CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, January 11 and Wednesday, January 12, 2000 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 approximately 1:05 p.m. on Tuesday, January 11. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Cannestra, were Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Juanita P. Baranco, 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, January 11 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that all Regents were present on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on November 9 and 10, 1999 were unanimously approved as distributed.
Chair Cannestra called upon Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Director of Yamacraw Educational Programs, to introduce the first presentation.

Dr. Papp thanked Chair Cannestra. He explained that 15 months ago, the Board of Regents authorized the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) in conjunction with Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”), Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”), and Savannah State University (“SSU”) to begin offering the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”). In August 1999, GTREP opened its doors to its first students. Dr. Papp said that he was pleased to report that in fall semester 1999, 119 students in civil engineering and computer engineering are involved in studying via GTREP. Dr. Papp then introduced Dr. James David Frost, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering at GIT and Director of GTREP. Dr. Frost has been at GIT for eight years, has a doctorate in civil engineering from Purdue University, and is one of the nation’s leading experts on earthquakes.

Dr. Frost thanked the Board for the opportunity to present something very exciting that has been happening in Southeast Georgia in the past 15 months. The GTREP initiative is broad-reaching and involves many partners, he noted. As such, it has many people doing something different than they have done before. Dr. Frost said that as a team, the partner institutions have met new challenges and addressed them, and the outcome has been very positive. Dr. Frost explained that the current organizational structure of GTREP is one that involves faculty and students in Atlanta, Statesboro, and Savannah. Moreover, GTREP also has potential to become a “virtual university” using computer technology to teach on other campuses. GIT personnel work with faculty at the participating institutions as well as in Atlanta to offer a full-breadth program with electives that are available in the programs at GIT. In addition, GIT faculty work together with each institution’s faculty. GIT faculty in Savannah are located at the Coastal Georgia Center (“CGC”), which is another University System facility. In addition, there are underclassmen and will be graduate students at all of the participating institutions.

There are three components of GTREP, explained Dr. Frost. The first is undergraduate engineering education. Currently, GTREP offers a bachelor of science degree (“B.S.”) in computer engineering and a B.S. in civil engineering. Other programs will be at the graduate level. In addition to the two programs that were originally discussed when the initiative started 15 months ago, the master of science degree (“M.S.”) in electrical and computer engineering and the M.S. in environmental engineering will eventually be offered. These graduate courses will build upon existing video-based courses that GIT has had for a number of years that have been very successful and have been delivered across the country. Secondly, there is the opportunity to take lab courses. In many cases, in engineering programs, being able to do something is equally if not more important than just hearing someone lecture about it. The third component of GTREP is economic development/applied research. This initiative has always been viewed as an opportunity to help existing industry and to attract new industry to the southeast region of the State. Growing up in Ireland, Dr. Frost commented, he knows that the Irish attracted many American companies by giving them big breaks on facilities costs and taxes. Today, companies are interested in the intellectual capital that a location can provide them. In that context, GTREP plays an integral role in economic development in the southeast region. The importance of having these three different components plays into a number of other things. GTREP is able to attract faculty of the highest quality to Southeast Georgia because it is able to give them the full set of opportunities that faculty at GIT have. Nowadays, it is very competitive to attract faculty, particularly in fields such as computer engineering. Unless a breadth of challenges and experiences is available, the program will have a difficult time attracting the caliber of faculty it wants to have.
a bachelor’s degree from GIT. What is slightly different than previous programs is that the freshman and sophomore courses are taken at the partner institution and the courses are taught primarily by instructors from that institution. However, after the sophomore year, instead of students relocating to Atlanta, they remain at the partner institution but become GIT students. They then receive their junior and senior level instruction predominantly from GIT faculty, but there is still involvement of partner institution faculty in some of the humanities electives and in some of the technical electives. Obviously, this is very attractive to many students. The end result is that those students will graduate with a GIT degree while remaining in Southeast Georgia.

GTREP is a success story because everyone involved appreciates it as a collaborative initiative, said Dr. Frost. Obviously, the Board of Regents and its Central Office have been playing very important roles in the initiative. In addition, there are GIT faculty and staff in Southeast Georgia as well as faculty and staff at AASU, GSOU, and SSU. The GIT faculty in Atlanta also provided a great deal of help in the start-up phases. Dr. Frost stated that he had met many people at the partner institutions through numerous meetings. What has been particularly exciting to him is the involvement at the partner institutions. On the economic development side, there has been collaboration with the Savannah Economic Development Association (“SEDA”) and the Business and Education Technology Alliance (“BETA”). Another unit of the University System of Georgia, the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography (“SKIO”), will also play an increasingly important role, particularly with regard to some of the civil engineering faculty who are working in the environmental area. There will be more opportunities for important interactions there.

Dr. Frost noted the accomplishments of GTREP to date. The undergraduate degrees and curricula have been identified, approved, and implemented. Recruitment, admission, and registration procedures have been developed and implemented. A significant amount of time was put into developing processes that thought about the students. It was not a matter of making existing programs work, but rather it was about simplifying processes for the students. For example, there were meetings with all of the admissions and registration staff from the participating institutions in which they worked through all of these issues. In addition to solving problems, the meetings also brought together people who were doing the same jobs at different institutions, increasing camaraderie and collaboration. Many program support elements were also identified and implemented. Issues such as co-op programs, library matters, student services, and career services have also been ongoing. Faculty needs and assessment procedures were also identified and approved. Students are being held to the same standards as they would in applying to GIT in Atlanta; therefore, those students should be provided with instruction from faculty who are held to the same high standards as GIT faculty. Three visiting faculty have been hired who may be converted to permanent faculty. Additionally, there are now advertisements out for other faculty, and more than 100 people have applied for civil engineering faculty positions. As expected, Dr. Frost said, there are substantially fewer applicants for the positions in computer engineering. The demand in that field is incredible, he explained, and there have been only about 20 applicants. By August 2000, GTREP will have approximately six to eight permanent faculty. As Dr. Papp had mentioned, there are in excess of 100 students enrolled in freshman and sophomore GTREP classes since fall 1999 in Savannah and Statesboro. The breakdown of those students is approximately 50-50 geographically and about 60-40 in the areas of computer and civil engineering, respectively. The first junior level GTREP courses began this month, January 2000. Additionally, the program has made extensive outreach efforts to industry (e.g., BETA, SEDA). One outcome of that is a BETA scholarship program; two students have been awarded BETA scholarships. There are applications and deadlines for the next round of scholarships, and there are resources to offer a substantial number of scholarships for fall 2000 as well.

**PRESENTATION: GEORGIA TECH REGIONAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM UPDATE**

Next, Dr. Frost discussed how GTREP resources are being used. He explained the breakdown of fiscal year 1999 and projected fiscal year 2000 allocations. He stressed that the most important items were in the category of major equipment. From the outset, allocations were made to GIT and all of the partner institutions, but a framework was put in place that also coordinated how those allocations were spent.
That was particularly important, because with those allocations, a backbone of servers was established that connects all of the nodes of the GTREP network. All of the nodes have consistent and identical computer hardware and software, so compatibility is ensured. Secondly, a great deal of resources has also been invested in some of the distance learning classrooms. While the Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”) has been a workhorse for the System for a number of years, GTREP is positioning itself for the next wave of technology. It also recognized that it would also be a significant enhancement to have dual technologies in classrooms. So, there are dual technology distance learning classrooms with a GSAMS classroom at the front of the room and computers below the desks with direct World Wide Web access. Hence, an instructor can teach via GSAMS and, at the same time, tell the students to look on the Web for some support resources for the course. Dr. Frost remarked that this is a move in the right direction and also provides an exciting classroom environment for the students. Other major equipment resources are going into some of the computer labs that have rather sophisticated computer stations. Each of the units costs approximately $20,000 to $25,000. Multiple students cannot share a unit, because the key issue for students in the instructional environment is the direct hands-on experience.

In concluding his presentation, Dr. Frost discussed the GTREP time line. While GTREP was begun about 15 months ago, it had its first formal freshman and sophomore courses in August 1999. The first selected junior courses began this month, and the first selected senior classes will begin in August 2000. The new faculty will also come on board in August 2000. The first student to graduate will likely graduate in May 2001. One of the reasons GTREP is able to accomplish this so quickly is because of the existing Regents Engineering Transfer Program (“RETP”) and the fact that a number of students who were originally taking the courses in RETP have elected to study via GTREP and will therefore graduate fairly early in the program. Obviously, that is very important also because, as with any program, GTREP must have graduates to become accredited. The sooner GTREP applies for accreditation, the better, Dr. Frost stated. With that, he concluded his remarks.

Chair Canestra thanked Dr. Frost.

Dr. Papp also thanked Dr. Frost.

Regent Jones asked what is the future projected enrollment for GTREP.

Dr. Frost responded that projections as far as 2008 or 2009 indicate that at that point in time, between both computer and civil engineering, there will be somewhere between 600 to 650 students enrolled in GTREP. There will be growth every year. Many factors were considered in those growth projections. This year, there was not a full year of recruiting. SSU did not have RETP before GTREP, so SSU’s involvement will likely increase.

Chancellor Portch asked whether there might be 200 students in GTREP in the next year.

Dr. Frost said that it would not surprise him.

**PRESENTATION: GEORGIA TECH REGIONAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM UPDATE**

Regent Baranco asked whether there is information on who is paying for outsourcing among the various partner institutions.

Chancellor Portch further asked whether information on the allocations per institution for equipment was available.
Dr. Frost replied that he could obtain that information.

Regent Baranco explained that she wanted to see the details because she was trying to understand the thought processes of the GTREP administrators.

Dr. Papp assured her that this information would be provided.

Regent Leebern asked how the numbers of students were distributed across the partner institutions.

Dr. Papp responded that the breakdown between GSOU and AASU is approximately half and half. SSU had no students involved during fall semester 1999, but that was because it did not have RETP.

Regent Leebern asked how many students would be in the program in 2005.

Dr. Frost estimated that among the three partner institutions, there would be approximately 450 to 500 students.

Chancellor Portch called upon President Carlton E. Brown of SSU to comment on the participation at that institution.

President Brown expanded upon Dr. Papp’s comments, explaining that in spring semester 2000, six students have enrolled in GTREP at SSU. However, SSU expects the number to increase dramatically with the transfer program, adding about 15 to 20 students in the next two years.

Dr. Frost remarked that this is consistent with his long-term projections.

Dr. Papp stated that he had visited SSU in the previous week, and the dean of the College of Technology felt very confident that there would be an increase in the number of students over the course of the next few years.

Regent Leebern noted that the majority of students are in Bulloch County. He asked whether this was in direct proportion to the enrollment at the respective institutions and whether the 50-50 dispersion would likely continue over time.

Dr. Frost responded that the prediction that the number of students in the program will increase to approximately 600 is based on two data points, the second of which he did not get until September 1999. He went to all of the participating institutions’ GTREP classes and asked the students whether they intend to remain GTREP students at their respective home institutions or whether they intend to transfer to GIT as an RETP student, and that feedback is what he used to formulate his predictions. A year from now, he will **PRESENTATION: GEORGIA TECH REGIONAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM UPDATE**

have a third data point, and he will feel much more confident about his predictions then. While there are only two bachelor’s degree programs offered in the Southeast, computer and civil engineering, there are eight programs at GIT. Sometimes, it is not just a choice of doing computer engineering in Savannah or Atlanta. It can be a choice between doing electrical engineering in Atlanta and computer engineering in Savannah. There are not many firewalls to make people feel locked into decisions. The program gives the students flexibility to take the time to make a good decision about where they want to get their degrees.

Vice Chair Coleman complimented AASU, GSOU, SSU, and GIT for their collaborative efforts on this initiative. He said that he was pleasantly surprised by how well they worked together. He congratulated
everyone involved in the project. He remarked that the regional engineering concept seems to be working in the Southeast and that it will obviously grow.

Regent White also commended the GTREP participants and noted the short duration of time in which the project has been started. He asked what is the biggest problem or obstacle of the initiative.

Dr. Frost replied that there are a number of significant challenges to the project. For instance, issues of facilities and networking/bandwidth must be addressed. He remarked that GTREP cannot be a top-notch engineering program with bandwidth limitation problems. While those are the two most pressing issues where money is concerned, another issue is ensuring that GTREP can hire the caliber of faculty it wants. He said that he will feel more comfortable in August 2000 when the new faculty are on board. Having looked through the resumes submitted, he asserted that there is quality there. The problem is that the competition is very stiff. Even GIT experiences that problem in Atlanta. So, this will be a big challenge for GTREP.

Regent Hunt asked whether the efficiency ratio of cost per student will remain constant and noted that the cost has not gone up with the increase from 20 students to 120 students.

Dr. Papp responded that costs per student may actually go up because of costs of technology and quality faculty, particularly in computer engineering. GTREP will do its best to contain costs, but if it is going to continue to be as high-quality as it began, the program will probably see per student costs increase.

Dr. Frost added that full-time equivalent student numbers and faculty-student ratios may be low at the beginning of a program. However, there is a minimum program size that is critical to have. He has seen in other projects that the driver becomes adding faculty to maintain a desirable faculty-student ratio, and that will affect the computer engineering program sooner because of its projected growth compared to the civil engineering program. At the eight- or nine-year point, it will also become a driver in the civil engineering program.

Regent Leebern asked whether the program will need more resources once students graduate and the program applies for accreditation.

Dr. Frost responded that Dr. Jack R. Lohmann in the GIT College of Engineering has been carefully monitoring the accreditation issue along the way because GTREP wants to ensure that it does everything correctly. The changeover to Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (“ABET”) 2000 made a lot of differences, but some of the forward-looking elements in ABET 2000 are consistent with the kind of program GTREP is developing. Dr. Frost said that he did not foresee any problems with accreditation.
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Regent NeSmith asked what was GTREP’s long-term vision regarding its relationship to the College of Engineering at GIT.

Dr. Papp stated that as far as he knew, the intention is to maintain the current relationship of GTREP as a GIT program with the collaborative effort that has been in place. The collaboration has been excellent not only for the engineering program itself, but it has also been incredibly useful in enhancing collaboration among universities in the Southeast as well. From his perspective, the first year was very successful. It is a model that will be amenable to growth and continuation as it currently exists, he posited.

Chancellor Portch added that in the long term, with the graduate programs, the portability to other regions of the State is highly likely. He wants to see how this model works to know whether it can be transported to other parts of Georgia. That will be easier on the graduate level than on the undergraduate level. The
commitment is to start the program in a quality way, produce some graduates, and see how the program evolves. It may grow to a point where the regional institutions can themselves run the program, and with the demands on GIT from its home-based programs, this may be a natural evolution. So, there are many possibilities. The Chancellor said that the System’s first commitment in designing the program was to serve the region and have it be basically invisible to people in that region how the System is doing that. He remarked that GTREP is off to a very good start. Obviously, the value added by the GIT engineering degree, recognized as one of the best in the nation, and the quality measures put into it are very important to the startup of the program. In 15 months, GTREP has already exceeded his expectations, Dr. Portch said. He also commented that Dr. Frost has exactly the personality to make something like this work, because each of the partner institutions reports to the Chancellor how much they like working with him. So, the long-term development of the program depends on the growth of the State and the region as well as their demand for the field. Chancellor Portch noted that engineering is a field with declining demand across the nation. Enrollments in engineering are also going down, except for some isolated pockets like computer engineering, where demand is going up. So, all of these elements come into play in the long term. He remarked that initially, the Board commissioned a study to see where there was high demand in engineering. By the look of the numbers, it seems the Board chose the right two programs.

Dr. Papp added that he wanted to give credit where credit is due. As Director of Yamacraw Educational Programs, Dr. Papp has taken a number of trips to Southeast Georgia, and without exception, when he visits AASU, GSOU, and SSU, there is tremendous praise for the work of Dr. Frost. He is the man who deserves credit for the success of the program.

Regent Jones thanked Vice Chair Coleman and Chancellor Portch for initiating this program. He noted that Georgia is the fourth fastest growing state in the nation, and he noted the importance of GTREP to the southern part of the State. He expressed his absolute faith that GTREP will someday be available in Southwest Georgia.

Chair Cannestra also commended the program and the presenters. He asked whether there were any further questions or comments. Seeing that there were none, he reminded the Regents that there would be a social event that evening at the 191 Club hosted by former Regent Elsie P. Hand. He then adjourned the Board into its regular Committee meetings.
CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, January 12, 2000 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 Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Juanita P. Baranco, 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, January 12 by Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, January 12 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that all Regents were present on that day.
INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JACK HILL

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

Chancellor Portch stated that it was his pleasure to welcome again the Chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee, Jack Hill (district 4). He remarked that the University System is blessed to have Senator Hill’s leadership. Senator Hill has a genuine interest and has been superb to work with. The previous day, the Senate Higher Education Committee had a briefing on the early retirement bill that was very successful and positive. Senator Hill is always available to the Regents and the Chancellor. The Chancellor then welcomed Senator Hill.

Senator Hill thanked the Chancellor and greeted the Board. He remarked that it was an honor to speak before the Board, especially because the Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) football team was represented at this meeting. Because it was early in the session, Senator Hill wanted to say a few things that had been on his mind. First of all, he was very proud of how GSOU’s football team played as well as how the team members represented the university, the region, and the State. Senator Hill remarked that it says a great deal about the leadership of the team and the university. He was reminded of something that was said at one of the playoff games where the score was rather close. At halftime, he was discussing the fear that the other team might come back, and someone said, “Just remember that as fast as our team is, the fact that there are only 11 players on the other side gives us an advantage.” By the end of the third quarter, the other team was exhausted. In a year where coaches have had to apologize for the actions of some players, the fact that GSOU had a championship team all year that represented the State well is a tribute to the University System. Senator Hill then thanked the Regents for the contributions that they make to the prosperity of the State. He asserted that one of the secrets to Georgia’s success has been the role that higher education has played in the prosperity and job growth and everything that has made businesses prosper in this State. As he looked at the State budget and the money being spent on the Georgia Research Alliance and the Yamacraw Mission as well as in many other areas, it was easy for him to see how these directly affect the success and prosperity of the State. The last thing he wanted to mention was that the Governor had gotten the General Assembly off to a good start with the budget this year. There were some concerns about problems facing higher education budgetarily, but with the Governor’s supplemental budget and his 2001 budget proposal, everything should be alright in the end. On behalf of the Senate Higher Education Committee, Senator Hill wanted assured the Board that the committee stands ready to assist the University System. He said that the committee greatly appreciates it when the Regents lobby for the System. In closing, he thanked the Regents for having him and for honoring the GSOU football team.

Chair Cannestra thanked Senator Hill for his visit and for all he does for the State of Georgia. He then asked the Chancellor to make a few more introductions.

Chancellor Portch recognized Representative Ann R. Purcell (district 147) and Representative Bob Lane (district 146). He noted that they are on the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, and he asked if they would like to speak.

Representative Lane said that it was a pleasure to be at the meeting. He stated that he was proud of GSOU’s football team and what the Chancellor and the Board do for the State.

Chancellor Portch then recognized former Representative John Godbee, who also remarked that it was a pleasure to be at the Board meeting.

KUDOS TO GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY’S NATIONAL FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP
Chair Cannestra next called upon the Chancellor to make another introduction.

Chancellor Portch said that it was his pleasure to honor the System’s national championship football team, the Eagles at Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”). He noted that President Bruce F. Grube and his wife Kathryn are the team’s number one fans. He then showed a brief video clip from national television of Walter Payton Award winner Adrian Peterson making a very long run. The Chancellor explained that Mr. Peterson brought incredible recognition to the team and to GSOU. He asked Mr. Peterson to stand and be recognized. He then invited President Grube to speak before the Board.

President Grube greeted the Board and said it was GSOU’s honor to be able to represent the State of Georgia and the System. He remarked not only is the team blessed with some terrific athletes of the highest character, but also with a good athletics administration and good coaches. He told the Regents that this is a team that averaged over 550 yards of offense during the entire year. That is about 250 yards more than most of the team’s opponents. The Eagles also broke 197 individual and team records this year, 23 of which were NCAA Division I-AA records and 13 of which were NCAA Division I-AA playoff records. So, this is an exceptional team. President Grube then introduced Athletic Director Sam Baker, who would be introducing a few members of the team.

Mr. Baker said that it was an honor to be at the Board meeting and that he was standing in for Coach Paul Johnson, who was attending the national football coaches annual meeting in Anaheim, California, where he would be honored at their national banquet as the NCAA Division I-AA National Coach of the Year. Mr. Baker remarked that this was a fitting tribute for a young man who returned to GSOU after several years away in other positions. Coach Johnson led the Eagles to a record of 37 and 6 in his three years back and a national championship. Mr. Baker stated that if Coach Johnson were at this meeting, he would applaud his staff for their work in recruiting and preparing the team each week and he would also congratulate the players for meeting the challenges each week to be able to win the national championship. Of the team starters, 20 of 22 are from the State of Georgia. Mr. Baker had brought four of the starters with him to this meeting. The first was Mr. Volcellies Allen, a nose tackle from Douglas. He is a four-year starter and a three-year All Southern Conference choice. Mr. Allen won first team selection to five All-American squads this season and is an Academic All-American with a 3.6 grade point average. He graduated in December with a bachelor’s degree in chemistry. He also earned recognition by the Burger King Corporation’s NCAA Division I-AA College Football Scholar Athlete Honor Roll, which included a $10,000 donation to the GSOU general scholarship fund in his name. Mr. Allen played in 51 collegiate games, starting 45 during his career. In 1999, he recorded 77 tackles and 47 solos. Mr. Greg Hill is a quarterback who has guided GSOU through a 32 and 4 record. The 1999 Southern Conference Offensive Player of the Year and All-American directed the Eagles to three playoff appearances and led an offense which averaged 44.5 points per game and 506 total offensive yards per contest during his 36 starts. For his career, Mr. Hill finished with 3,309 rushing yards and 3,369 passing yards, and he is the first player in I-AA history to reach that 3,300 mark. He also became the first player in GSOU history to have rushed and passed for over 1,000 yards in back-to-back seasons after finishing 1999 with 1,084 rushing and 1,262 yards passing. Mr. Hill will graduate this summer. Mr. Rich McGrath is an offensive tackle from Snellville, who Mr. Baker said is one of the finest and most durable offensive linemen ever to play at GSOU. Mr. McGrath played in 54 games during his four-year career while making 52 starts, the most among any member of the team. He earned first team All-Southern Conference honors in three consecutive seasons, 1997, 1998, and 1999, and his national honors list includes a selection on the Sports Network All-American Squad. He helped anchor an offensive

KUDOS TO GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY’S NATIONAL FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

line which captured three major national offensive statistical category championships, topping the I-AA football and scoring 50 points per game this year, rushing offense 419 yards per game and total offense
Mr. McGrath graduated in December with a bachelor’s degree in business administration and is now employed by a certified public accounting firm in Atlanta. Mr. Adrian Peterson has been a starting fullback for his first two years at GSOU and has already earned a reputation as the most prolific running back in I-AA history. In December, he became the first GSOU player to win the Walter Payton Award, symbolic of the I-AA national player of the year honors. In addition, he earned first team selections of five different All-American squads in 1999 and is a two-time first team All-Southern Conference choice. Mr. Peterson has rushed for 100 yards or more in all 30 collegiate games he has played. In just two seasons, he has broken or tied 118 single game, single season, or career records; 42 GSOU records; 32 NCAA Division I-AA records; and 44 Southern Conference records. During his career, he has already rushed for 5,310 overall yards, an average of 117 per game, and scored 76 touchdowns. Mr. Peterson averaged 203 rushing yards per game in eight games against nationally ranked I-AA or I-A opponents during this season. Mr. Baker again lauded Coach Johnson’s work in leading the football team. He remarked that Coach Johnson prepares the team not only for the football games but also for the game of life. In closing, Mr. Baker also thanked President Grube for his leadership.

President Grube thanked the Board for the opportunity to introduce the players and Mr. Baker and said that he hoped the Eagles will win the championship again next year.

Chair Cannestra thanked President Grube and Mr. Baker.
TEACHING HOSPITAL COMMITTEE

The Teaching Hospital Committee met on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at approximately 10:35 a.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor’s Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Vice Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr., and Regents Kenneth W. Cannistra, Joe Frank Harris, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, and James D. Yancey. Chair Allgood reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed four items, one of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of the Master Affiliation Agreement Between the Board of Regents and MCG Health, Inc.

Approved: The Board approved the master affiliation agreement between the Board of Regents and MCG Health, Inc. for transfer of facilities, assets, employees, and obligations of Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) hospital and clinics from the Board of Regents to MCG Health, Inc.

Background: The master affiliation agreement, which was prepared with the assistance of the Office of the Attorney General and Special Attorney General, is the first of a series of agreements that will accomplish the transfer of the management of MCG hospital and clinics from the Board of Regents to MCG Health, Inc., effective July 1, 2000. This agreement sets out the understanding of the parties regarding the proposed affiliation and expresses the interests of the parties in negotiating the terms of the associated agreements. The associated agreements will include a clinical, educational, and research services agreement; an operations and services agreement; a master lease; a personnel agreement; a physicians practice group agreement; and a transfer agreement detailing the assets and liabilities to be transferred. The effective date of the master affiliation agreement will be 60 days following notification of the General Assembly, or February 2, 2000.

A summary of the terms of the master affiliation agreement was distributed to the Committee members, and a copy of the agreement is on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

2. Information Item: Update on the Medical College of Georgia Early Retirement Plan

President Francis J. Tedesco updated the Committee on the status of the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) early retirement plan. In August 1999, the Board of Regents approved an early retirement program for MCG employees who meet certain eligibility criteria. The principal goal of the program was to reduce costs and achieve savings in the MCG hospital and clinics. The election period during which eligible MCG employees could elect to retire under the early retirement plan ended December 6, 1999. A total of 713 employees, representing 88% of the eligible employees, elected to retire under the plan. (A small number of additional employees is still being determined.) An early retirement monitoring committee has been established to monitor the savings from these early retirements to ensure that MCG meets its fiscal goals and to oversee the necessary filling of vacancies that result. The Board of Regents staff will also monitor the retirement plan implementation and fiscal goals. Retirements will be scheduled...
between January 1, 2000 and June 30, 2001 to ensure the continued effective operation of the college and the hospital and clinics.
TEACHING HOSPITAL COMMITTEE

3. Information Item: Report From President Francis J. Tedesco on Follow-up to the Actions of the Blue Ribbon Commission Adopted by the Board of Regents in January 1999

President Francis J. Tedesco reported to the Committee on the status of follow-up to the actions of the Blue Ribbon Commission, which were adopted in January 1999.

4. Information Item: Report From Mr. Don Snell on Follow-up to the Actions of the Blue Ribbon Commission Adopted by the Board of Regents in January 1999

Mr. Don Snell, President and Chief Executive Officer of MCG Health, Inc., distributed a written report to the Committee on the status of follow-up to the actions adopted by the Blue Ribbon Commission, which were adopted in January 1999. However, due to time constraints, he was not able to go over the report with the Committee. He will return to discuss the report in March 2000.

Background on Items 3 and 4: In fall 1998, the Board of Regents appointed a Blue Ribbon Commission on the Medical College of Georgia: Vision and Mission. Membership included appointments by the Chair of the Board of Regents and the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Speaker of the House.

In January 1999, the Commission reported back to the Board of Regents, and the Regents unanimously reaffirmed the mission of and vision for the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) with modest changes. Additionally, numerous recommendations, especially related to the future of the MCG hospital and clinics, were unanimously adopted. The report was redistributed to the Committee members at this meeting.

President Francis J. Tedesco of MCG and Mr. Don Snell of MCG Health, Inc. reported to the Committee at the August 1999 meeting on follow-up actions to the Commission’s recommendations. President Tedesco reported to the Committee again at this meeting, although Mr. Snell did not due to time constraints, and they will bring annual updates hereafter, as required by the Board.
AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at approximately 11:20 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. Chair Howell reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items, neither of which required action. Additionally, there was an add-on agenda item of an Executive Session on a personnel matter. No actions were taken in Executive Session. Those items were as follows:

1. Information Item: Fort Valley State University – Implementation Update on State Audit Report and NASFAA Financial Aid Study

In May 1999, the Audit Committee reviewed the State Department of Audits’ (“DOA”) report on Fort Valley State University (“FVSU”). At that meeting, the Committee requested that FVSU engage an outside firm to evaluate issues brought up in the report. In November 1999, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark reported to the Committee on a preliminary report of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administration (“NASFAA”). (The final report was issued on December 17, 1999.) At the time of the November meeting, the report had not been fully reviewed and commented on by President Oscar L. Prater. The findings of the report were consistent with a majority of the financial aid findings of the State Department of Audits. Chair Howell requested that President Oscar L. Prater attend the January 2000 meeting of the Audit Committee when the Committee would again revisit the matter. Additionally, the Committee requested that Chancellor Portch and Senior Vice Chancellor Lindsay Desrochers require President Prater to develop an action plan that would resolve the issues identified in both the NASFAA and the DOA reports.

At this meeting, President Prater assured the Committee that he has taken a leadership role in developing and implementing a strong corrective action program. The program contains both an action plan to re-engineer the financial aid operations of FVSU and a monitoring system for tracking the progress towards and achievement of the goals of the action plan. President Prater explained that the action plan addresses each recommendation of the NASFAA. One of the initial actions of the corrective action plan was to hire a new Director of Financial Aid. That was accomplished effective October 18, 1999. Additionally, FVSU contracted with Wesley Peachtree Group, a consulting firm that has been assigned the responsibility of reviewing student financial aid records and correcting any problems, to ensure that all records are in compliance with federal regulations. The consultants began their work on December 13, 1999. In response to Regent concerns regarding the quality and training of the financial aid staff, only two of the eight original staff members remain in the financial aid office, and the new director is hiring and training new staff. A monitoring system has been established to document the goals, actions, target dates, status reports, and achievement dates of the action program. The Vice President for Student Affairs reports to President Prater on the monitoring process on a biweekly basis. In closing, President Prater assured the Committee that FVSU is rectifying identified areas of concern in accordance with the rules and regulations of the State and federal bodies governing student financial services in order to ensure that the fiscal integrity and efficient operation of the financial aid office are maintained.
2. **Information Item: Accounts Receivable Project Update**

During fiscal year 1999, the Committee heard from Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark on some accounts receivable ("AR") functions. The Office of Internal Audit was asked by the Committee to evaluate AR for the University System. An analytical review was completed. The status of the analytical review was presented to the Committee by Mr. Stark, and he indicated a need for minor adjustments in procedures. An audit of selected campuses will be performed throughout the year, and any notable issues with AR will be reported to the Committee. Mr. Stark will make an annual report to the Committee on any accounts receivable issues.

3. **Executive Session**

The Committee voted to add an item to its agenda concerning a personnel matter, which required an Executive Session. The following Committee members voted to go into Executive Session: Chair 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. Chancellor Stephen R. Portch, Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (Prevention) J. Burns Newsome, and President Oscar L. Prater of Fort Valley State University also attended the Executive Session. During the session, Chair Howell asked everyone to leave the room except the Committee members, the Chancellor, and Dr. Desrochers. When the Committee returned to its regular session, Chair Howell reported that no action was taken in Executive Session.
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The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at approximately 2:00 p.m. in room 6041, the GSAMS/Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Juanita P. Baranco, Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Chair Baranco reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 11 items, 8 of which required action. Additionally, 105 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 Bachelor of Science in International Affairs and Modern Language Degree, 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 bachelor of science in international affairs and modern language degree, effective January 12, 2000.

Abstract: The bachelor of science in international affairs and modern language degree with options in Spanish, French, German, or Japanese will serve the requirements of business, industry, government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations that need graduates who understand the global and multicultural environment of today’s interdependent world. The new degree will provide a structured curriculum in international affairs and advanced language study using existing courses and instructional resources. This combination will provide students with rigorous academic training that will prepare them to function effectively in positions that require both substantive, international knowledge and sophisticated linguistic skills.

Need: Georgia is increasingly becoming a global, interdependent, and multicultural place to live and work. Many companies with an international base have developed in or relocated to Georgia. These companies will find a resource of technical graduates who have the analytical knowledge base and practical language skills that are directly applicable to an international business environment. In addition to private sector opportunities, graduates may find employment in agencies such as the Peace Corps, state trade commissions, the Agency for International Development, the foreign service, and the military. The 1990 edition of The Annals published by the American Academy of Political and Social Science suggested that “while professional skills were seen as an important factor in hiring, most companies concurred that foreign language knowledge would give a candidate an edge” and that “most predicted that they would need more foreign language skills among all of their employees.” In an article entitled, “Business Schools Promote International Focus, but Critics See More Hype than Substance,” published in the September 1997 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, it was stated that “despite their professed commitment to international study, only a handful of schools, including Thunderbird, Monterey, and South Carolina, require students to be able to speak a foreign language.” The program is unique in Georgia for its inclusion of courses focusing on science and technology, its four-year foreign language proficiency requirement, and its emphasis on the application of language skills in professional settings (as opposed to a traditional literature-based curriculum).

Objectives: The combination of an international affairs curriculum and in-depth study of a modern language will provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary for management and leadership positions in global enterprises, both public and private. The program is designed to develop foreign language proficiency.
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1. Establishment of the Bachelor of Science in International Affairs and Modern Language Degree, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)
within the context of a strong international affairs specialization. The program seeks to produce graduates with the linguistic and cross-cultural skills to operate effectively in a variety of international settings, particularly in Georgia or with Georgia-based companies and organizations.

**Curriculum:** The program will be offered jointly by the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs and the Department of Modern Languages of the Ivan Allen College using existing courses that are regularly offered by the school and the department.

The new joint degree program requires 39 semester credits in the core curriculum; 31 credits in international affairs; 30 credits in either Spanish, French, or German above the first-year level; 12 credits of cluster electives that focus on a particular area of study (e.g., international business, European studies, technology transfer, arms control, etc.); and 10 credits of unrestricted electives. (Given the limited instruction in Japanese available at most high schools, the degree option in Japanese requires 29 hours that include first-year courses.) It is expected that many students will acquire a portion of their language and related coursework in intensive study abroad summer sessions that GIT has developed to support these programs.

**Projected Enrollment:** There are currently 230 students enrolled as majors in the existing bachelor of science in international affairs, with an average of 43 degrees awarded in each of the past five years. The Department of Modern Languages does not offer an undergraduate degree but has awarded 224 certificates in the past five years, with about 10% of those earned by international affairs majors. It is anticipated that for the first three years of the new joint program, student enrollment in the major will be 10, 20, and 30 with an expectation of granting at least 10 degrees each year as the initial student cohorts complete the program.

**Funding:** Program costs will be met through existing budget allocations. The university can provide both expertise and structure for the major at no additional cost by using courses, faculty, library, computer facilities, and equipment already in place. The School of International Affairs will provide administrative support for the program, including the services of a full-time academic adviser to assist new majors. No new State funding will be sought for this proposal.

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

2. **Establishment of the Internet Alternative Delivery of the Existing Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology, Medical College of Georgia**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the Internet alternative delivery of the existing bachelor of science in medical technology degree, effective August 2000.
2. Establishment of the Internet Alternative Delivery of the Existing Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)

Abstract: MCG proposed to offer, on a pilot basis, the existing bachelor of science in medical technology degree via the Internet. The Web site address is http://www.mcg.edu/MedTech/MLTHomepage.htm. The campus-based degree allows a student several curriculum options. However, the Internet-based degree will be restricted to students who are already certified laboratory technicians (Medical Laboratory Technology ["MLT"] articulation).

Need: The number of medical technology graduates per year from System institutions has dropped from a maximum of 80 to 40 students. MCG has received several requests from Georgia’s State laboratories and employees of allied health agencies concerning the need for medical technologists. In order to produce more graduates in the State, MCG is attempting to address the needs of the nontraditional, associate-level graduate who wants a baccalaureate degree. It is anticipated that the program will help rural areas that have difficulty recruiting graduates and will provide the additional training needed to function at the technologist level. An MCG survey of distance education students also found that the nontraditional students needed more than one year to complete the program. Therefore, MCG has increased the length of the program to two years while reducing the hours per semester. The increased time frame will allow MCG to evaluate the process, offer professional and technical courses in separate semesters, and reduce the hours per week in internships to compensate for more study time.

Delivery of the program: Instead of the previously approved Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”) mode, Internet and WebCT will be the primary delivery system. Face-to-face interaction with instructors is still viewed as an important component of the program; therefore, MCG will provide for up to three GSAMS meetings per semester to supplement the WebCT Internet courses. Because this is a pilot program, admissions have been capped to a maximum of ten students for the first two-year cohort. Preference will be given to Georgia residents for the program. The location of instruction will be the student's home, local Internet access site, and work site, or suitable local medical laboratory. The program is not specific to one site. Didactic instruction will be offered via the Internet using WebCT. Prior to accepting a student, a suitable internship site will be confirmed and a clinical affiliation agreement will be obtained. For clinical instruction, a visit to each affiliation site will be arranged. Every semester, the clinical supervisor will be contacted with plans for the student's activities and evaluation of the student and the program.

Objectives: The primary objectives of the program are to help students achieve increased competency in the profession, to provide appropriate educational experiences, and to help meet the need for laboratory professionals. A graduated educational experience allows the student to gain increasing competence in the variety of subjects which are to be mastered (i.e., to diagnose and treat diseases by reliable performance and interpretation of clinical laboratory tests; the complex analysis of blood or other patient specimens, problem identification, and solution/confirmation of results; and the establishment and monitoring of quality control programs). Students will amass basic knowledge of test procedures for blood banking, chemistry, hematology, immunology, and microbiology, as required. The graduate will have a knowledge of both normal and disease states and recognize the interdependency of tests to evaluate a patient’s test results.
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2. Establishment of the Internet Alternative Delivery of the Existing Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)

Curriculum: The admission and graduation requirements are the same for both the on-campus and distance medical technology programs. The curriculum is a senior year (34-semester-hour) professional curriculum, modified from the GSAMS distance education program. Computer access to the WebCT course management program is required. A local internship site must be available to the student. The interview for admission will be completed using E-mail instead of on-campus screenings. In addition, a student must present proof of certification acceptable to the State of Georgia as a medical laboratory technician or clinical laboratory scientist. Faculty have videotaped on-campus lectures and have developed slide presentations to supplement the WebCT courses. Each student is assigned faculty and clinical advisors. The alternative delivery of the medical technology program has been developed to be in full compliance with the accreditation requirements of the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Science. Graduates will be immediately eligible for national certification examinations.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that new student enrollment will be 10 each year for the first three years of the program.

Funding: Program costs will be met through redirection of funds, fund-raising initiatives, and tuition income. The departmental budget will be adjusted to accommodate the pilot study. 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 2004, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program’s implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

3. Establishment of the Major in Regional Economic Development Under the Existing Bachelor of Business Administration Degree, Georgia Southern University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce F. Grube that Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) be authorized to establish the major in regional economic development under the existing bachelor of business administration degree, effective January 12, 1999.

Abstract: Modern regional economic development is the process by which businesses and state and local governments combine resources and enter into partnership arrangements which create jobs and stimulate economic activity. A central feature of regional economic development is the emphasis on local initiatives which utilize an area’s existing human, institutional, and physical resources. GSOU requested authorization to establish the bachelor of business administration degree with a major in regional economic development because economic development requires leadership to succeed. Due to such issues as environmental regulation, resource conservation, alternative industries, and international opportunities, formal training is required to create development opportunities within existing communities.
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3. Establishment of the Major in Regional Economic Development Under the Existing Bachelor of Business Administration Degree, Georgia Southern University (Continued)

**Need:** Full-time professional economic development positions exist in business, industry, and state and local government units. Private sector initiatives in economic development by local chambers of commerce and some private firms (such as public utilities) are also increasingly common and require professionally trained staff. Thus, the need for economic development professionals is burgeoning. Regional economic development specialists are frequently found in planning units working as urban and regional planners. Nationally, there are approximately 30,000 jobs for planners. Annual job openings approach 1,200. Annual employment for planners in Georgia averages to approximately 40 jobs.

**Objectives:** The bachelor of business administration degree with a major in regional economic development will emphasize those business factors that enhance business creation and expansion. Its students will be grounded in the functional areas of business, namely accounting, finance, management, and marketing. With a degree in business, the graduates with a bachelor of business administration degree with a major in regional economic development will be able to evaluate development policies from the perspective of private business. They will recognize the importance of business factors, such as labor quality, existing infrastructure, transportation access, and space availability, as well as non-business factors, such as taxes and land use restrictions.

During the course of study, students will develop a knowledge and understanding of the political and economic process of taxation and other forms of government revenue gathering; the theories of urban and regional economics as well as the theories of regional planning; the effects of incentives on activities resulting in environmental impacts; the current environmental laws and regulations and their impact on economic development activities; and the economic interaction between regions as well as the local and national impact of regional forces. Students will gain the communicative and analytical skills required to create and implement a regional economic development plan.

**Curriculum:** The 120-semester-hour degree will require that students take the bachelor of business administration core in addition to the required health and physical education and orientation courses. The typical student served by this program will have a basic desire for a business degree supplemented by an interest in public-private partnerships. The curriculum provides students with the requisite grounding in business operations and strategic management. The economics courses provide students with a broad perspective of the relationships between government, private firms, environmental regulation, tax and spending policies, and growth processes in rural and urban areas. The regional economic development courses provide students with information about specific government programs both nationally and locally that serve to promote economic development efforts. At the penultimate section of the program, students will complete an internship at an economic development agency.

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

**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 additional cost by using courses, faculty, library, computer facilities, and equipment already in place. No new State funding will be sought for this proposal.
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3. Establishment of the Major in Regional Economic Development Under the Existing Bachelor of Business Administration Degree, Georgia Southern University (Continued)
Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2004, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program’s implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

4. Establishment of the W. Lee Burge Chair in Law and Ethics, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to establish the W. Lee Burge Chair in Law and Ethics, effective January 12, 2000.

Rationale: GSU has received the sum of $2.5 million from the E. I. DuPont de Nemours Corporation for the creation of a chair in ethics and professionalism in the practice of law. The college proposes to name the chair the W. Lee Burge Chair in Law and Ethics to honor the former Chair of the Board of Regents, who has been a prominent supporter of the College of Law.

Due to the vision and determination of Mr. Burge and many others, the College of Law has experienced many successes in its 16-year history. Its students regularly win regional and mock trial competitions, and its law review students annually publish the legislative history of bills enacted into law by the General Assembly. The college’s professors have been engaged in law reform efforts, most notably revisions to Georgia’s probate code. The college attracts leading scholars and appellate judges to campus, adding enrichment to the academic and legal communities. The creation of the W. Lee Burge Chair in Law and Ethics will further enhance the College of Law’s service to the citizens of Georgia and the University System.

Biography of W. Lee Burge: W. Lee Burge, an alumnus of GSU, has remained a longtime supporter of the university and the College of Law. Among Mr. Burge’s other philanthropic endeavors, he most recently gave the College of Law a $100,000 gift to establish the Burge Family Scholarship to recruit meritorious students.

Mr. Burge served on the Board of Regents from 1968 to 1975 and was Chair from 1972 to 1973. In 1974, he was Chair of a Board of Regents subcommittee formed to develop the basis for approving a law school at GSU.

Mr. Burge served as Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board at Equifax, Inc., where he worked from 1936 to 1988. He studied finance and accounting at GSU in the 1930s and 1940s and received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Mercer University. Twice named Alumnus of the Year of Georgia State University, Mr. Burge serves on advisory boards for the College of Law and the J. Mack Robinson College of Business. In addition, Mr. Burge serves the Georgia State University Foundation with distinction as trustee emeritus.
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5. Establishment of the Dorothy A. Hahn, M.D. Chair in Pediatrics, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco that the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") be authorized to establish the Dorothy A. Hahn, M.D. Chair in Pediatrics, effective January 12, 2000.

Rationale and Biography of Dr. Dorothy A. Hahn: Dr. Dorothy Hahn was a member of the Department of Pediatrics from 1958 until her death in 1992. Dr. Hahn was the third member of the department when it was converted to geographic full-time faculty. She was an accomplished pediatrician and was board certified in pediatrics with subspecialty boards in hematology/oncology and genetics. The chair will be established to honor and perpetuate Dr. Hahn’s commitment to the care of infants and children.

Funding: MCG has on deposit $500,000 in an endowment for this chair. The funding for this chair comes from a combination of sources, as follows: 1) $201,076 in contributions to the MCG Foundation account named for Dorothy A. Hahn, M.D., 2) a contribution of $98,924 from the Physician Practice Group Foundation, and 3) a matching grant of $200,000 from the MCG Foundation institutional support funds, which have come from donations by corporations and banks.

6. Establishment of the Electronic Commerce Institute, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University ("GSU") be authorized to establish the Electronic Commerce Institute ("ECI"), effective January 12, 2000.

Rationale: GSU sought authorization to establish an electronic commerce institute within the J. Mack Robinson College of Business. ECI will generate and disseminate information and expertise concerning electronic commerce and the digital economy through research, degree programs, and interaction with the business community. The existing Eminent Scholar in Digital Commerce will reside in ECI.

ECI and its research extension, the existing Center for Digital Commerce, will enable faculty researchers, students, and practitioners to devise and test new forms of business organizations, markets, and methods of delivery made possible by advances in electronic commerce technology. ECI will be a degree-granting unit with a faculty base developed through the re-deployment of existing resources and joint faculty appointments. Currently, the university offers the graduate certificate in electronic commerce and a concentration and specialization in electronic commerce in existing master’s degree programs.

7. Reorganization of Academic Departments, Fort Valley State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Oscar L. Prater to reorganize specific departments at Fort Valley State University ("FVSU"), effective January 12, 2000.

Reorganization of the Departments of Psychology and Criminal Justice, Social Work and Sociology to form the Department of Behavioral Sciences

AND
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7. Reorganization of Academic Departments, Fort Valley State University (Continued)
Reorganization of the Departments of Mathematics and Computer and Information Sciences to the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

Fort Valley State University’s proposed organizational design will facilitate improved collaboration among faculty who will meet cross-related, interdisciplinary lines to schedule courses, develop and implement assessment models, and advise students. Involved faculty will be more knowledgeable of the academic programs which support or are closely related to their major program offerings. The reorganized units, which will remain within the College of Arts and Sciences, will be tasked to explore curricular efficiencies through core offerings within their revised units, thereby supporting the university’s interests to be an engaged university. FVSU will be optimally organized to apply its resources, knowledge base, research, and services to meet identified needs.

The request to reorganize two departments represents phase one of a longer-term strategy to develop departmental leadership and viability for implementing FVSU’s institutional effectiveness paradigm. FVSU is primarily a teaching institution, which is responding increasingly to a greater public demand for diverse technical services and outreach initiatives. In addition, FVSU has undertaken a major strategic planning goal of continuous quality improvement. As such, departmental chairpersons have been identified as the primary leaders responsible for engaging their faculty in achieving this and other goals of the institution’s strategic plan.

In addition to their teaching responsibilities, departmental chairs are expected to assist faculty not only in a) designing and implementing academic programs responsive to students’ needs, b) gathering data appropriate to evaluating program effectiveness, and c) reporting to the broader community the outcomes attained, but also in applying in a more timely manner the resources of their units to the needs of the broader community. To meet these and other increasing demands, department chairpersons need more of a time commitment to tasks than currently allowed under their present academic-year contracts. While departmental chairs provide the majority of instruction during the summer session, they are not on payroll to perform the administrative duties of their offices. These tasks are then relegated to the academic deans. This administrative model is neither cost-effective nor efficient relative to the changing management trends through restructuring. It is, therefore, proposed that the number of department chairpersons overall be reduced by six persons to achieve a cost-efficient leadership model for appointing departmental chairpersons on a 12-month, rather than a 9-month basis.

8. **Administrative/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 full-time appointments are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.
SUMMARY OF FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions by Type:</th>
<th>Totals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Research Universities Appointments** 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Totals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Regional Universities Appointments** 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Totals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton College &amp; State University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of West Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total State Universities Appointments** 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Totals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalton State College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon State College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total State Colleges Appointments** 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Totals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Baldwin Agric. College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Metropolitan College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Georgia Community College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darton College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Georgia College 0
Floyd College 0
Gainesville College 1
Georgia Perimeter College 2
Gordon College 1
Middle Georgia College 3
South Georgia College 0
Waycross College 2

Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments 9

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS 102

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

BOSTROM, ANN: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, IVAN ALLEN COLLEGE, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 1999 TO AUGUST 15, 2000, WITH PAY.

WATSON, WILLIAM D.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, IVAN ALLEN COLLEGE, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 1999 TO MAY 15, 2000, WITH PAY.

NORTON, BRYAN G.: PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, IVAN ALLEN COLLEGE, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 1999 TO MAY 15, 2000, WITH PAY.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RETIREES:


GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

NEEL, JOHN H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, LEAVE FROM JANUARY 10, 2000 TO MAY 10, 2000, WITH PAY.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

8. Administrative/Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions
(Continued)
PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RETIREES:


UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

MAYOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:


EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:


LEAVES OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

ADAMS, NIGEL GRAHAM: RESEARCH PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 1999 TO MAY 9, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

LOVELL, C. A. KNOX: TERRY DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, LEAVE FROM JANUARY 1, 2000 TO JUNE 30, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RETIREES:


COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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


Snyder, Harold E., College of Veterinary Medicine, as needed for period beginning January 1, 2000 and ending June 30, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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


ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY
11. **Information Item: Service Agreements** (Continued)

**EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:**


**NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY.**

**PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RETIREES:**


**DALTON STATE COLLEGE**

**EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:**

11. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)

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

**BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE**

**PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RETIREES:**


**FLOYD COLLEGE**

**EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:**


**GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE**

**TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:**

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


9. Discussion of New Faculty Information System Format

Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Beheruz N. Sethna provided to the Committee an update concerning the new format of the “Administrative/Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions” section of the agenda. The new format will become effective in February 2000. Dr. Sethna explained that the need for the new faculty information system (“FIS”) emerged out of year 2000 computer compliance issues. Later events proved conclusively that this was the correct decision since the reports for 2000 could not be produced through the old system. Having identified the need to develop a new system, it was felt appropriate to make the new reports more productive. Enhancements in the new FIS include the following:

- Two sections created to better highlight key faculty appointments and administrative actions:
  - Special Faculty Appointments
  - Midyear Salary Increases
- Unused data fields removed (e.g., “unam cons” [unanimous consent])
- Part-time retired faculty no longer differentiated by age
- Elimination of confusing terminology (e.g., “regular” faculty appointments)
- Appointments now differentiated by type as well as total for each institution
- New summary of tenured appointments added
- Supplement made easier to read by reformatting presentation
- Clear, concise, and accurate information provided to Regents
10. **Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia State University</strong></td>
<td>Cardiopulmonary Care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia Hospital Assoc.</td>
<td>2, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>2, 2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical College of Georgia</strong></td>
<td>Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>16, 14R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitals and Clinics</td>
<td>4, 9R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCG Research Institute</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>8, 8R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2, 6R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Georgia</strong></td>
<td>Communic. Sci. Disorders</td>
<td>2, 6R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Perform.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1, 9R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation and Leisure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia Southern University</strong></td>
<td>Family and Consumer Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health, Nursing, Recreation</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership/Tech./Human Dev.</td>
<td>1, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Armstrong Atlantic State University</strong></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Augusta State University</strong></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>1, 5R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kennesaw State University</strong></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>17, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Georgia College &amp; State University</strong></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>17, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>17, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State University of West Georgia</strong></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dalton State College</strong></td>
<td>Medical Assisting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal Georgia Community College</strong></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floyd College</strong></td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>3, 6R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 178

R = Renewal
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

11. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia State University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Y76 Kindergarten Program</td>
<td>Georgia Office of School Readiness</td>
<td>8/15/99 - 6/15/00</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study adolescent health and youth development</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Human Resources</td>
<td>9/15/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$134,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Healthy Grandparents program</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/15/00</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct HIV/AIDS services and training</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8/16/99 - 8/15/00</td>
<td>$129,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Babies Can’t Wait program</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9/28/99 - 9/10/00</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Georgia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Second Step violence prevention program</td>
<td>Georgia Children’s Trust Fund Commission</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 6/30/02</td>
<td>$723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Georgia Personal Assistance Service Corps/ Americorp</td>
<td>Georgia Comm. for National Comm. Service</td>
<td>9/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$196,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce survey report on condition of D.W. Brooks papers</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Archives and History</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide codes 2000 program income</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs</td>
<td>10/06/99 - 10/06/99</td>
<td>$42,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide services at PI Logan training center</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Education</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$26,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey safe and drug-free schools</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Education</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer Georgia student assessment program</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10/31/98 - 12/31/99</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Georgia (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score and report on Georgia’s student writing program</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11/1/99 - 10/31/00</td>
<td>$858,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop community nutrition</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Human</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$188,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources for low-income families</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$4,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct parents program</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>9/30/99 - 9/39/00</td>
<td>$199,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct nutrition program for infants and toddlers</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 8/31/00</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Gift of Time 2000 program</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 8/31/00</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide social work education for DFCS</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 8/1/00</td>
<td>$9,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist student interns with delinquent youth</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>8/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$41,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Georgia archaeological site file</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct “Adopt A River” program</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$54,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct promotional testing for Georgia State Patrol</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Public Safety</td>
<td>9/1/99 - 7/15/00</td>
<td>$101,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct FMT 2000 PI</td>
<td>Georgia Office of Planning and Budget</td>
<td>10/06/99 - 10/06-99</td>
<td>$29,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide GPSTC program income 072-058</td>
<td>Georgia Public Safety Training Center</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$21,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Americans with disabilities child care link</td>
<td>Georgia Childcare Council</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Georgia comprehensive passenger safety education</td>
<td>Governor’s Office of Highway Safety</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$591,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Letters to Lettrisme/ Use of signs and letters</td>
<td>Georgia Humanities Council</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/99</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide computer training</td>
<td>City of Rome, Georgia</td>
<td>10/18/99 - 10/26/99</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide computer training</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>11/10-30/99</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide motivational training</td>
<td>“” “” “”</td>
<td>11/4/99</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount - January</td>
<td>$3,684,901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount FY 2000 to Date</td>
<td>$21,339,137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount FY 99 - to January</td>
<td>$22,911,176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount FY 99</td>
<td>$31,358,479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at approximately 3:00 p.m. in 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 eight applications for review, all of which were denied. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. In the matter of the 21 signatories at Georgia Perimeter College, concerning a grievance of May 3, 1999, the application for review was denied.

2. In the matter of Carly Armour at Georgia College & State University, concerning a disability accommodation, the application for review was denied.

3. In the matter of James Duncan at Columbus State University, concerning expulsion from school, the application for review was denied.

4. In the matter of Timothy E. Yorkey at Valdosta State University, concerning his suspension, the application for review was denied.

5. In the matter of Mary Armstrong at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning termination of her employment, the application for review was denied.

6. In the matter of Clifton Rawles at Atlanta Metropolitan College, concerning reassignment of his duties, the application for review was denied. (Regent McMillan recused himself from this appeal.)

7. In the matter of Dwain J. Johnson at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning his early retirement eligibility, the application for review was denied.

8. In the matter of Edward Collier at the University of Georgia, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was denied.
The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at approximately 1:50 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, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., 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, none of which required action. Those items were as follows:

1. **Information Item: Update on Actions Taken by the Chancellor in Response to Proposals for Cost Savings From the Department of Community Health**

**Background:** At its November meeting, the Board was made aware of significant deficits in the budget for the Board of Regents health plan for fiscal year 2000 and for projected deficits for fiscal year 2001. The Board was informed that opportunities to share in cost savings strategies developed by the Department of Community Health (the “DCH”) would be pursued. Several initiatives resulting in opportunities for joint purchasing by the Board of Regents health plan and the State health benefits plan have been developed. Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers communicated with Chair White about these initiatives during the holiday break.

**Acute Care Hospital Services:** Historically, both the Board of Regents health plan and the State health benefits plan have taken advantage of payment rates for inpatient hospital services negotiated by Blue Cross Blue Shield under its Prudent Buyer Program (“PBP”). In November, the DCH issued an invitation to each acute care hospital in Georgia participating in the PBP to contract directly with the State for these services. Commissioner Russ Toal of the DCH reports that all of the acute care hospitals in Georgia (162 hospitals) have submitted signed contracts to DCH. A new rate structure has been negotiated by DCH to secure more competitive pricing and will become effective for both plans January 1, 2000.

The Chancellor has confirmed to Commissioner Toal and to Blue Cross Blue Shield that the Board of Regents will participate in these newly negotiated rates. The anticipated annual savings for the Board of Regents Health plan are being determined by DCH.

**Behavioral Health Services:** The Board of Regents health plan also covers services with specialty hospitals for mental health and substance abuse treatment, using the Blue Cross Blue Shield PBP rates. Central Office staff are currently working with DCH on a strategy to achieve additional savings on inpatient care in these specialty hospitals.

In 1996, the State health benefits plan contracted with Magellan Behavioral Health for the management of its inpatient/outpatient benefits associated with mental health and substance abuse cases. For the first year of its contract with Magellan Behavioral Health, DCH achieved a 50% decrease in the annual costs of these benefits when compared to the previous year. The cost of these services for DCH with Magellan Behavioral Health has remained stable for the past 2.5 years.
DCH has held preliminary discussions with Magellan Behavioral Health on behalf of the Board of Regents health plan. On December 10, 1999, the Chancellor conveyed to Blue Cross Blue Shield that the Board of Regents/DCH will negotiate with a vendor during calendar year 2000 for a mental health and substance abuse referral/pre-certification/hospital review services contract. The Board of Regents staff plan to bring a proposal on this initiative to the Board in February 2000 for its review. If adopted, the staff anticipate an **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

1. **Information Item: Update on Actions Taken by the Chancellor in Response to Proposals for Cost Savings From the Department of Community Health** (Continued)

implementation date of April 2000, following notification of any approved plan changes to the University System’s covered membership. Discussions with current and prospective vendors would be required.

**Disease State Management Program:** The DCH has contracted with Unicare for a disease state management program for oncology, congestive heart failure, and diabetes. For the diabetes program currently accessed by the State health benefits plan members, the rate of $.29/employee/month would be available for members of the Board of Regents health plan beginning January 1, 2000.

DCH has secured an agreement from Unicare that both the oncology and congestive heart failure programs would be piloted for the members of the Board of Regents health plan at no cost for the first year. If the oncology and congestive heart failure pilot programs resulted in increased patient satisfaction and reduced per for the congestive heart failure program would be charged.

At its October 1999 meeting, the Board approved an administrative services contract with Unicare for calendar year 2000. The staff expect to bring a request to the Board at its February 2000 meeting to modify the calendar year 2000 contract with Unicare. Discussions concerning the contract terms with current vendors and with proposed vendors for behavioral health services, disease state management programs, and utilization review management services had not been initiated before this meeting, because they were awaiting review by the Board.

**Centers of Excellence for Transplants:** The DCH has arranged for Board of Regents health plan members to be able to take advantage of discounted per case rates from a national network of high-quality transplant centers, effective January 1, 2000. The State health benefits plan has used this network for a number of years. The State has experienced total savings of between $25,000 and $30,000 on a per case basis for the past two years.

Access to this network will be conveyed to Board of Regents health plan members following the January 2000 Board meeting. There will be an initial access fee for use of the network with the initial fee being offset by total savings. Representatives with the DCH have conveyed that the Board of Regents health plan members will also receive discounted rates for kidney and
pancreas transplants.

**Decision Support**: Access to monthly data and the ability to conduct in-depth trend analyses for the Board of Regents health plan are currently limited. The DCH has requested that the Regents Central Office participate in a joint initiative with the State health benefits plan and Medicaid to utilize an automated decision support data system administered and managed by the vendor MEDSTAT. With improved access to timely data, all three participants should be better able to determine emerging trends, identify areas for needed plan design changes, identify opportunities for plan savings, estimate the fiscal impact of proposed plan design changes, and monitor quality of care across the respective plans. This approach is supportive of the Board of Regents and the Governor’s desire to have the State serve as a prudent purchaser of healthcare.
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2. Information Item: Presentation of Request for Proposals for a Preferred Provider Organization Option Issued by the Department of Community Health on Behalf of the Board of Regents Health Plan and the State Health Benefits Plan

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers introduced this item, and Commissioner Russ Toal of the Department of Community Health (the “DCH”) presented the item to the Committee.

Background: On November 30, 1999, the DCH issued a request for proposals for a Statewide preferred provider organization (“PPO”) health benefits plan option. The PPO will be offered as an additional option to the existing indemnity and health maintenance organization (“HMO”) plan offerings for members of the Regents and State health benefits plans.

The PPO proposers’ conference was held on December 8, 1999. Final proposals are due on January 14, 2000. The DCH will integrate a statewide PPO option into its current healthcare offerings effective July 1, 2000.

Dr. Desrochers indicated that in March 2000, staff intend to bring a package of items to the Committee and the Board concerning cost containment and plan design changes for the indemnity plan as well as a reason to adopt the PPO option as an alternative which might be chosen by University System employees as well as State employees. Staff are evaluating accelerating the normal campus schedules for “open enrollment” in health insurance plans such that it would occur in April or May 2000 in order to allow employees to choose amongst alternative plans effective July 1, 2000.


Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes presented to the Committee the first quarter financial report for the University System of Georgia for the period ending September 30, 1999, which is on file with the Office of Capital Resources. The report provides tables which compare actual and budgeted revenues and expenditures through September 30, 1999 for educational and general funds, auxiliary enterprise funds, and student activity funds. In addition, the report contains charts which compare September 1999 financial data with data of September 1998.

At the request of Regent Jones, Chair White requested that the staff provide a breakdown of other costs and revenues within the student activity funds and to provide information on carryforward balances in student activity funds.
COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, January 11, 2000 at approximately 2:20 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, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., 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 eight items, five of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Authorization of Project BR-10-0003 “Aquatic Biotechnology and Environmental Laboratory (ABEL),” the University of Georgia**

   **Approved:** The Board authorized Project BR-10-0003 “Aquatic Biotechnology and Environmental Laboratory (ABEL),” the University of Georgia (“UGA”), with a total project budget of $1,587,429 using amended fiscal year 1999 supplemental budget appropriations designated for Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”) funds.

   **Background:** The mission of the ABEL project at UGA is to provide facilities for genetic research and the development of and transfer of products and technologies derived from that research for the benefit and expansion of the Georgia economy.

   The facility will be approximately 8,500 gross square feet and will be comprised of an aquatic animal culture laboratory, an exposure laboratory, and a toxicology preparation laboratory to support UGA’s growing transgenesis research activities. The facility will accommodate fresh and saltwater species, including specialized strains developed for aquaculture, environmental hazard assessment, biomedicine, and biotechnology.

   The construction cost of the facility is estimated at $950,000 ($112 per square foot). Funding for the project is amended fiscal year 1999 appropriations designated for GRA funds.

   UGA has completed a preliminary programming study and has conducted interviews for design services following Board of Regents’ procedures.

2. **Authorization of Project, “Biomedical Engineering Laboratory Buildout,” Georgia Institute of Technology**

   **Approved:** The Board authorized Project No. BR-30-0005, “Biomedical Engineering Laboratory Buildout,” Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), with a total project budget of $1,618,000.

   The proposed project involves construction of approximately 8,450 gross square feet of new laboratory and office space in unfinished space within an existing building.

   **Background:** The project is located on the third floor, north wing, Building 146, Bioengineering and Bioscience Building, 315 Ferst Drive on the GIT campus. This floor was left unfinished when the building was completed in July 1999. Existing mechanical, electrical, HVAC, and plumbing systems were designed to accommodate future buildout of the space.
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3. **Authorization of Project, “Biomedical Engineering Laboratory Buildout,” Georgia Institute of Technology** (Continued)
The GIT/Emory University Biomedical Engineering (“BME”) Department and elements of the GIT School of Chemistry and Biochemistry and the School of Biology will utilize the laboratory.

Approximately 62% of assignable square feet will be laboratory space, and 38% will be graduate/post-doctoral office space.

The project will meet the current laboratory and academic needs for the BME program. This is a rapidly expanding educational and research program with a focus on biomedical and healthcare areas. The BME department currently occupies 1,920 gross square feet of administrative office space within the Bioengineering and Bioscience Building.

The total project cost is $1,618,000 ($154/gsf) and the estimated construction cost is $1,300,000. This is based on a cost estimate prepared by the architectural firm of Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum, Inc.

The total project cost will be funded as follows: (1) $527,500 from the president’s discretionary endowment income funds for equipment and (2) the balance ($1,090,500) from the Georgia Tech Research Corporation (non-state funds).

Upon Board of Regents approval, programming and design will be initiated with a construction start anticipated in June 2000. Because authorization was granted, the staff in conjunction with GIT will proceed with architectural selection for design services.

3. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia**

**Approved:** The Board appointed each first-named architectural firm listed below for the identified major and minor capital outlay projects and authorized the execution of an architectural contract with each identified firm at the stated cost limitation shown for each project. Should it not be possible to execute a contract with the top-ranked firm, the staff would then attempt to execute a contract with the other listed firms in rank order.

Following current practice for the selection of architect, the following recommendations were made:

**Project No. I-41, “Nursing, Health Science and Outreach Complex”**

**Macon State College**

Project Description: 81,000-gross-square-foot facility that will include space for the Nursing, Health Sciences, and Laboratory Sciences Departments for classrooms, laboratories, administrative, and ancillary support services. The facility will also include conference, meeting, and training space for Systemwide use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>$16,222,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$12,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$639,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

3. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia** (Continued)

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 31

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
1. The Woodhurst Partnership/John Portman & Associates, Augusta/Atlanta
2. Technicon/Lord Aeck Sargent Architecture, Macon/Atlanta
3. Dunwoody, Beal, Adar, Walsh & Mathews/RFD, Macon/San Diego, CA

**Project No. I-42, “Agricultural Sciences Building”**
**Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College**
Project Description: 40,000 gross square foot facility that will provide space for the consolidation of programs within the Division of Agriculture and Forest Resources including laboratories, classrooms, administrative, and ancillary support services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>$7,138,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$331,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 23
Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
1. Yielding, Wakeford & McGee/Stanley, Love-Stanley, Albany/Atlanta

**Project No. I-44, “HPE Recreation, Athletic, and Student Success Center”**
**Georgia Southwestern State University**
Project Description: 130,000-gross-square-foot facility that will include renovation of 35,000 gross square feet in an existing facility and an addition of 95,000 gross square feet which will provide a new convocation/gymnasium, student support space, and administrative and ancillary support services. This project will also include the demolition of antiquated facilities, as identified in the campus master plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>$18,818,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$14,261,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$855,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 33
Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
1. Richard + Wittschiebe Architects/Goode Van Slyke Architects, Atlanta/Atlanta
2. Thompson, Ventulett, Stainback & Associates, Inc., Atlanta
3. JRA Architects, Inc., Columbus

**COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

3. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia** (Continued)

**Project No. I-45, “Classroom and Convocation Center”**
**Kennesaw State University**
Project Description: 147,000-gross-square-foot facility that will provide space for the College of Health and Human Services, Health Services, and Physical Education and will include a major convocation/gymnasium space,
general classrooms, and administrative and ancillary support services space.

- **Total Project Cost**: $23,468,000
- **Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)**: $19,400,000
- **A/E (fixed) Fee**: $1,257,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 37

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
1. Heery International, Inc., Atlanta
2. Rosser International, Atlanta
3. Cooper Carry, Inc./Cheeks•Hornbein Architects, Atlanta/Atlanta

**Project No. I-81, “Classroom Replacement Phase II”**
Augusta State University

Project Description: 100,000-gross-square-foot facility that will provide replacement of academic space as the second phase in a comprehensive plan to replace six WWII warehouse structures currently housing the majority of the instructional space on campus. The adapted warehouse structures will be demolished as part of the project and in accordance with the campus master plan.

- **Total Project Cost**: $19,791,000
- **Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)**: $14,000,000
- **A/E (fixed) Fee**: $980,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 24

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
1. The Hinman Architectural Group/Jova, Daniels, Busby, Augusta/Atlanta
2. Lord Aeck Sargent Architecture/2KM, Atlanta/Augusta
3. Tippett Clepper Associates, Inc./Richard+Wittschiebe, Architects, Atlanta/Atlanta

**Project No. I-82, “10th Street Chiller Plant Phase Expansion”**
Georgia Institute of Technology

Project Description: Two 200-ton chillers and associated cooling towers will be provided to expand the capacity of the existing plant. This expansion is necessary to ensure continued service to the Institute of Bioengineering and Biosciences and to the West Campus Student Housing Complex.

**COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

3. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia** (Continued)

- **Total Project Cost**: $4,800,000
- **Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)**: $4,100,000
- **A/E (fixed) Fee**: $246,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 24

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
1. Lockwood Green, Atlanta
2. The Prad Group, Atlanta
3. EMC Engineers, Atlanta

4. **Ground Lease Agreement, Savannah State University**

**Approved:** The Board declared approximately 17 acres of land located at Savannah State University (“SSU”), Savannah, Georgia no longer advantageously useful to SSU or other units of the University System, but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this land to be leased for the benefit of SSU.

The Board also approved the first-named developer/operator listed below to provide student housing at SSU and authorized the execution of a ground lease agreement and contracts with this firm to provide student housing. Should negotiations with this top-ranked firm be unsuccessful, negotiations would proceed with the second-ranked firm.

- American Campus Communities, L.L.C.
- University Housing Services, Inc.

The Board authorized the execution of a ground lease agreement between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and the selected firm as Lessee, covering approximately 17 acres located at SSU, Savannah, Georgia for a 30-year period, beginning in Spring 2000, in consideration of providing and operating student housing.

The terms of this ground lease agreement and contracts are subject to review and legal approval by the Office of the Attorney General and review with the Chair of the Real Estate and Facilities Committee or his designee.

**Background:** In October 1997, the Board passed a new student housing policy that requires the preparation of a comprehensive plan for student housing, together with a financial plan to support the housing program objectives.

In accordance with the Board’s housing policy, in February 1999, President Carlton E. Brown presented the SSU housing plan to the Board of Regents as an information item, concerning development of an request for proposals (“RFP”) to provide financing, design and construction, operation, and maintenance of student housing.
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4. **Ground Lease Agreement, Savannah State University** (Continued)

The SSU plan is a five-year phased plan which consists of new housing facilities, demolition of the oldest four of the existing seven housing facilities, and renovation of the remaining buildings.

While a State-funded project is on the major capital list and is currently under design, the institution would like the first phase of new dormitory construction to be construction of housing on campus property through a partnership with private industry.

Upon execution of the ground lease, facilities for approximately 700 beds and support space will be constructed in two phases for occupancy by spring 2001 and fall 2001.

Traditionally, housing projects approved by the Board have been constructed using brick and concrete construction. However, the anticipated construction will be similar to commercially constructed apartments.

Following a pre-qualification process that was developed with the assistance of the Attorney General, the RFP was issued on September 15, 1999. Three proposals were received and evaluated in December 1999. This request was a result of that evaluation.

5. **Conveyance of Property, Clayton College & State University**

**Approved:** The Board declared approximately 1.182 acres of land located on Tara Boulevard (U.S. Highway 19 and 41), Jonesboro, Clayton County, Georgia no longer advantageously useful to Clayton College & State University (“CCSU”) or other units of the University System of Georgia, but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing the conveyance of this property to Clayton County for the benefit of CCSU and the University System of Georgia.

The Board also conveyed title to approximately 1.182 acres of land located on Tara Boulevard (U.S. Highway 19 and 41), Jonesboro, Clayton County, Georgia for the use and benefit of Clayton County to provide an improved entrance for CCSU Continuing Education’s transportation training facility.

The legal details involved with this conveyance are subject to review and approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

**Background:** In March 1997, the Board accepted this property as part of a gift of a 6.284-acre tract from Mrs. Lucy Huie. This gift was subject to granting Mrs. Huie an access easement. By conveying the 1.182 acres to Clayton County, the access easement will be relinquished.

As consideration for this property, Clayton County will provide a signaled entry road that will improve the accessibility and provide a safer entrance into CCSU’s existing aviation maintenance technology facility.

The appraised value of the approximately 1.182 acres of land is $155,000. There are no improvements on the property.
6. **Information Item: Master Plan, Columbus State University**

Columbus State University (“CSU”) and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the campus. The consultants; Mr. Walt Miller, Vice President of the architectural firm of John Portman & Associates; and President Frank D. Brown presented the plan to the Committee. The consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the college’s mission statement, its strategic plan, its academic and support programs, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented five-year, ten-year, and long-term options for facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian patterns, and campus beautification. Based on the consultants’ findings, CSU’s master plan recommendations included the following:

- Improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation by creating a campus loop road that unifies the campus and creates opportunities for future building sites
- Consider future opportunity property acquisition contiguous with the campus
- Modernize several campus buildings
- Improve campus image and entry
- Create and enhance common outdoor areas and campus landscaping

7. **Information Item: Student Housing, Georgia College & State University**

In October 1997, the Board passed a new student housing policy that requires the preparation of a comprehensive plan for student housing, together with a financial plan to support the housing program objectives. Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) has developed a comprehensive student housing plan that is consistent with the policy. President Rosemary DePaolo presented the GCSU plan, which is a six-year phased plan that consists of constructing new housing facilities and renovating the remaining buildings. According to the plan, the net result is approximately 2,000 beds capacity, which will be an increase of 1,000 beds, or 100% over current capacity.

Currently, the campus operates 1036 student housing beds with a 97% occupancy rate. Approximately 22% of the students are housed on campus. With the proposed housing plan, this percentage will increase to approximately 40%. The enrollment assumptions in the housing plan are consistent with the Board-approved enrollment target of 6% growth by 2003.

The Committee stipulated that GCSU work with the Regents’ staff and a representative of the Office of the Attorney General to develop a privatized housing program. The staff will work with the Office of the Attorney General to prepare a request for qualifications (“RFQ”) and a request for proposals (“RFP”) for public/private housing at GCSU modeled after Southern Polytechnic State University but modified to respond to specific campus needs. A summary of the RFP will be presented to the Chairman of the Real Estate and Facilities Committee or his designee prior to RFP issuance based on the Board’s support for this concept.

8. **Information Item: Facilities Management**
Culminating a year of research and investigation regarding implementation of the major repair and renovation (“MRR”) program, the Board of Regents received a final report in the form of a guidelines document at the October 1999 meeting. This document is intended to be a tool that can assist campuses in preparing more comprehensive and focused MRR funding requests. As a part of the October discussion, the staff were requested to revisit the topic of the MRR program at the January 2000 meeting and discuss ways in which the guidelines document could be expected to enhance the program. Since October, the staff have taken the following steps to acquaint campus personnel with the MRR guidelines and how they can be used to advance the MRR objectives:

- Each president was provided with a final copy of the guidelines and advised of its content and purpose;
- A training session regarding the context of the guidelines, together with the manner in which they could be used, was conducted at the annual Facilities Officers Conference; and
- A workshop for senior facilities managers was held on December 10, 1999.

Additionally, each campus was polled regarding the nature, type, and volume of maintenance-related work performed by outside contractors. The results of this survey were also discussed at this meeting.

The Committee requested that the staff report back at an appropriate time with a facilities management/preventive maintenance program, schedule, and cost proposal.
CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me begin this first report of 2000 by thanking the Board, Dr. Randall Thursby (Interim Vice Chancellor for Information/Instructional Technology and Chief Information Officer), and countless others in our offices and at the institutions who helped make Y2K the yawn we desired. Incidentally, I saw a wonderful sign above an antique clock booth this weekend: “All our clocks Y3K compliant”!

Time is compressed at this time of year. My report is sandwiched between the Governor's budget message yesterday and his education speech tomorrow. So let me report on the Governor's budget recommendations.

The overall context is one of fiscal conservatism by the Governor, wanting to take advantage of the State's current economic prosperity to prepare for any economic downturn.

Given that context, he has responded positively to your requests.

- Support for our formula, recognizing that it provides the resources for the students who will be with us next fall. The Governor understands the quarter to semester impact on the formula and has mitigated the negative impacts. This was our highest priority.
- 3% salary increases
- $116,505,000 in bonds for ten new construction projects and design funds for two projects for the University System in the fiscal year 2000 amended budget.
- $35,640,463 to provide for formula-related adjustments for new facilities, major repairs and renovations, fringe benefits, and the health insurance reserve.
- $3,000,000 to provide matching funds for endowed chairs at the following institutions: in rural economic development at Georgia Southern University ($500,000); history at Gainesville College ($500,000); science at Georgia College & State University ($500,000); biology at North Georgia College & State University ($500,000); policy studies at Georgia State University ($500,000); and maternal and child health at Georgia Southwestern State University ($500,000).
- $2,640,000 to provide matching land grant funds for Fort Valley State University and for program initiatives at Savannah State University, Fort Valley State University, and Albany State University.
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- $7,466,000 in lottery funds to continue several of the Chancellor's special funding initiatives. (Includes $4,820,000 for Connecting Teachers & Technology; $180,000 for P-16/PREP [Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program]; $1,939,000 for GALILEO [Georgia Library Learning Online]; and $527,000 for Connecting Students & Services.)

- $1.4 million for Georgia GLOBE (Global Learning Online for Business & Education).

- $375,000 for the Hispanic initiative.

Our ICAPP (Intellectual Capital Partnership Program) rural economic development proposals have been identified as eligible for funding from the one Georgia initiative using tobacco funds. Incidentally, you'll find the latest ICAPP brochure in your folders; I'll think you'll enjoy it.
INTRODUCTION OF REPRESENTATIVE DUBOSE PORTER

While Chancellor Portch was giving his report to the Board, Representative DuBose Porter (district 143) entered the Board Room. The Chancellor noted that Representative Porter is Chair of the University System of Georgia Committee and a good friend of the System. He remarked that Representative Porter has done a remarkable job to get a first-rate center in Dublin, which is really thriving. He then asked Representative Porter to speak before the Board.

Representative Porter thanked the Chancellor and the Regents for inviting him to come to the meeting. He also thanked them for all they do for the State. He noted that in the Governor's budget report, $47 million was directed to help the University System with its budgetary repercussions of the changeover from the quarter system to the semester system. He said that the System can count on enrollment to drive the formula and pick up the remainder of the deficit. The biggest challenge facing Representative Porter when he became Chair was to not lose the momentum that the University System already has. He recently served on the Governor's Education Reform Study Commission (the "Commission"), and the Regents also participated in that effort. The focus is now on K-12 education and how to get more students prepared for higher education. Until now, the focus of remedial education has been how it affects people when they get to college. A new focus will be the number of students in remedial classes in technical and adult education, which is far greater and much more startling. This speaks to what must be done to prepare students not only for college, but also for technical and job training. That has taken some of the pressure off the Board of Regents by saying that the emphasis needs to be on basic skills, lower classroom size for students who need extra help, and all that prepares people better in K-12 education. This is where the focus of the Governor's education package is going to be. Representative Porter remarked that this will be exciting for the University System and the students it will be getting, because it basically means that the State is going to raise the bar.

However, there are some challenges for the University System that the legislature will discuss further during the session, said Representative Porter. The committee will have hearings on some of the items. The big issue this year is the collaboration between the University of Georgia and the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") on research. It is one of the most exciting things that any state is doing right now. So, the focus needs to be on making MCG the world-premier college that it can be, he said. That is what the Board and the General Assembly both want to be a part of, progressive challenges they know they can take on. As far as the other items, Representative Porter said there are smaller issues to be discussed at another time. He noted the Governor's mansion in Milledgeville. He said that it is a great State resource that, in his personal opinion, the Regents should have a part in keeping. Because it is in his area of the State, he has a personal interest in it. He remarked that it is a great resource that should be used by the University System in some very progressive ways, such as a center of Georgia studies. He noted that there are great lessons to be learned in what happened in that area in the first 100 years of the State before the capital was moved. He asserted that the mansion should be more than just a museum; it should be an active center. There are also bigger issues, like the Georgia Research Alliance and the Yamacraw Mission.
The new money that the Governor is directing into the Yamacraw Mission is very exciting, he said. In closing, Representative Porter thanked the Regents for all that they do and said for them to let him know when he can be of help.
INTRODUCTION OF REPRESENTATIVE DUBOSE PORTER

Since Chair Cannestra had mentioned the Dublin Center (the “Center”), Representative Porter wanted to make a few comments. He stated that there are over 1,000 students in the collaborative among Middle Georgia College (“MGC”), Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”), and Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”). He noted that with GCSU’s new mission, GSOU will step in as the senior institution of the Center. He also noted that unemployment in Laurens County is 9% and unemployment in Treutlen County is 12%. There is always a focus on how to bring opportunity to and improve the economy in Southwest Georgia, and he asserted that the Dublin Center is a success story. With the new building soon to open, the Center may grow to 1,500 students. He stressed that many people do not have the opportunity to go to a traditional college. There are many nontraditional students who, once given the opportunity, are taking advantage of it. He thanked the Regents for their vision and help on the Center.

The Chancellor thanked him for visiting, and continued his report to the Board.
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The positive response has much to do, I'm sure, with the positive happenings on our campuses. But before I comment on that, let me just mention a few issues that have generated some legislative interest.

- Early retirement at MCG (Medical College of Georgia). We continue to meet with anyone who has questions about this, and President Tedesco has been particularly helpful in this regard. We simply present the hard, cold facts that the Board of Regents has first and foremost a fiduciary responsibility. This decision was carefully examined, publicly discussed for months, and properly made.

- The old Governor's mansion in Milledgeville. There has been a dispute between local legislators and some non-local legislators over ownership and operation of the mansion. The Governor has indicated he won't fund restoration until all parties have come to agreement. And it now looks like that is close, with no change in ownership, but with an operations advisory board.

- Use of part-time faculty. This is a national issue. The University System of Georgia uses far fewer part-time faculty than the national average, teaching only 16% of the courses. I will, however, be reminding our presidents of the importance of good working conditions for part-time faculty.

Now these are the current issues of interest. Undoubtedly new ones will surface, and I'll keep you posted.

Now to a sampling of positive happenings:

- ABAC's (Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College) Public Service & Business Outreach Center received the Georgia Economic Developers Association “Terrific Award.” (The center provides valuable resource matches between individuals, business, nonprofit agencies, and government agencies promoting workforce development, personal enrichment, and lifelong learning.)

- A University of Georgia graduate, Amy Denty, was named Georgia's 2000 Teacher of the Year. She has taught middle school science since 1990 and is currently teaching at Arthur Williams Middle School in Jesup, Georgia.

- Georgia Tech received the majority of votes (beating out MIT, NC State, Penn State, and Stanford) in a Southern Technology Council national poll to identify which universities maintain exemplary programs for state and local economic development. Georgia Tech was tied for second with Harvard in a recent poll on the number of young innovators; MIT was first.

- State University of West Georgia's chemistry major, Yong Suh was chosen from a highly selective competition to make a presentation at the National Collegiate Honors Council (“NCHC”) conference. This was the fifth consecutive year that a West Georgia student has been chosen to present such a research project.
· Valdosta State University, the recipient of the estate of a former librarian, has used the proceeds to select 30 freshmen with SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores of 1230 or higher to receive full scholarships.

· A small Georgia Southern University flag which reads “Georgia Southern Soars with the Eagles” was sent along on the Discovery space shuttle mission to the International Space Station May 27 to June 6, 1999. The flag was presented to President Bruce F. Grube by alumni Chris Fairey, Andy Warren, and Bob Pound (all employed by NASA).

While our campuses have been busy, I have had a wonderful time since we last met — most notably moving into my little house! In addition, I've had some interesting meal companions:

· Breakfast with Michael Coles of the Georgia Film Advisory Committee.

· Lunch with the AJC's Colin Campbell, who has written very appreciatively of Georgia College & State University's new mission.

· Afternoon tea with Representative Terry Coleman.

· Dinner with the University of Georgia Press's national Flannery O'Connor short story winners in Macon.

I was also a keynote speaker in Washington for the Education Trust on the relation between P-16, students, and equity; a speaker at the Southern Education Foundation consultation on equity in education; the speaker for the annual Chancellor's convocation at Indiana University/Purdue University in Indianapolis (and you thought the names of some of our institutions were convoluted!); a panelist on education at the Atlanta branch of the American Jewish Committee forum on education; and a panelist on education's role in workforce development at the State Labor Department's annual conference.

There has also been a lowlight moment and a highlight moment for me. The lowlight? Runnin' Regents versus Macon State in basketball. After a furious comeback, led by the tenacious defense of Regent Cater, we tied the score. With the clock expired, one referee blew time, the other a foul on us, leading to a free-throw defeat. We'd have been better off if the third referee, Regent Jones — decked out in black knee socks, backward baseball cap, and cracking whip — had been able to stay to the bitter — and I mean bitter — end!

The highlight? Attending Georgia State's commencement to hand the degree to our very own student assistant, LaToya Hansford. LaToya, who hails from Bainbridge, Georgia, has been with us since January 1997 and just earned her B.S. degree in psychology from Georgia State University.

This is why we do all of this.

REPORT FROM STUDENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

After his report to the Board, Chancellor Portch introduced Student Advisory Council (“SAC”) President John M. Fuchko III. He noted that Mr. Fuchko is working on a number of issues with the Board of Regents staff and they will be meeting again at a retreat in the near future. He remarked that
Mr. Fuchko is a fine young man, a professional who is running a very professional organization.

Mr. Fuchko greeted the Board and stated that he was returning with more resolutions from SAC, but he had been mindful of Regent Baranco’s advice during his last presentation and had therefore limited the resolutions to very pertinent issues. In fact, two of the resolutions were actually information items. At the August 1999 Board meeting, Mr. Fuchko had presented three resolutions, one dealing with student fees, one regarding co-curricular transcripts, and one about the HOPE book allowance. At this meeting, he was pleased to report that SAC has been meeting with Central Office staff and with the various University System presidents to discuss these issues. Mr. Fuchko hopes to present a report to the Board on these items in March 2000.

There were four major resolutions that resulted from the SAC fall conference, explained Mr. Fuchko. The first of these resolutions deals with the Open Records Act and student records. Under current law, businesses can solicit from colleges and universities personal information about students, such as their names, addresses, phone numbers, and majors. This information is often used for commercial solicitation. SAC is meeting with the Governor’s Office and hopes the discussions will lead to an amendment of the Open Records Act to require that those using the act to obtain access to student records will not use the records for commercial solicitation. The second resolution addresses SAC’s support for the University System budget. Many student government association (“SGA”) presidents and SAC representatives will visit the legislature to lobby for support of the University System budget. On January 24, 2000, SGA presidents from all over the State will be meeting with their local legislators to express their support of the budget on behalf of the student body of the System. The third issue is voter registration. SAC will be working with Secretary of State Cathy Cox to coordinate a voter registration drive. SAC feels it should set a moral example for the System students about the importance of being involved in voting and politics. The goal is to get more students registered before the presidential primaries. The fourth and final issue is a potential alternative payment plan. Current Board policy requires payment of tuition in full at the commencement of class. There are many students with financial aid or with the HOPE Scholarship; however, there are some students who may not have financial aid and find themselves in emergency situations as payment time approaches at the beginning of the semester. Semester conversion also increased the financial burden for some students by requiring additional monies earlier in the year. SAC has been in conversations with Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers and her office. At this point, SAC is seeking a plan that would give students with financial emergencies a way to pay their matriculation and fees in a staggered payment plan with the first payment due at the beginning of the semester and the final payment due on the last day to withdraw from classes. Of course, it is important that this be a fiscally and legally sound policy that will not negatively affect cash flow or otherwise hurt the institution. Mr. Fuchko stressed that this would not be a program that all students would be able to participate in. Rather, it would be available to a limited pool of students who, for whatever reason, do not have financial aid and need something to help them stay in school. He stressed that SAC would be working hand-in-hand with the Central Office to try to make this plan a reality, and he said that he would like to hear any feedback the Regents may have. In closing, Mr. Fuchko reviewed the four resolutions again. He said that Regent Baranco’s feedback from his last presentation to the Board has encouraged SAC to review how it brings resolutions to the Board. He then thanked the Regents for their attention, consideration, and service to the students.

**REPORT FROM STUDENT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Chair Cannestra thanked Mr. Fuchko. He noted that Mr. Fuchko is a student at Kennesaw State University. He remarked that Mr. Fuchko is a very productive president and thanked him for SAC’s support of the budget and all the organization does for the good of the System.
Chancellor Portch mentioned that during the Audit Committee meeting the preceding day, there was some discussion of student accounts payable and receivable related to tuition and fees. The Committee felt that there should be a more consistent policy on tuition payment. The Chancellor had mentioned to the Committee that SAC was also interested in reviewing this issue. So, the SAC concerns are consistent with those of the Regents.

Mr. Fuchko thanked the Chancellor and the Regents and then stepped down.

At approximately 10:00 a.m., Chair Cannestra recessed the meeting for a brief break.
PRESENTATION: PANEL DISCUSSION ON PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS GRANT

At approximately 10:10 a.m., Chair Cannestra reconvened the Board meeting and introduced Dr. Jan Kettlewell, who is Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Co-facilitator of the Georgia P-16 Initiative, and Coordinator of Performance Assessment for Colleges and Technical Schools, for her presentation to the Board on the PEW Charitable Trusts Grant.

Dr. Kettlewell greeted the Board and explained that the slide the Regents saw on the screen depicted an early example of work that has been underway through the P-16 initiative. The slide read “Seamless Collaboration: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do at Levels 12, 14, and 16.” Level 12 is when students leave high school, and this addresses what students need to know and be able to do to go on to college, to a technical institute, or to work. Most of the P-16 work to date has been done at that level. Level 14 would be after two years of college, and level 16 would be at the completion of a baccalaureate degree. The work on levels 14 and 16 would be introduced later during this presentation, but the P-16 staff first wanted to bring the Board up to date on what they have been doing at level 12, the transition point between high school and post-secondary education. The P-16 initiative received a grant from PEW to support the involvement of faculties from high schools, technical institutes, colleges, and the business community in developing standards and assessments. Once those standards and assessments are identified, they can then be implemented in the high schools. The idea is that if high school teachers and high school students and their parents have a better idea of what students need to know and be able to do to move successfully into college, a technical institute, or the workforce, then greater numbers of students will be prepared. The grant is called Performance Assessment for Colleges and Technical Schools (“PACTS”), it is for three years, and it supports some exciting faculty collaboration across the State of Georgia. Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Regents that when the Board adopted the new admissions policy in 1995, there was a provision for a pilot of this kind of work, and the P-16 initiative was fortunate to receive the grant from PEW to help develop the pilot. The point of the project is to focus on what students must learn rather than what teachers teach and to try to make that clear and explicit. If PACTS is able to do that, more high schools will be able to prepare students to succeed when they enter the University System. There are several other states that are doing similar kinds of work, and PACTS has drawn people from a number of these states to work on a national advisory council to help PACTS. Dr. Kettlewell explained that this program was developed out of an examination of the economy. Most jobs require some form of post-secondary education. So, if more students need to be successful when they enter the System or a technical school, then there should be a better way of ensuring that rather than some of the traditional methods that have been used in the past. For example, in high schools, two students can complete two courses with the same title and even get the same grade, but they could have learned very different things in those courses. So, PACTS focuses on what a student needs to know and be able to do.

There are four local P-16 Councils participating in this work, explained Dr. Kettlewell. In every case, there are college, technical school, business, and high school representatives. There are also State-level partners: the University System, the Georgia Department of Education, and the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”). Dr. Kettlewell had distributed to the Regents a map listing all of the high schools, technical schools, and colleges that are participating. The University System institutions that are participating are from the Metro Atlanta P-16 Council: Georgia State University (“GSU”) and Georgia Perimeter College; the Middle Georgia P-16 Council: Fort Valley State University (“FVSU”) and Middle Georgia College; the South Georgia P-16 Council: Valdosta State University (“VSU”) and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College; and the Southeast Georgia P-16 Council: Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”), Savannah State University, and Coastal Georgia Community College. The PRESENTATION: PANEL DISCUSSION ON PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS GRANT
participating faculty and administrators have reached consensus on the standards in each of the
following areas for level 12: English, mathematics, science, social science, fine and performing arts,
and second language. At this meeting, three panelists would be discussing their work on this initiative.
The first panelist was Mr. Ron Hutcheson. Mr. Hutcheson is an instructional coordinator in
mathematics with the DeKalb County public schools, and he has been working with the mathematics
committee. The second panelist was Ms. Hazel B. Struby, Department Head and Instructor in the Arts
and Sciences Division at Macon Technical Institute (“Macon Tech”), who has also been working on the
mathematics committee. The third panelist was Dr. Byron Brown, Assistant Chair of the Department of
English at Valdosta State University. Dr. Kettlewell invited the panelists to be seated at a table in the
front of the Board Room. She explained that they would be discussing content standards, performance
standards, and performance assessment. They would be emphasizing examples of what they have been
doing, why they think it is important, what they have learned, and what the challenges are.

Ms. Struby began the panel discussion by explaining that a group of faculty members from the two-year
colleges, four-year colleges, technical schools, and high schools, as well as business representatives and
guidance counselors, came together to agree on certain mathematics content standards to really raise the
bar. She said that the collaboration was a very rewarding experience for her. The standards were
developed by national professional association standards such as the National Council for Teachers of
Mathematics, as well as State standards and standards developed by a P-16 subcommittee. Ms. Struby
gave one example of a math content standard, “Math Content Standard #5: [The student will be able to] use
functions to model mathematical relationships and incorporate the concept of function in broad
areas of mathematics.” She explained that a function would be used in all math subjects beginning with
algebra. Ms. Struby then explained that a student should be proficient by level 12, which means more
than just solving an equation; it means analyzing, communicating, and applying a function. This would
demonstrate that the student really understands what a function is. Proficiency means that in routine
problem-solving and modeling situations, students’ decisions will reflect analysis of the behavior of
functions and application of functions as models of mathematical relationships. Students must be able
to communicate the reasoning supporting their solutions using appropriate technologies. This level of
proficiency would make it much easier for students to succeed in post-secondary education. It would
certainly reduce the number of remedial students in post-secondary education. Ms. Struby stated that
she is very excited about this. She taught high school for 3 years and college for 13 years, and she has
been at Macon Tech for nearly 8 years. She also had her own business for a while. So, this was a good
opportunity for her to pull all of her life experiences together.

Next, Dr. Brown began by saying that an abiding question in education has always been how to assess
or measure what students know. He presented to the Board a sample assessment task that the language
arts committee of PACTS had developed. An assessment task is an activity used to measure what
students know and can do as people who read and write in society. Dr. Brown explained that the first
standard in language arts is that students can read, comprehend, and evaluate a wide range of materials
in order to respond appropriately in a diverse society. So, the aim is not simply to prepare students for
post-secondary education, but also to prepare them to be good citizens. The assessment task included
students reading works that have a political or social appeal, including such things as Patrick Henry’s
“Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death” speech, Sojourner Truth’s “Ain’t I a Woman?,” and Dr. Martin
Luther King, Jr.’s “Letter From a Birmingham Jail.” These are sophisticated, varied works. Students
are then charged with identifying the main idea of the work. Can they identify and distinguish between
emotional appeals and logical appeals? Can they identify the kinds of evidence given to them? These
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good citizens and good students. This task was time-consuming and represents a couple of hours of
work. There were representatives in the language arts committee from five University System
institutions, eight high schools, as well as librarians, a principal, and a curriculum director from a county school system. So, there was a lot of feedback from different people in determining what would be a good assessment task. For every standard in an area, there is not simply one task. There are anywhere from two to six tasks per standard. So, students have an opportunity to write about a variety of things in a variety of situations to demonstrate their abilities and knowledge. This kind of assessment has some real benefits, stated Dr. Brown. First of all, unlike a standard grade received in a class, it is less subjective. Secondly, unlike tests like the Scholastic Aptitude Test (“SAT”), it is not given just one time in a multiple choice format. Instead, students are called upon to demonstrate their ability not by bubbling in answers, but rather by actually writing an essay that will demonstrate their ability in a much more concrete way. This is also of great benefit to students. Their goal is no longer simply to pass a class. Rather, they are looking to develop a demonstrated ability to perform a certain task. To write a good essay demonstrates a student’s ability to distinguish the main idea and logical and emotional appeals. The benefit to teachers is that it clarifies what they are to teach. The goal is no longer just to teach a class, but rather to teach a demonstrable skill. This has real implications for University System faculty as they are called upon to teach the students who come to them. Just as with mathematics, a student should be proficient by level 12. Proficient responses identify all of the devices and evaluate some of the ones listed in the question. Students’ thesis statements are clear but not complex, and the writer shows some awareness of the nuances of language. This way, the students and the teachers both understand the goals of their instruction. Dr. Brown commented that he felt this was an exciting program with rigorous requirements that expect students to function on various levels, read sophisticated writings, and respond to those writings. If students were to bring these skills to the university classroom, then instructors could move in new directions, engage in more sophisticated kinds of teaching, and focus more on college-level standards.

Mr. Hutcheson said that one of the many benefits that PACTS affords is the opportunity for high school teachers, technical school teachers, and university faculty to talk to each other about what students need to know to be successful in post-secondary education. In the past, high school teachers have felt that the post-secondary instructors were finger-pointers accusing them of not doing their job because students were coming to college unprepared. As a result of PACTS, the teachers who felt that way now feel that they are working collaboratively with the post-secondary instructors on a viable solution to the problem that all education in Georgia is facing. In the summer of 2000, there will be collaborative staff development opportunities for high school, technical school, and college faculty. They will be working together in the same classrooms, and the focus will be on learning to teach in a standards-based environment. The goal is to have the faculty members not focused on what the teacher needs to teach, but rather on what the student needs to learn. Students are really the ultimate beneficiary of this project. They are being given the opportunity to demonstrate that they are capable of producing outstanding work. The focus is being taken away from doing well on a test to doing well on everything that they do. Students are also being asked to focus on problem solving rather than on fact accumulation. If a student can think through a problem, he can go to the resources he needs to find the facts he needs to solve the problem. Mr. Hutcheson asserted that students tend to do better work when they know that the work they do is for a purpose other than just taking a test. PACTS is focusing on having students do work that will let them demonstrate they can do the problem solving that is necessary in today’s world. PACTS affords the participating schools the opportunity to be pace-setters in Georgia education. They have the chance to move Georgia to the level in education that its students deserve.
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Dr. Kettlewell then introduced Mr. Fred Kiehle, Director of Instructional Support Services with DTAE, and Ms. Judith Monsaa, Associate Professor of Education at North Georgia College & State University who is now working in the Board of Regents Office of Academic Affairs. Mr. Kiehle, Ms. Monsaa, and Dr. Kettlewell have been co-directing the PACTS project. Dr. Kettlewell then asked the Regents for
their questions and comments.

Regent Leebern asked whether the typical multi-paragraph essay was what the language arts assessment was looking for and whether that was really applicable to the business world.

Mr. Hutcheson responded that the goal is not a standard five-paragraph essay, but it would be a multi-paragraph essay. He stressed that the main skill the assessment is seeking is the ability to segment many ideas into discreet groups. So, a student could have one paragraph on emotional appeals, one on logical appeals, etc. However, the organization of the essay would be up to the student. Mr. Hutcheson stated that not every student who graduates high school needs to be able to regularly compose a five-paragraph theme, but if a student continues into post-secondary education, she certainly will be called upon to write essays. No matter where a student goes, however, she will have to be able to group her ideas. That is the main goal of the assessment.

Ms. Monsaas added that the actual standard behind the assessment addresses the ability to write to a variety of audiences. So, there are a variety of different writing tasks in the assessment.

Regent Jenkins commented that the goals of PACTS are extremely laudable, and he commended the work of the committees. He asked why there were no participants from the north or the east regions of the State.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that the participating local P-16 Councils had done a great deal of preliminary work in this direction, so it allowed for a jump-start of the PACTS program as a pilot program before it is expanded to the rest of the State.

Chancellor Portch added that the other P-16 Councils are likely doing other pilot projects which will benefit the participants in this pilot project.

Chair Cannestra remarked that this project seems very challenging and looks at education from a different viewpoint. He said that students do tend to try to memorize facts, and PACTS is instead looking for process.

The Chancellor said that there would be more attention on seamlessness and this is a concrete example of that thinking. If the project failed to produce any measurable uses in the future, it would still have been a tremendous success in getting faculty at different types of institutions communicating amongst themselves about curriculum standards and assessment. The enormous value is the process that is going on, but the Chancellor asserted that there will be useful results.

Chair Cannestra asked if it would be a challenge to break up the program by grades and how students progress through the System.
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Dr. Kettlewell responded that this presentation focuses on the level 12 transition from high school. The local P-16 Councils and others have focused on the earlier years, and the next person she would be introducing was awarded a companion grant from PEW to focus on this same kind of work after two and four years of college in a given academic major.

Chair Cannestra asked whether the program could be segmented into individual grade levels so it all comes together at the end to give the desired results. If it could be, he said, it would be a wonderful tool for evaluating schools.

Dr. Kettlewell replied that it can be segmented and that she agreed that it could be a useful tool. The standards developed are helping high school teachers understand exactly what it is the students should be able to do to have success after high school.

Chancellor Portch noted that third, fifth, and eighth grades were the other levels at which similar assessments are being done.

Dr. Kettlewell agreed and added pre-kindergarten and kindergarten.

The Chancellor stated that Commissioner Kenneth H. Breeden of DTAE had advocated that looking at grade 12 and backwards is a better way to assess where students need to be at each grade level.

Regent Howell remarked that it was nice to see an emphasis on the written word as a standard coming out of high school and going into college. He said he felt that there is not enough emphasis on this nationwide. He explained that he had been a liberal arts major in undergraduate school and had then earned a law degree, but when he got into a master of business administration program, there was hardly anyone in the program who could write or even speak well for that matter. The students were very bright and had the highest Graduate Management Admission Test (“GMAT”) scores and grade point averages, but they were simply unable to put their thoughts into words. For that reason, he wanted to thank PACTS for looking at language arts in that regard, because the written word is a very critical issue that seems too often overlooked in the technological world today.

Regent Jones asked Dr. Kettlewell to list again the organizations participating in this project.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that there were the four local P-16 Councils, and in each case, they include local colleges, technical schools, and high schools, as well as some community and business representatives. Faculty and administrators from each of those areas were brought together to form a single Statewide committee in the six subject areas she had mentioned earlier.

Regent Jones remarked that this was the first time he had heard that all of the parties affected by education have ever come together. He suggested that perhaps the input of high school students would also be useful. He said this was a step in the right direction. In his own experience, when problems have been resolved, it was because all parties sat down together and discussed matters.
Ms. Struby stated that everyone should know how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide whole numbers, fractions, and decimals without calculators. Today, some businesses will not allow calculators on their pre-employment tests but they will allow them on the jobs. They want to ensure that their employees understand math. She emphasizes this and never lets her students have calculators until they can prove they know how to do things the long way. However, high school teachers have been allowing students to use only calculators. Because of PACTS, high school teachers are going back to basics to refresh students memories, and she feels this is a great success.

Regent Jenkins remarked that this was laudable. He knew a person who had to close down his restaurant because the power went out and his employees did not know how to make change.

Chair Cannestra agreed that this was an important basic skill and commended the project.

Regent Baranco asked for the other side of the story. In other words, how does all of this work together with the technological developments in education today? She noted that the children she knows are so far advanced but they do not need to know everything, and what they do not know they will be able to find because of technology.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that if PACTS were implemented in all high schools in Georgia, it would require using a lot of technology and many different instructional methods to reach all of the students. This cannot be done without technology.

Ms. Struby remarked that she teaches using distance learning, and she is putting all of the technical math courses online for the State of Georgia for Macon Tech. She does not allow calculators in those courses either until those students can demonstrate that they know how to perform calculations without calculators. Their skills are further demonstrated when they come in person to take their final exams.

Regent Jones commended Ms. Struby and remarked that mathematics include basic skills that students used to have. One of his sons went to school with a calculator, and he cannot answer basic math problems quickly. His younger son was not allowed a calculator, and he can calculate math problems better. He stressed the importance of that in the business world.

Regent Cater concurred.

Regent Jones further said that it is a disservice to allow students to use calculators in high school and even in college courses.

Dr. Kettlewell reiterated that this presentation was intended to give the Regents an example of what has been developed at level 12. However, as Dr. Brown mentioned, if PACTS were able to get students to this level of standards in high school, it would have many implications for the University System. If two students at the University of Georgia were to take courses with the same title, they would not necessarily come out knowing the same kinds of things, so this is a similar problem for the System. This raises a lot of implications for what should be have been taught by the end of the first two years in college and the total four years in college. Next, Dr. Kettlewell introduced Dr. Ronald J. Henry, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at GSU, who received a companion grant to the PACTS grant. He is the principal investigator and GSU is the fiscal agent for another grant from PEW that focuses on levels 14 and 16. He is beginning this project, and he would be closing out this presentation.
Dr. Henry greeted the Board and said that, as the Chancellor mentioned, if the bar is set high at level 12, then all of the other grades must pull up to that. Similarly, this project seeks to set the bar at level 16. It examines standards for graduation from college in a number of disciplines, such as English, mathematics, and history. Once standards are set for graduation from college at level 16, they can also be set for where students should be at level 14, particularly if they are going to transfer from one institution to another. Dr. Henry asked, “What implications does that have on level 12, and how do we make it a seamless transition?” He reiterated that there are established standards for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, as well as levels 3, 5, and 8. Level 12 had been discussed by Dr. Kettlewell and the panelists, and he was dealing with levels 14 and 16. The PEW grant he was awarded involves four different states: California, Nevada, Maryland, and Georgia. So far, there has been one lead four-year institution in each state and its companion two-year main feeder college. They are California State University at Long Beach, the University of Nevada at Reno, Towson University in Maryland, and GSU. With the grant, this project is being expanded to ten different four-year institutions in the four states and their respective feeder colleges. In Georgia, we have extended invitations to the other members who are involved in PACTS, in particular, VSU, AASU, and FVSU. If this is successful, then the idea is to bring the information that is found useful into the systems in the states, because the four states are all members of the National Association of System Heads. So, the project will be addressing the university systems as well. This project just began, though preliminary work has been underway for a couple of years. Dr. Henry remarked that he looks forward to all of the faculty working together very diligently over the next three years. There is also another proposal to the Exxon Mobile Foundation which, if accepted, would also help extend this work. Dr. Henry remarked that it was a pleasure to be at this meeting and there are exciting things going on in the various colleges and universities in the System, in particular the idea of seamlessness. He thanked the Board and stepped down.

Regent Leeborn noted Dr. Kettlewell and Dr. Henry are truly a collaborative effort, because as husband and wife, they have done an outstanding job acquiring the PEW grants. On behalf of the Board, he thanked them for their hard work.

Chair Cannostra asked if there were any further questions or comments. Seeing that there were none, he thanked the presenters and remarked that it gives hope that the quality of education will continue to improve.
STRAIGHTIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chair Cannistra next convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern explained that there were two discussion items on the agenda at this Committee meeting. In the Regents’ folders were selected parts of the completed requests for proposals (“RFPs”) for both the benchmarking initiative and the technology master planning initiative. Dr. Madlyn A. Hanes, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor, would be presenting the RFP for the benchmarking initiative, followed by Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Beheruz N. Sethna, who would be presenting the RFP for technology master planning.

Dr. Hanes greeted the Board and remarked that she appreciated the opportunity to update the Board on the status of the benchmarking initiative. She was pleased to report that the initiative is moving forward according to plan. In the past few Board meetings, much if not all of the substance and expectations of the work to be accomplished in this initiative have been discussed. There have been many good discussions that were helpful in fine-tuning the initiative and developing the RFP. Dr. Hanes thanked the Regents for their input. The Governor’s comments at the November 1999 Board meeting provided an excellent summary of the RFP. Dr. Hanes said that she could not improve upon his remarks, but she could refresh the Regents’ memories in terms of the scope of the project. The project is three-fold in scope. The first scope of the project is the benchmarking study, where appropriate national comparators of peer institutions by sector will be identified as well as key performance indicators. This will help the staff see how the System fares and allow them to get inside the data to recognize, resolve, and in some cases, explain away some performance outliers that they find. It will also allow them to identify best practices for continued improvement and to set performance expectations aiming higher over time. The second scope of the initiative is a management review of the core business practices of the Central Office and of selected institutions representing each of the sectors within the University System. Four institutions, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Macon State College, Kennesaw State University, and the University of Georgia, will be participating in the management review along with the Central Office, and Dr. Hanes recognized their willingness to “step up to the plate.” She stressed that the identification of best practices that offer improved services, increased effectiveness, and greater efficiency is the intended outcome of the management review. The third scope of the initiative is a data systems review. The staff want to identify approaches to maximize the integrity and utility of the information drawn from the data systems for reporting purposes, but more importantly, for accountability purposes. If the staff want to continue to conduct benchmarking studies and to monitor the University System’s progress against performance indicators, they need to concern themselves with issues of how they will define data and how they will input those data and extract and report the data. These are the scopes of the projects.

Another piece of good news is that this venture has indeed been a partnership with the Governor’s Office from the outset, remarked Dr. Hanes. Together with Dr. Sethna and Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers, she has been working with members of the Office of Planning and Budget in the development of the RFP, including the setting of evaluative criteria. They will continue to work as a team to review proposals and select the vendor, and they will sustain their involvement by being part of an oversight committee once the work of the project begins. The actual RFP was released December 15, 1999, and proposals are due January 26, 2000. Oral presentations by the finalists will take place the week of February 7, 2000. So, the real work of the benchmarking initiative could feasibly begin as early as mid-February. The staff hope for a good response to the RFP and quality proposals to energize the selection process.
process. If the work begins in mid-February, it is anticipated that the benchmarking study can be completed by June 1, 2000 and that the management review and data systems review could be completed by September 15, 2000. Dr. Hanes remarked that this is a very ambitious project, but it is very exciting. True to the Board’s strategic plan and its guiding principles, this initiative is action- and data-driven. With that, she concluded her update.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Hanes and called upon Dr. Sethna to make his presentation.

Dr. Sethna explained that he has come to the Regents before with parts of the technology master plan. The good news is that the RFP is out. The staff have received questions from interested vendors, and they are in the process of framing responses to those questions. Having received several questions indicates that there is interest among the vendors. Dr. Sethna explained that there are five major areas of the technology master plan. First of all, the staff will ask the selected vendor to advise them as to which services should be provided centrally versus at the campus level. Secondly, they will also ask the vendor to recommend a technical infrastructure and architecture of the information systems as they pertain to the structure of the University System. Thirdly, they will ask the vendor to address issues such as stability and bandwidth of the network, retention of staff, training and development of faculty and staff, and various other issues that have been identified, including one that the Chancellor has placed on the table, which is a way to integrate all of the special initiatives in technology that already exist in the System. The fourth item is an understanding that the next phase of this initiative will be institutional master planning. While it will not be part of this year’s work, the vendor will be expected to help the staff develop a template for the next phase. The final part is some discussion of financial sustainability issues, such as ways in which the System can fund the ideas that emerge from this initiative. That is a synopsis of the scope of the technology master planning initiative.

Next, Dr. Sethna discussed the structure of the steering committee, stressing that this is very important since the initiative is being done at the System level but also needs buy-in at the campus level. Therefore, it is critical to have a steering committee that reflects the various important players. The committee has representation from the highest levels of the State, industry, students, the Chancellor’s Office, Academic Affairs, the Office of Information and Instructional Technology, Capital Resources, Human Resources, Georgia Global Learning Online for Business & Education (“Georgia GLOBE”), and the Administrative Committee on Information Technology (“ACIT”), which is the consortium of all the chief information officers of all the System institutions. In addition, there is representation from each sector of the institutions and from each important constituency within the institutions. So, structuring the steering committee itself has been quite a task. The committee is now in place and has been participating in the technology master planning process. A subset of the steering committee will help the staff select the vendor. In closing, Dr. Sethna remarked the timetable of this initiative is very similar to the timetable of the benchmarking initiative. Proposals are due January 26, 2000, and a vendor will hopefully be selected around the time of the February Board meeting. With that, Dr. Sethna stepped down.

Chair Leebern thanked both Dr. Hanes and Dr. Sethna for their presentations. He then asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments. Seeing that they had none, he asked for a motion to recess the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. Regent Jones made the motion, which was variously seconded. Motion properly made, duly seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Chair Cansnstra reminded the Regents that at the November 1999 Board meeting, they had authorized Chancellor Portch to take any actions necessary on behalf of the Board between that meeting and the
January 2000 Board meeting with such actions to be ratified by the Board at the January meeting. However, the Chancellor had taken no such actions.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Cannestra called upon Regent White to inform the Regents about an upcoming campus tour.

Regent White stated that Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber had sent a memorandum to the Regents dated November 30, 1999 regarding a campus visit planned for Wednesday, January 26 and Thursday, January 27, 2000. This is a process that Regent Jones developed for a Macon-area tour and Regent Hunt later carried forward when the Regents toured institutions in Southwest Georgia. The trip would include visits to the University of Georgia, the Gwinnett Center, and then Gainesville College. Regent White remarked that this would be a very worthwhile trip and encouraged the Regents to attend. He asked them to coordinate with Ms. Weber or himself so that there would be good attendance.

Chair Cannestra next called upon Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning to discuss “The Policy Manual of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia” (the “Manual”).

Dr. Dunning thanked Chair Cannestra. He explained that over the last six months, members of the Central Office staff have performed an exhaustive review of the Manual. The Manual is a legal document, which is legally binding and may be used in a court of law to enforce issues against the University System or to defend the University System. The Manual is also the only place where all of the Board policies are available for public distribution. Moreover, it explains how one Board policy affects another Board policy. For example, the Manual explains how semester conversion affects degree requirements and tuition and fees. Dr. Dunning stressed that the Manual is a living document and is not static. In reviewing the Manual, the staff were able to examine the work of previous Boards and how it impacts the work of the current Board. The staff’s work in this endeavor was strictly to ensure the accuracy of the Manual. They also wanted to ensure the wide distribution of the Manual. So, the Manual will be distributed to each University System president and library. It will also be made available on the University System of Georgia Web site (www.usg.edu). Dr. Dunning noted that copies would be available to the Regents in the Regents Conference Room and that all of the Regents had been given their own copies to take home. Dr. Dunning thanked Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (Prevention) J. Burns Newsome for his keen eye, sharp mind, and ability to gently prod the staff to stay on task in this effort. In closing, Dr. Dunning remarked that the Manual is now accurate and current, and the staff will ensure that any policy changes will be recorded promptly and also put on the Web.

Regent Baranco thanked Dr. Dunning and Mr. Newsome. She remarked that the old Manual had many inconsistencies, and many times, the Regents had referred back to the Manual and found it to be of little help. This effort was sorely needed, and it required a great deal of work. She expressed great appreciation to the staff.
NEW BUSINESS (Continued)

Chancellor Portch underscored that the Central Office staff had brought the Manual completely up-to-date and removed any inconsistencies. However, they did not question any existing policies. So, the next step is to identify policies in the Manual that need to be changed or updated. For example, there is now an affidavit requirement for Executive Sessions. That requirement has not yet been incorporated into the Manual, and its incorporation will have to go through the Committee on Organization and Law. For the next few months, various Committees may need to revisit existing policies that may need to be updated or revised.

Chair Cannestra agreed with Regent Baranco that this was very much needed and appreciated.

On another note, Regent Jones stressed the importance of the Regents’ visit to the Budget Committee of the legislature. He suggested that the Regents gather at the Central Office on January 19, 2000 and go to the budget hearing together.

Chancellor Portch agreed that it would be good if the Regents went together.

Chair Cannestra also agreed that this was a good suggestion. He remarked that the Chancellor and the Regents have done a fine job of gaining the support of the Governor and legislators for the University System budget, and they need to keep the momentum going.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, February 8 and Wednesday, February 9, 2000 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

Regent NeSmith asked where the next out-of-town Board meeting would be held.

Ms. Weber responded that the next on-campus meeting would be held at Georgia State University in April 2000.

Chancellor Portch added that before the next Board meeting, the Regents would receive a schedule for the next 18 months.

Regent Jones asked whether the dates for April had been determined.

Ms. Weber responded that the meeting would be held on April 18 and 19, 2000, a week later than the monthly meetings are usually held.
EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:25 a.m., Chair Cannestra called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a legal matter. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Cannestra and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leeborn, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Joel O. Wooten, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance were Chancellor Stephen R. Portch, Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning, Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Elizabeth E. Neely, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (Contracts) Corlis Cummings, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (Prevention) J. Burns Newsome, Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber, President Michael F. Adams of the University of Georgia, Mr. Dennis Dunn, and Mr. Mark Cohen. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (Amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor’s Office.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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