has yet gotten it right. In terms of certain functions, there are discussions about efficiencies, use of space, and other things to compare. In terms of the bottom line of student learning, however, a lot of work needs to be done.

Regent Jenkins noted that when you attempt to compare a suburban college with an inner-city college, you cannot compare retention rates because the factors are very different. For that reason, it would not be feasible to have a universal benchmark for that type of information. To try to compare dissimilar institutions would be an enormous undertaking.

Dr. Ewell asked the Regents to back up a bit and think about the next step and what they mean by facilitating improvement. The one area where other systems have failed before is that whatever measure is selected, the first thing institutions tend to think is that the system is going to use it against them or that something will be done to reward those who are high and punish those who are low. Performance funding is an example of what some states are doing along those lines, which can have some deleterious effect. If the Board signals that it will help an institution that is trying, can it mediate the conversation in such a way to find out whether the efforts are really in place to make improvements? For example, in Washington State, the university system was mandated by the legislature to do a form of performance funding in the two-year college sector. The system established outcome goals for the system in order to earn the legislature’s money, but it did not hold individual campuses responsible for outcomes that they have no control over. Rather, colleges were challenged to create their own benchmarks. For instance, if they were interested in job placement, they were rewarded for doing things in that area to contribute to the system average. The system itself benefitted in terms of outcomes that it earned based on performance funding, but the way in which it held individual institutions responsible for contributing to the bottom line was just like a portfolio: different for different circumstances. That is the kind of situation that Dr. Ewell said makes sense.

Regent Yancey noted that the System has an improving national reputation, but he asked to what the System is being compared. He asked if there was no ranking of state systems like the *U.S. News and World Report* ranking of individual colleges.

Dr. Ewell reiterated that the Higher Education Policy Institute will be producing one next year. When it hits the streets, it will be subject to exactly the same debates that the *U.S. News and World Report* evokes. Those who do well are going to like the system of measurement, and those who do not are going to reject it with methodological comments. However, there is nothing quite like that yet. The comments about the System are more about the System’s reputation and benchmarks like SATs scores, which is an admissions criteria rather than an output criteria.

Chancellor Portch remarked that the university systems are very different with regard to composition. For instance, the California State University System has no research universities in it, while the University of California System has only research institutions. The New York State University System does not have any urban institutions in it, and it has a maritime academy. There are few systems that have similarities. The University System of Georgia would probably compare best to the University System of Wisconsin and the **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

University System of North Carolina. However, the University System of North Carolina does not have

any two-year institutions. So, there are just not that many similarities across systems to allow for a comfortable comparison.

Regent Cater asked how the System's predominantly black colleges are benchmarked against those in other systems.

Dr. Ewell did not know, but he said that would be a knowable statistic. He felt confident that figures like graduation rates would likely be figures that every system had.

Dr. Mingle added that the level of graduation success in the United States is relatively low and the Board would not have to look hard to discover that. Compared to European countries, the United States admits more students, but it graduates fewer and has a lower success rate. So, the nation's goals are set high about educating the broadest sector of society, but it falls short in terms of retention and graduation. Therefore, regardless of the differences in the comparisons, Dr. Mingle predicted that, after the Regents go through their benchmarking analysis, they will be dissatisfied with the performance of all sectors. This inevitably leads to the question of what causes the drop-out. Systems have found very different causes for this. In some systems, it is a matter of student motivation; in others, it is a financial aid problem; sometimes the institutions are not offering the courses that students need to graduate in a timely fashion; and sometimes there are "bottleneck" courses that students cannot get through because they have poor preparation. So, there are a variety of reasons for that phenomenon. That is the payoff in benchmarking, he said. The finding that a system is not graduating as many students as it would like is simple. What the System should not get involved in is an exercise of compliance and manipulation where the System and the institutions are trying to jockey for explaining away why they have not done as well as they could have. Instead, the Board should direct the System and the institutions to the solutions and the best practices.

Dr. Ewell added that sometimes there is more than one factor causing the student retention problem. All of those issues are present in any institution. The question is trying to find a local solution that allows institutions to address one problem at a time. If they find that the major problem they have is course bottlenecks, then they would benchmark to find somebody who knows how to solve that problem. A lot of the issue is disaggregation, trying to get down to a relatively stable set of procedures so that you can learn from someone else. He stressed that although each institution is unique, institutions are not as unique as they think they are. They have to be compared, but the findings should be used as the opening for a conversation rather than a point of blame.

Chancellor Portch remarked that Regent Cater had raised one of the most difficult questions that the Board has discussed. When you start to talk to institutions, they say that they are so different that they do not fit in any sector. So, how much subsectoring do you do? The System's historically black institutions fall into different sectors, but they have some common characteristics. Meanwhile, Georgia College & State University is currently benchmarking itself against elite public ivy league schools.

Dr. Mingle said that the world is made up of "lumpers" and "splitters," and the Board needs some lumpers to design its benchmarking initiative. Otherwise, it will end up with 34 separate institutions it cannot compare.

### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Dr. Ewell added that lumping is something that NCHEMS does a lot, and it is an art. It is sometimes useful to have an outside resource do this, and then let the institutions complain about where they are lumped.

Regent Hunt referred back to Dr. Mingle's remarks comparing U.S. retention rates with those of Europe. He stated that he did not know that and doubted that many others in the room knew that. He further stated that the System can be broken down, but the Board needs to look at how the two-year colleges in general are doing compared to other two-year colleges. When the Board uncovers the information it is seeking, the Regents will want to work harder to improve things, but first they need to learn the general information.

Regent NeSmith remarked that this would certainly be a complicated process, but it seemed to him that a good starting point would be learning how the students feel about their education. The quality of education should be the place to start benchmarking, and then, everything else will follow.

Dr. Ewell stated that this is the conclusion to which many people are coming. If you do not have a common bottom line in terms of dollars, you can at least have something that compares in terms of how satisfied the students are and with what they are satisfied.

Regent NeSmith added that this was something that could be done immediately.

Dr. Ewell stated that the University System of North Carolina does this type of inquiry as a biannual set of surveys that are administered through the system office across the institutions.

Chancellor Portch noted that the University System of Georgia performed a student survey two years ago and is scheduled to do it again a year from now, though the Board may want to move that up a year.

Dr. Ewell added that the Board may want to consider a different kind of instrument.

Chair Leebern asked Regent McMillan, as the longest serving Regent, what were his observations on these matters.

Regent McMillan replied that he agreed with Regent Jenkins' remarks and noted that he considers himself a "lumper" in a sense, but that you have to do some splitting, too. There are so many variables that impact differences in institutions and the people who come to them. He warned that if the Regents do not take cognizance of those things, their benchmarking will not be valuable. As an example, he said that if entering students at Harvard University have an average 1300 SAT score and are tested again coming out with an average SAT score of 1500, then Harvard has not done much with those students. However, entering students at Ball State University have an average SAT score of 900 and then they tested at 1300 coming out, then Ball State's performance is better than Harvard's. He said that this seems to be one of the dangers of benchmarking and performance measurement. If the Regents are not cognizant of the differences in institutions, then it will be "garbage in, garbage out." He did not understand how you could not split when you have so many variables affecting the benchmarking process.

Dr. Ewell noted that one way of sorting through the incredible number of variables is to ask those who are doing the job. If the Board were to put on the table a few key measures, some things that are considered very important, and then ask the institutions why this is happening, then some of the variables will begin **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

to emerge. They may be different at different institutions, but the Board should feel its way into the process by asking the constituency what they think is important.

Regent Cannestra stated that he was not in favor of using the information gained from the benchmarking exercise to criticize or place blame on any institutions. Also, the concept of performance-based funding

was not appealing to him because he asserted that monies should be spent where they will give the largest incremental benefit. As an engineer with a master of business administration, he was amazed that business people do such illogical things. As an example, he used advertising as a percent of sales: as sales go up, advertising dollars go up and vice versa. He remarked that this is backwards in his opinion. Along the same lines, he is not certain that it makes sense to give better funding to the institutions that are already doing well. However, the Board will not know until it has the numbers to help it make decisions to improve matters. Having been through the benchmarking process before, Regent Cannestra said that the biggest benefit is the process itself. The process will educate the individual institutions and make them more efficient. If nothing else results, this would be a great benefit from the initiative.

Dr. Ewell added that another process that the Board might want to consider is the Illinois Priorities, Quality, and Productivity Initiative. Essentially, the logic of the initiative is to establish some things at the center and then challenge the institutions to provide a good case for doing what they are doing. Some institutions already have processes like that, but not all of them.

Dr. Mingle stated that one of the things that is valuable in this exercise and an opportunity the Board should take is to communicate to the institutions what the Regents care about, which seems to be student learning, efficiency, productivity, and a customer focus. He would add to that customer list employers and the citizens of Georgia as a whole. To that end, he would push the Regents toward a conversation about how the System matters in the lives of everyday citizens of the State, not just the students. There may not be a direct causal link or a quantitative measure between the lives of the citizens of Georgia and the activities of a given institution, but that does not mean that there is not a relationship, and it is important to examine that relationship. Dr. Gordon K. Davies, President of the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, noted recently that the state of Kentucky has ambitions to create one of the finest university systems in the country. Dr. Davies cited a recent report called "Children First," which ranked Kentucky fortieth in the welfare of its children. He then noticed that North Carolina, which has a reputation for having one of the finest university systems in the nation, ranked thirty-ninth. So, it is certainly possible to create a fine university system and not be relevant to very important issues like infant mortality, out-of-wedlock births, and other measures that are indicative of the health of a society. Dr. Mingle remarked that the same thing is true for the environment. Those are not direct responsibilities of the Board, but that does not mean that, in a benchmarking exercise, that kind of discussion about how the University System relates to the quality of life in Georgia is not an important discussion. It is important for the Regents to communicate to the institutions what matters to them so the institutions can sort out how to measure it and get on with the job of improvement.

Chancellor Portch asked that the Board shift gears to the other topic of this meeting, technology master planning. He asked Dr. Mingle to begin this discussion.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Dr. Mingle explained that he came to Georgia during his leave in 1995 in part because he spent eight years here working for the Southern Regional Education Board and he wanted to connect with people that knew more about technology than he did. One of the first visits he made on that trip was to the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”). He sat down with information technology staff and faculty who were trying to figure out what to do with exciting new tools such as network computing. He asked them why they were making such substantial investments in technology at GIT. The answer was simple, and it explains and justifies the enormous amounts of time and money that people are spending on information technology. The answer was, “We have to... create an environment where we learn the way our students will work, and our students are working in a technology-rich environment. They are working in a networked environment in which their colleagues in business are scattered throughout the world, and we have to prepare our students for that world.” Dr. Mingle noted that this was an engineering school that was working on redesigning its engineering and architectural design courses, but it has gotten to the point where there is not a field or an occupation in which information technology is not an important factor in the work environment. So, the response is that technology is becoming ubiquitous in the workplace, and the skills it takes to manage and use technology are becoming basic skills. Dr. Mingle urged the Board, as it develops its technology master plan, to think about this as not about distance learning and not about high-tech jobs, because most graduates work in the office or classroom or hospitals. They are users and managers of technology rather than producers of technology. Even though there is a shortage of workers in the information technology industry, it is a small percentage of the total job market, he said. The job market is mostly an office economy, and in that economy, every graduate needs some familiarity with information technology. He explained that this can happen by infusing the System in a ubiquitous manner. Not until there was a telephone everywhere did society really utilize the full potential of the telephone. Likewise, not until 100% of students have access to their own computers will a faculty member incorporate technology tools into his or her curriculum. So, the Board must make it a goal to infuse the entire System for all students. Dr. Mingle said that SHEEO has done studies for state university systems around the country and asked questions like “What percentage of your students own their own computers?” The percentage at a rural community college in Colorado might be 10% to 15%, while the percentage at GIT is likely almost 100%. So, there is a real equity problem as well as an access problem, and access is an important objective of the System.

When people think about technology, what they tend to want to do is buy equipment, software, and networks and put fiber underground and satellites in the sky. Dr. Mingle cautioned the Regents that when they cost out a technology project, the stuff they buy should be the minority share of the project. The majority share of the project should be people’s time and energy that they put into the investment. One of the problems right now in higher education is that there is a good amount of money at the end of the year in state budget surpluses that the legislature hands out saying, “Don’t hire anybody with this money. Go out and buy some stuff, because that will be a one-time expenditure.” University systems have gotten themselves in a bind because they do not have the academic technical support people at the campus level to carry out those projects. When they invest in large administrative data systems, which states all over the country are doing for a variety of reasons, the most common one being trying to solve their year 2000 computer problems, the cost of the software is a very small share of the total cost. So, the Board should start budgeting and thinking about technology as an ongoing cost with different life cycles and an expense on the personnel side as well.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Dr. Mingle next addressed the critical issue of investing in faculty. He did not mean only faculty teaching at a distance, and he advised the Regents to not think of this as a distance issue. He noted that a couple of surprising things have happened in the market. One of the things that has happened is that the biggest market for Internet-based courses is an institution’s own students on its own campus who want the convenience of taking a course on the Internet. One of the productivity problems is that faculty are stacking that technology on top of their traditional mode of teaching. So, they have a lecture, a lab, E-mail, and an online tutorial, all of which are adding cost because they have not really rethought how they are going to teach that course and incorporate that technology into their curriculum, how to not add cost but rather transform the way they are teaching and the students are learning. The most popular courses right now on the Internet are not courses that are completely online, but rather those that are partially online with some seat time reduction. Instead of coming to class three times a week, a student will come once or twice. The student is getting the convenience of the Internet with the value of the face-to-face contact. So, the Board and the faculty need to think about that. At SHEEO, there is an exciting project with four states called the Online Learning Exchange. Dr. Mingle said that the technology innovations group of the University System of Georgia is a part of this project. The Online Learning Exchange is going to provide faculty access to educational modules that are available on the Internet that they can incorporate into their classrooms. It will go through a consistent peer review process so people will know whether or not it is any good. He remarked that this is a very exciting project. In closing, Dr. Mingle congratulated the Board on its Georgia Global Learning Online for Business & Education (“Georgia GLOBE”) initiative and then asked whether the Regents had any questions.

Chancellor Portch stated that the Board is currently working with the State on its funding formula. One of the priorities of the Board to date has been increasing the formula budget in the area of major renovation and rehabilitation (“MRR”) of buildings. He asked whether Dr. Mingle would recommend that the Board have a similar type of factor in the formula so that technology is not part of the end-of-year supplemental budget request, but rather on a replacement schedule.

Dr. Mingle replied, “Absolutely.” He explained that the Board needs to examine life cycle costs of technology in the same way it examines MRR.

Dr. Ewell added that it would be wise to put the technology personnel costs in the formula budget as well. He remarked that it is an asset maintenance issue because the University System has invested in an asset that must be maintained.

Dr. Mingle noted that states are beginning to do budget in this manner. There are some reasonable benchmarks available both as to cost and lifetime replacement.

Regent NeSmith asked whether technology would help reduce faculty expenses.

Dr. Mingle responded that it is a great fear that technology is going to replace faculty, but it has not been realized to date. The level of interaction that goes on in an electronic format between student and faculty is usually greater than the level of interaction that goes on face to face. That is, if a professor is using E-mail to respond to students, he or she is probably responding to more students than in the classroom. He noted that there are productivity gains to be had. For example, an institution like GIT redesigned its courses to merge lecture and lab components. Instead of a physics course that consists of a 300-person lecture and **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

a 30-person lab, the college now has a 50-student “studio.” The faculty member gives a mini lecture and then tells the students to perform an online exercise. So, in a sense, the lecture and lab are merged. The



productivity gain is that the course used to be a six-credit-hour course, and now it is a four-credit-hour course. In other words, students are getting through an introductory physics course in one-third less time than before. That extra time allows that professor to do other things, like research. In a state like Georgia, it is not a matter of how to reduce the number of faculty. Rather, it is a matter of how to accommodate more students with the same physical plant and probably the same number of faculty. Dr. Mingle stated that it is reasonable for all students to have some self-directed component of their curriculum where technology is used. So, there will be student productivity gains, and because of that, an institution can become more efficient.

Regent NeSmith remarked that although there is some concern about this issue, in his experience with his own business, despite the addition of many computers, there was no reduction in workforce. He noted that employees, however, are more efficient.

Dr. Mingle added that the University of Minnesota converted to a Web registration system. The institution saw a reduction in the registrar's office at the minimally trained level of employee. So, there are fewer employees in that office, but they are at a higher educational level and there were likely more hirings in technical support.

Chair Leebern asked Dr. Mingle his opinion on wireless transmission versus bandwidth.

Dr. Mingle replied that the University System of Georgia has already invested a great deal in land lines, and that is likely where it will stay. Schools, unlike colleges and universities, have not done that, and they will probably go wireless because of the lower cost to them. He then called upon Vice Chancellor for Information/Instructional Technology E. Michael Staman to address this issue.

Dr. Staman responded that it is not clear that wireless technology will keep up with the speed of bandwidth at the campus level in the immediate future. So, what is happening is institutions are working hard to increase their own capacity using fiber optics in the ground capacity as opposed to wireless primarily because of the incredible need for multimedia and the incredible speed available at the wired level.

Dr. Mingle added that another important factor for the System is the power of computing with the development of the personal computer and Microsoft software flow to the desktop. That is, we all have very powerful computers sitting on our desks, which replaced mainframe systems. What is happening in technology because of the Internet is that the power is flowing back to the mainframe, though they now call them super servers. That is going to require a big mindset change among researchers and administrators in universities. The executive vice chancellor of the California State University System said at a meeting recently that there are 300,000 students and 23 institutions in that system, and that the system could have two administrative data centers in the state and every institution could be pulling its software and data off of that network via the Internet. Dr. Mingle stressed that this exemplifies the real economies of scale and the real implications for how the System and Georgia GLOBE will develop. There is a tradeoff: the more standardization the System has, the lower the cost. However, the more standardization, the more reaction the System will get from institutions wanting flexibility. Somewhere in between, the System has to reach an agreement about how much centralization it is going to have in data systems. The Board will have to make decisions about where the payoffs are and how much flexibility and customization it wants and can afford.

#### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Chair Leebern asked how the System can end an obsolete program and still retain the people that govern that program.

Chancellor Portch interjected that the conversation had come full circle, because benchmarking seems to be the answer to Chair Leebern's question.

Chair Leebern noted that when programs are obsolete, the people being adversely affected are really the customers. He asked how the System can redirect those funds.

Dr. Mingle responded that you always have the decision with technology, whether it is a software system or a delivery system, of legacy. That is, you have invested a certain amount of money in a technology or product and now it has become obsolete and you have to decide whether the System is going to be cutting-edge at all times or whether it will be cutting-edge just in some areas and a follower in others. Then, the question is incorporating information technology and its renewal into a budget cycle and a management process that systematically budgets for technology at the System level and pushes for reallocation at the institutional level. He noted that Virginia Technical Institute five years ago said that it wanted to be cutting-edge in technology and decided to systematically internally reinvest 10% of its budget into this priority.

Dr. Ewell added that some states expense depreciation in this area and build it into their budgets. He said that it is a greater problem, because the original centralization was in a highly bureaucratic environment. There is no longer that kind of environment, and one of the questions is how to get the institutions to take some of the risks with you.

Dr. Mingle stated that he wanted to discuss the power of joint purchasing and licensing of databases. There is a very interesting revenue opportunity for universities, and it is selling access of their students to vendors. He asked whether the Board would want to have a "button" (link) on its Georgia GLOBE Web site for various vendors and, in exchange, get a percentage of student dollars spent with those vendors. Institutions and states are being approached now with that option. They are also being approached by long-distance telephone companies who want access to the students. California State University was approached by one company that said the average student spends about \$1,200 a year on long-distance calls, and the company would give the institution 20% if it let the company put a button on its Web page. So, the Web has created all sorts of opportunities for systems to market their students. Dr. Mingle recommended that this be handled on the System level, rather than the institutional level.

Chair Leebern asked if there were any further questions and, seeing that there were none, thanked the speakers and recessed the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Regent Leebern explained that in each of the Regent’s folders was a copy of a resolution honoring a man who is very dear to the Board, Mr. Benjamin H. Hardaway, on his eightieth birthday. With motion properly made, duly seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the resolution, as follows:

**RESOLUTION**

**BENJAMIN H. HARDAWAY, III, MFH**

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway erred early by going to Virginia Military Institute for his own “education” but

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway has recently redeemed himself in the world of higher education by being a major factor in helping Regent Donald Leebern recruit Chancellor Stephen R. Portch to Georgia in 1994 and

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway colorfully tells this great story in the foreword to his critically acclaimed book as the best of its kind this century: *Never Outfoxed* and

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway “enjoyed,” at times, the assistance of Chancellor Stephen R. Portch in writing this book, even allowing him to suggest ways it could be made suitable for family audiences, and

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway has advanced Chancellor Stephen R. Portch’s venary education, has negotiated him a flexible schedule, has provided him opportunities and responsibilities, and has bribed him with hounds, thereby keeping him in the great state of Georgia and

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway is considered the world’s greatest living houndsman and

**WHEREAS**, Benjamin H. Hardaway celebrates his 80th birthday this month

**NOW, THEREFORE**, The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, on a motion by Regent Leebern, duly seconded by Regent Yancey and unanimously adopted, do hereby designate Benjamin H. Hardaway as its secret higher educational weapon and recognize him for a lifetime of achievement and for living life to its fullest.

Witnesseth this 8th day of September, 1999.

s/ Kenneth W. Cannestra  
**Chairman, Board of Regents**

s/ Donald M. Leebern, Jr.  
**Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr.**

s/ Stephen R. Portch  
**Chancellor, University System of Georgia**  
**NEW BUSINESS** (Continued)

s/ James D. Yancey  
**Regent James D. Yancey**

Next, Chair Cannestra wished Chancellor Portch an early happy birthday, because his birthday was Saturday, September 11. Chair Leebern presented the Chancellor with a gift for his birthday.

Chancellor Portch then recognized Representative Bob Lane from Statesboro, who was in attendance at the meeting. Representative Lane chairs the House Appropriations Education Subcommittee.

### **PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, October 12 and Wednesday, October 13, 1999 at Macon State College in Macon, Georgia.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m. on September 8, 1999.

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

s/  
Kenneth W. Cannestra  
Chair, Board of Regents  
University System of Georgia