MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
May 9 and 10, 2000

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, May 9 and Wednesday, May 10, 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 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9. 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, Glenn S. White, and Joel O. Wooten.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, May 9, 2000 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent James D. Yancey had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on April 18 and 19 were unanimously approved as distributed.
SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

Chair Cannestra asked the Chancellor to report on a recent tragedy at Savannah State University (“SSU”).

Chancellor Portch explained that the previous night, SSU’s Hill Hall had burned. He reminded the Regents that Hill Hall is the historic building that was featured in the film The General’s Daughter. The building suffered extensive damage, but there had not yet been a full assessment of that damage by the Fire Marshall. It was being renovated at the time of the fire, but both the contractor and the building are insured. The Chancellor reminded the Regents that when Brooks Hall at the University of Georgia burned, the Board requested emergency help from the legislature, which was forthcoming. He noted that no one was injured in this fire.

Chair Cannestra asked the Chancellor and Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Beheruz N. Sethna to make some special recognitions.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Regents that in 1996, the Board decided to put more emphasis on professional development for faculty and staff. One of the ideas that came out of that initiative was the annual Regents’ Awards for Academic Excellence. Since that time, the Board has called for nominations for outstanding faculty. There are two basic categories of awards. One is Regents’ Teaching Excellence Awards, which look for a record of sustained superlative teaching and interactive, innovative instruction. The other category is the Regents’ Research in Undergraduate Education Awards. The Chancellor remarked that involving undergraduates in research early in their college careers is a wonderful instructional tool and a good way to mentor students so they learn early the benefits of engaging in research. At larger institution in particular, this is a way for students to get involved in some very high-level academic work. The Chancellor then asked Dr. Sethna to introduce the recipients of this year’s awards.

Dr. Sethna stated that this was an outstanding opportunity to recognize the System’s star teachers and researchers. He began by introducing the faculty recipient of the Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award on the two-year and state college level, Ms. Marolyn H. Mixon, Associate Professor of Education at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (“ABAC”). Ms. Mixon has been at ABAC since 1985. She has received several awards for her dedication and commitment to excellence in teaching, most recently the Outstanding Educator Award from the ABAC Alumni Association. She has been called “a teacher’s teacher” and has been commended for creating a multitude of extracurricular activities that help the college produce some of the best transfer students in education in the State of Georgia. Dr. Sethna asked Ms. Mixon to come before the Board to accept her reward.

Next, Dr. Sethna recognized Dr. Carol D. Edwards, Associate Professor of Art and Art Education and Chair of the Department of Visual Arts at Kennesaw State University (“KSU”). Dr. Edwards was not present, but she had been selected as the faculty recipient of the Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award on the regional and state universities level.

Dr. Sethna next introduced the faculty recipient of the Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award for research universities, Dr. Erian A. Armanios, Professor of Aerospace Engineering at Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”). Dr. Armanios joined GIT as a research engineer in 1985 and has since risen to the rank of Professor and Director of the Georgia Space Grant Consortium. In addition to being a distinguished researcher, he has consistently maintained a strong commitment to outstanding teaching. It has been said that he personifies what GIT looks for in an engineering professor. He maintains an active research career while teaching and mentoring students. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. Armanios to come before the Board to accept his award.

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS
Next, Dr. Sethna recognized the departmental recipient of the Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award on the regional and state universities level, the Department of Physical Therapy at Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”). He explained that the master of science program in physical therapy has achieved recognition both nationally and internationally for its innovative curriculum and its approach to the learning process since March 1995. Dr. Sara Connor, Vice President for Academic Affairs at AASU, had noted three factors that have been key to the success of the program: a comprehensive and rigorous admissions process, a strong evaluation plan for student performance, and a modified problem-based learning approach. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. David A. Lake, Professor and Department Head, to approach the Board and accept the award on behalf of the Department of Physical Therapy.

Dr. Sethna then introduced the faculty recipient of the Regents’ Research in Undergraduate Education Award on the regional and state universities level, Dr. Patricia H. Reggio, Professor of Chemistry at KSU. Dr. Reggio has distinguished herself as a highly accomplished researcher and is recognized both nationally and internationally for her contributions to cannabinoid research. She has been awarded both KSU’s Distinguished Teaching and Distinguished Scholarship Awards. She has embraced a philosophy of scholarship that combines both teaching in the classroom and in the laboratory. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. Reggio to come before the Board to accept her award.

Next, Dr. Sethna introduced the faculty recipient of the Regents’ Research in Undergraduate Education Award on the research universities level, Dr. Charles A. Eckert, Professor of Chemical Engineering and Physical Chemistry at GIT. Dr. Eckert is the recipient of numerous prestigious awards for teaching and research and was elected to the National Academy of Engineering in 1983. He has consistently involved undergraduates in his research, serving as both their teacher and mentor. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. Eckert to approach the Board to accept his reward.

Then, Dr. Sethna introduced the program recipient of the Regents’ Research in Undergraduate Education Award for regional and state universities, the Mentor-Protégé Undergraduate Research Program at KSU. The program was implemented in 1998 at KSU to attract and retain more students in the sciences and mathematics. This program honors and promotes the engagement of undergraduate protégés as collaborators and joint researchers and presenters with faculty members in significant scientific research within the College of Science & Mathematics. In less than two years, 56 protégé students have partnered with 27 faculty members on 49 research projects. The program continuously demonstrates the power of turning energetic and exciting undergraduate research experiences into excellent teaching and learning opportunities for students. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. Laurence I. Peterson, Dean of the College of Science & Mathematics, to approach the Board and accept the award on behalf of the Mentor-Protégé Undergraduate Research Program.

Finally, Dr. Sethna introduced the department recipient of the Regents’ Research in Undergraduate Education Award for research universities, the Department of Geology at Georgia State University. He explained that the department strives to make significant intellectual advances in the geosciences and to provide quality instruction in geology for a diverse student body through the creation and utilization of effective learning environments. In addition to its notable research record and its ability to compete nationally for research grants, the department employs many effective strategies for involving as many undergraduates as possible in faculty research projects. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. David A. Vanko, Chair of the Department of Geology, to come forward and accept the award on behalf of the department.

**SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS**

After presenting the awards, Dr. Sethna recognized Ms. Dorothy D. Zinsmeister, Senior Associate for Academic Affairs, for her work with regard to the awards. He then acknowledged that Dr. Edwards, faculty recipient of the Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award on the regional and state university level,
had arrived at the meeting. Dr. Sethna explained that Dr. Edwards is Associate Professor of Art and Art Education and Chair of the Department of Visual Arts at KSU. She has received several awards for accomplishments in art and art education. She is the fiscal year 2000 Regent’s Distinguished Professor for Teaching and Learning and was selected by KSU’s students as the institution’s Outstanding Advisor in 1999. Dr. Sethna invited Dr. Edwards to approach the Board to receive her award.

After the awards presentation, Chancellor Portch recognized KSU’s Dr. JoAllen Bradham, Professor of English, who in April was named Fiction Author of the Year by the Georgia Writers, Inc. He noted that Dr. Bradham had once received the Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award herself. Her first novel received the 1996 Townsend Award, and this year, it was republished for wider distribution by Black Belt Press. The Chancellor asked Dr. Bradham to stand and be recognized.
YAMACRAW MISSION UPDATE

Chair Cannestra remarked that the Yamacraw Mission (“Yamacraw”) will give Georgia recognition as one of the high-tech centers of the nation. He asked the Chancellor to begin this presentation.

Chancellor Portch explained that Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Director of Yamacraw Educational Programs, and Dr. James D. Foley, Chief Executive Officer of Yamacraw, would be making this presentation to the Board. Dr. Foley is a distinguished academic in his own right. He was formerly at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), and then, he went into the private sector and worked for Mitsubishi. Since Yamacraw is an economic development initiative marrying the academic and business worlds, the Chancellor was happy to have someone from the best of both worlds. Chancellor Portch remarked that he had recently attended a luncheon where Governor Barnes met the Yamacraw faculty for the first time and there was an announcement of a new company coming to Georgia as a result of Yamacraw. The Governor is passionate about Yamacraw and sees a connection between the program and his efforts to strengthen math and science in K-12 education. The Chancellor remarked that the Governor’s insights on Yamacraw were “spellbinding.” Since this is a high-stakes part of Georgia’s future, the Board would hear a full briefing on the status of Yamacraw.

Dr. Foley greeted the Board and noted that some of the early Yamacraw meetings were held in the Board Room. He explained that Yamacraw is a unique economic development initiative in that it is focused on a particular technology domain, namely the domain of broadband communications systems, devices, and chips. It is also unique because it covers all of the areas that are important to economic development. It is focused and has some very well defined strategies. The primary goal of Yamacraw is to make Georgia the location in which companies want to develop next-generation broadband, wireless, and optical communications technologies. Dr. Foley gave several examples of such technologies, such as next-generation cell phones, set-top boxes, and Internet infrastructure. He stated that Yamacraw has been allotted State funding of approximately $100 million over a five- to seven-year period. When Governor Barnes first introduced the initiative, he explained that it is a strategic long-term investment to make the goal of Yamacraw a reality. While the primary goal of Yamacraw is to make Georgia recognized as the place of choice for designers of telecommunications infrastructure, other goals of Yamacraw include creating 2,000 new high-tech jobs, creating 10 new companies, quadrupling the amount of venture capital in the telecommunications infrastructure segment, and educating at least 2,000 additional computer scientists and computer, electrical, and software engineers. Yamacraw is a highly collaborative endeavor with many entities working together, including the Board of Regents; the Governor’s Office; the legislature; the Georgia Center for Advanced Telecommunication Technologies; the Georgia Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism; the Georgia Research Alliance; the Technology Association of Georgia; technology companies; and chambers of commerce.

Dr. Foley explained that there are five strategies for achieving the goals of Yamacraw: human capital, intellectual capital, infrastructure capital, venture capital, and mind-share capital. Yamacraw is unique in that it has a broader set of strategies targeted on a specific area and a larger investment in this activity than any other state. Dr. Foley explained that in the area of human capital, Yamacraw will offer university courses and degree programs as well as continuing education. Additionally, Yamacraw will seek to attract former Georgians who have left the State to work in technological fields, and there will be more high-tech jobs for Georgians already in Georgia. There will also be a jobs and resume database in the targeted hardware infrastructure domain so that those companies with jobs can be matched to students and repatriates who are looking for employment opportunities. Intellectual capital means investing $4 million to $5 million
Yamacraw Mission Update

A year in State funding, leveraged by federal and corporate monies, in research areas that are of prime interest to the types of companies Yamacraw wants to attract to Georgia, such as Lucent Technologies, Motorola, Inc., Nokia, Siemens, Samsung, Mitsubishi Electric, and NTT Systems Inc. This research will be used to attract companies into the Yamacraw Design Center (the “Design Center”). Companies can join the Design Center by committing to create 100 new jobs in Georgia over the next five years and paying a $25,000 annual fee. So far, member companies include Star*Core (a joint venture between Lucent and Motorola), Broadcom, and WiLAN. If companies are not prepared to make the job commitment, but are nonetheless interested in Georgia, they may join the Design Center by paying $250,000 a year, which National Semiconductor has done. Companies that join the Design Center get a royalty-free, nonexclusive, five-year license to all of the Design Center’s intellectual property as well as involvement with other people and ideas. The fact that Georgia is making a five-year, $100 million commitment to growth in this area greatly facilitates bringing companies here and recruiting faculty here.

On the infrastructure capital side, the Design Center building is in the pre-planning stage. It will be both an organization and a place. It will serve as a central coordinating agency, a meeting point, and an incubator for emerging companies. With regard to venture capital strategy, an increased amount of funding at the seed capital level will bring more companies to the point where the larger capital venture firms would be prepared to make large investments in companies. This is an early stage fund with $5 million of State monies which must be matched on a deal-by-deal basis with at least a three-to-one match from the private sector with a maximum investment of $2 million. Dr. Foley reported that the first investment in RF Solutions Ltd. leveraged on a seven-to-one ratio, with $250,000 of State money to $1.75 million of private funding. He thanked Regent White and the Committee on Finance and Business Operations for approving the Seed Capital Fund (the “Fund”) at the April 2000 Board meeting. The Fund is being administered by the Advanced Technology Development Center on behalf of Yamacraw. The final strategy, mind-share capital, is intended to tell the world that Georgia is the place to be. A major marketing and public relations campaign is about to be rolled out, a new Web site (www.yamacraw.org) is being developed, and there are also an ad campaign targeting Georgia repatriots, a newsletter, and conferences and exhibits. In conjunction with Supercomm, a 50,000-person technology convention, Yamacraw will host a dinner for chief executive officers and other senior management. The Governor has committed to attend that dinner and give a speech on Yamacraw. In closing, Dr. Foley turned the floor over to Dr. Papp.

Dr. Papp thanked Dr. Foley and reiterated that one of the critical strategies of Yamacraw is to develop the intellectual capital of the State. When Yamacraw was created last year, each of the 34 University System institutions was given an opportunity to participate. A request for proposals was sent to all of them, and eight decided to participate. When the proposals came in from the institutions, they were sent to an external board of reviewers that consisted of a number of members of the National Academy of Engineering and the National Academy of Sciences, very prominent people in the field of broadband telecommunications. The board performed its review, and all eight institutions became players in Yamacraw. Those institutions were Armstrong Atlantic State University, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, GIT, Kennesaw State University, Savannah State University, Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”), and University of Georgia. These institutions are planning to hire approximately 85 to 90 new faculty members in broadband areas, such as signal processing, high-speed access, and optical and wireless networks, over the next five years. They hired 22 faculty members in the first year of the program, and there are already 17 new faculty members hired for next fiscal year. The people already on board are actively engaged in curriculum revision and modification in computer science and electrical and computer engineering. In Savannah recently, the participating institutions laid out their curriculum revisions and modifications.
Yamacraw Mission Update

Everyone was very pleased with the direction in which the initiative is moving. Dr. Papp stressed that Yamacraw did not begin without a foundation. There was an intellectual/faculty base of approximately 70 people already in place at a number of institutions in Georgia. He noted that in addition to academic degree programs, continuing education programs are also in place. These programs have several different purposes. One purpose is directed specifically to member companies who have joined the Design Center. They will be able to work together with continuing education programs that are part of the Yamacraw institutions and design specific courses for their employees. In addition, other information technology (“IT”) workers in the State of Georgia will also have the opportunity to participate in continuing education programs. There are some workers in the State in areas of IT that are closely aligned to Yamacraw areas, and there are continuing education programs in place for them. Continuing education programs are also being developed to draw for those individuals who may be interested in IT but at more basic levels and who wish to enhance their capabilities through Yamacraw. Dr. Papp noted that during the first two weeks in August, Yamacraw will have its first Yamacraw Broadband and Computing Institute. In this institute, the GIT continuing education group is bringing together eight different continuing education courses in hopes of attracting large numbers of people in the nation and enhancing the visibility of the continuing education programs in Yamacraw areas here in Georgia.

Collaboration is something the Board of Regents has strongly emphasized and something Yamacraw is also strongly emphasizing, stated Dr. Papp. He noted that there has been an incredible amount of cooperation among the eight institutions. He remarked that it was heart-warming to see university administration and faculty working together on all areas, such as curriculum revision/modification, continuing education, research at the Design Center, faculty recruiting, and student recruiting. Future high school programs are also being developed to draw students into Yamacraw areas at these institutions. Other parts of Yamacraw include community building, such as program-wide meetings, consortiums, and a luncheon with Governor Barnes. A number of institutions send their professors at GIT and SPSU to work with Yamacraw professors in a mentoring effort. Additionally, Yamacraw will move into distance learning in the next fiscal year. Dr. Papp reminded the Regents that at the January 2000 meeting, Dr. James David Frost, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering at GIT and Director of the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program (“GTREP”), made a presentation to the Board on that program. The computer engineering part of GTREP has some students who are concentrating in Yamacraw areas. In closing, Dr. Papp said that a baseline survey has been developed which provides information from each of the participating institutions regarding where they were in fiscal year 1999 before Yamacraw began. Each year, this information will be requested again. This effort will help track where the program is succeeding and where it is not. If the program is doing poorly in an area, this tool will make it easier to track. Dr. Papp speculated that Yamacraw will actually exceed the targets that have been established. He then asked Dr. Foley to discuss those targets.

Dr. Foley reiterated the five- to seven-year goals he had outlined earlier. He remarked that in ten months, Yamacraw has made great progress. Its national marketing campaign is about to begin. By the end of this fiscal year, approximately 500 new jobs will have been created. Twenty-two faculty members are already on board. There are approximately 50 new degrees and 50 continuing education programs in Yamacraw areas. The Design Center already has four members, and one start-up company has been funded. In closing, he asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.
YAMACRAW MISSION UPDATE

Regent Leebern asked how Yamacraw can measure its competitiveness and how it can remain competitive.

Dr. Foley responded that Yamacraw is competitive because of its carefully chosen target as well as its resources. He stated that the program is being carefully tracked and that he felt it will be able to reach its goals and possibly exceed them. He noted that while Yamacraw is competitive, the market is such that the resources put on the table can determine the success of a program. He stressed that the goal of creating 2,000 jobs meant specifically high-tech jobs. Other jobs related to the industry are not included in this goal but will likely be created.

Regent Leebern asked about RF Solutions’ seven-to-one levering of State funds versus the recommended three-to-one match of private money to State funds.

Dr. Foley replied that there have been many studies on economic development. Those who have done the studies suggest that three to one is a good ratio.

Regent Leebern asked whether other states are also targeting these areas of technology and whether they could steal this idea.

Dr. Foley responded that success is always imitated, but Georgia wants to be there first. The other way to deal with that is the level of resource commitment.

Regent Howell commended the program and remarked that $5 million is a rather modest amount of money for this type of technology.

Dr. Foley agreed and stated that is why he had emphasized that this was a very early stage. However, the mentoring and relationship building are as important as funding.

Regent Howell asked who is making the decisions for Yamacraw and how they decide with which venture capital firms to do business. He noted that while Yamacraw has an incentive to keep its intellectual capital here in Georgia, venture capital firms do not.

Dr. Foley replied that the lead investor must be in Georgia. The doors are open to all companies that meet a certain set of criteria and want to make an investment. However, the lead investor could even be “angel funding,” in which a coalition of investors contribute, which is fairly common.

Regent Howell asked where Dr. Foley is finding the “angel” investors or venture capital investors.

Dr. Foley responded that they are in Atlanta and Savannah and there are a few in other areas of Georgia.

Regent Howell asked whether Yamacraw is approaching them or they are approaching Yamacraw.

Mr. Foley replied that both are happening. He has been giving talks about Yamacraw, and as a consequence, there have been some communications. In a week, he would be speaking at the Atlanta Venture Forum, which is a place where people come together for venture capital investing.

YAMACRAW MISSION UPDATE

Regent Leebern asked whether there could be any flexibility with regard to the location of the lead
Dr. Foley reiterated that the lead investor must be doing business in the State of Georgia.

Regent Leebern stated that as long as the money was coming, he felt the lead investor could be from anywhere.

Dr. Foley responded that he does not believe the program needs to be that flexible, because there is money in the State. However, if there was a great opportunity and the money was not here, then it would be better to fund the program than not fund it.

Regent Leebern asked whether the program was competitive enough to have the lead investor outside the State of Georgia.

Dr. Foley responded that it would not be an issue.

Regent Baranco asked what would be the incentive to potential investors.

Dr. Foley replied that they would own a piece of the company and that, as its value goes up, they will get rich too, which is why he prefers investors from the State of Georgia.

Regent Jenkins asked where competition for this industry lies other than the states of California, Massachusetts, Colorado, and Texas.

Dr. Foley stated that there is new initiative in Pennsylvania called the Digital Greenhouse, which is funded at a much lower level and is focused on high-definition televisions. Research Triangle Park in Raleigh, North Carolina represents a long-term investment by that state in both educational and physical resources, but it is across-the-board in its scope.

Regent Jenkins said that he did not understand the reasoning behind having a lead investor, because venture capital associations are comprised of thousands of investors. If the investors do not care where they invest, why would Yamacraw care about the origin of the money?

Regent Baranco asked whether this stipulation for the lead investor is in the legislation of Yamacraw.

Dr. Foley responded that it is in the criteria that have been established. The reason Yamacraw cares where the money comes from is that it wants the lead investors to be close to the company to help the company develop. He explained that Yamacraw wants “smart money” from lead investors who have experience in helping companies get started. Companies are typically started by people who are long on technology savvy and have some business savvy. If they are smart, they have a chief executive officer with a lot of business savvy, but they need the network of connections that the more seasoned investors have. A new startup needs connections and networking.

Chancellor Portch remarked that Dr. Foley might want to reconsider this condition.

**Yamacraw Mission Update**

Chair Cannestra asked where there is a restriction on foreign investors.

Dr. Foley responded that international companies are welcome to establish business activities around the Design Center in Georgia.
Chair Cannestra asked whether there were any further questions or comments, and there were none. He commented that this is very beneficial for the State of Georgia in the area of high technology.
NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

After the presentation, Chair Cannestra reminded the Regents that Vice Chair Coleman will be the new Commissioner of the Department of Transportation and that Wednesday, May 10 would be his last Board meeting day. Chair Cannestra thanked Vice Chair Coleman for his service as a Regent and as Vice Chair. He reminded the Regents that at its April 2000 meeting, he had asked Regent Leebern to chair a Nominating Committee with Regents Baranco and Coleman to nominate the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board for fiscal year 2001. He asked Regent Leebern to give the Committee report.

Regent Leebern reported that the Committee was recommending the following nominations: Regent Howell for the Vice Chairmanship and Regent White for the Chairmanship.

Chair Cannestra reminded the Regents that the election of the Chair and Vice Chair actually takes place in June. This was simply the nomination of the Committee. He asked whether there was a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation with the election to be held in June.

Vice Chair Coleman made the motion, and Regent Baranco seconded it. With motion properly made and seconded, the Board accepted the recommendations of the Committee.

Regent Baranco noted that the Committee, in the course of its deliberations, had realized that it might be a good time to consider a one-day strategic planning retreat like the Board has done in the past at the Jolley Lodge of Kennesaw State University. This would be especially beneficial for new Regents. It would also be an ideal opportunity to discuss the benchmarking report as well as other strategic planning concerns. The University System has made significant strides, but it has a long way to go. This would be an opportune time for the Regents to reflect on the direction in which they want the System to go.

Chair Cannestra asked whether there were any questions or comments.

Regent White agreed that this was a good suggestion.

Chancellor Portch also agreed. He reminded the Regents that the strategic plan has a 2001 milepost for many of its goals. So, this would be a good time to examine the progress of the plan as well as what future goals should be.

Regent Leebern stated that he hoped the Regents could do this as soon as possible, since the summer was approaching.

Chair Cannestra suggested that the Board use the Jolley Lodge again. He asked whether there were any further questions or comments, and there were none. He asked the staff to develop a program for the retreat and perhaps arrange for a guest speaker.

The Chancellor stated that the staff would soon know when they would receive the benchmarking report so that they could work around that.

Chair Cannestra asked whether a Monday before the Board meeting would work or whether anyone had any other suggestions.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chancellor said that the staff would work out the details.
Before recessing for the Committee meetings, Regent Baranco asked Regent Allgood to chair the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension, because she would be unable to attend.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chair Canestra 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, May 10, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Vice Chair of the Board, Regent J. Tom Coleman, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Vice Chair Coleman, were 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, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, May 10 by Regent Edgar L. Jenkins.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, May 10, 2000 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Chair Kenneth W. Cannestra had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.
SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

Vice Chair Coleman called upon the Chancellor to make some special recognitions.

Chancellor Portch noted that May is the month in which the Board celebrates its national champions. He stated that debate was one of the most influential subjects in his own education and he has enjoyed listening to many good debates. This year, the debating team at State University of West Georgia won the Cross Examination Debate Association’s National Championship tournament. The team is directed by Mr. Michael Hester, Instructor of Speech/Debate Coach, and Dr. Chester Gibson, Professor and Chair of the Department of Mass Communication, is the person who established the team. While debating is a long-standing tradition at SUWG, this year, the team reached its pinnacle by winning its first national championship. The Chancellor asked Acting President Thomas J. Hynes to introduce two members of the team.

The Chancellor reminded the Regents that at the May 1999 meeting, the Board met members of the University of Georgia’s (“UGA”) women’s swimming and diving team, the Lady Bulldogs, because they were the 1999 National Collegiate Athletic Association (“NCAA”) champions. This year, the Lady Bulldogs won the national championship again and have broken even more world records. Chancellor Portch introduced Coach Jack Bauerle and asked him to introduce some of the team members.

Coach Bauerle thanked the Chancellor and greeted the Board. He stated that it is harder to defend a championship than to win the first one. He noted that the two co-NCAA swimmers of the year were unable to attend this meeting because they were training to compete for a place on the Olympic team. Senior Kristy Kowal set 12 American records and 2 world records during her tenure at UGA. Mrs. Courtney Shealy, also a senior, was part of a world-record performance and also set three American records at the championships. He noted that they are not only great athletes, but also great students. They carried 3.7 and 3.8 grade point averages (“GPA”), respectively, and one of them will likely be an NCAA postgraduate. The third senior on the team has a 4.0 GPA. Coach Bauerle introduced to the Regents Assistant Coach Carol Capitani. He said that she was an All-American at the University of California - Berkeley and has been with UGA for four years. In that time, the team has won four Southeastern Conference championships and two NCAA titles. He also introduced Assistant Coach Harvey Humphries, who has been a full-time coach at UGA for 18 years.

Chancellor Portch explained that the third recognition at this meeting was for North Georgia College & State University’s (“NGCSU”) Blue Ridge Rifles, a precision rifle drill team with a long-standing national reputation. This year, the team won the first-place overall trophy at the Mardi Gras Invitational Drill Meet in New Orleans. The team also won first place in inspection, platoon basic, and exhibition and won second place in squad exhibition. The team competed against such universities as The Citadel, Auburn University, North Carolina State University, and the U.S. Naval Academy. This is the eleventh time the team has won the championship since 1979. The Chancellor asked President Nathaniel Hansford to come forward and introduce the team and commandant.
SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

President Hansford thanked the Chancellor and said that he was very proud to introduce to the Board two representatives of the Blue Ridge Rifles. He remarked that the young men had done an outstanding job, and that they work very hard to reach the highest level of precision. Moreover, they are the only team to use rifles with bayonets on them. He then introduced Cadet Captain Justin Shelton, Commander of the Blue Ridge Rifles. Mr. Shelton is from Griffin, Georgia. He is a senior majoring in business management and marketing. Next, he introduced Mr. Zachary Poole, Cadet Sergeant and Drillmaster, from Peachtree City. He is a junior majoring in history. Finally, President Hansford introduced Colonel Tom Palmer, Commandant of Cadets. He served 26 years on active duty in the U.S. Army. He is also a graduate of NGCSU and a Canton, Georgia native. President Hansford stated that there are 14 members of the Blue Ridge Rifles, and they competed against 27 schools. He noted that the NGCSU Corp of Cadets is considered a leadership training program, and the two students attending this meeting represent the dual nature of the program. Mr. Shelton will be going into the corporate world when he graduates, but he chose the corp to learn leadership training. On the other hand, Mr. Poole is in ROTC and will be commissioned in the military. His long-term goal is to go to law school. President Hansford asked Mr. Shelton to speak.

Mr. Shelton thanked the Regents for honoring him at this meeting. He stated that it means a great deal to be applauded by such high-standing persons.

The Chancellor next recognized the Savannah State University (“SSU”) baseball team, which has set the national record for consecutive wins by winning 46 games in a row. He asked Dr. Charles J. Elmore, Interim Director of Athletics, to step forward.

Mr. Elmore approached the Board. He explained that the team broke a record that was standing for 27 years. He noted that Coach James C. Rigdon is a 1996 graduate of SSU. He epitomizes the SSU slogan, “You can get anywhere from here.” He then introduced Assistant Coach Eric Andrew and asked Mr. Rigdon to speak.

Mr. Rigdon thanked the Regents for this honor and recognized Assistant Coaches Robert Lampkin and Luis Marquez, who were not able to attend the meeting.

Chancellor Portch explained that because the team moved to a different division, it was not eligible to go into post-season competition. In closing, he noted that there was another national champion who was not able to attend this meeting. Ms. Marjo Venalainen, a student at KSU, won the women’s NCAA Division II National Cross Country Championship. In April, she also captured the 3000-meter championship at the prestigious Penn Relays, hosted by the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, the oldest and one of the most distinguished track events in the nation. Her coach at KSU is Assistant Coach Don McGarey, and Dr. David L. Waples is the Athletic Director at KSU. In closing, the Chancellor congratulated all of these champions for their superb accomplishments.

Vice Chair Coleman said that the Board would next move to the Committee reports.

Regent Allgood interjected that he would like to make a few remarks. First, he commended Vice Chair Coleman for his brief tenure as presiding officer of the Board and wished him well in his new role as Commissioner of the Department of Transportation. He also congratulated Regents White and Howell on their nominations for the positions of Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. Regent Allgood suggested that
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the first order of business by the new officers be to establish procedures and policies that ensure that every member of the Board has a full opportunity to have whatever input he or she wishes to have in the future selection of the Chair and Vice Chair. He noted that this time, the Committee worked very well; however, that may not always be the case. He hoped that in the future, every Regent will be aware of when the nominations would be made and how to be heard. He stressed that he was not suggesting that this did not occur in this case. However, the nominations were not an agenda item, and it bothered him because he felt the Regents should always be aware when a Committee will make its report.

Vice Chair Coleman responded that Regent Allgood’s remarks were duly noted.
The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, May 9, 2000 at approximately 11:30 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. Those items were as follows:

1. **Information Item: Fiscal Year 2001 Phase I Audit Plan**

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ronald B. Stark presented to the Committee information regarding the audit rating of each institution to determine audit risk utilized to create the fiscal year 2001 audit plan. He also presented the preliminary audit plans for fiscal year 2001 of each of the institutions that have audit departments.

2. **Information Item: Status of Internal Audit Activity, March 31, 2000 Year-to-Date**

Mr. Stark presented to the Committee the status of all Systemwide internal audit activity. The status of each institution’s audit plan was also discussed. A summary of the internal audit findings will be presented at the first Audit Committee meeting of fiscal year 2001.
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The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, May 9, 2000 at approximately 2:05 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, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Chair White reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed six items, two of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Health Insurance Premiums, Effective August 1, 2000

Approved: The Board approved increases in the indemnity health plan premiums. The rate increases were distributed with the agenda and are on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

Background: Claims for medical services covered under the self-insured health benefits plan for the University System of Georgia increased significantly over an 18-month period from July 1998 through December 1999. This trend has continued into this calendar year.

Since July 1998, the combined claims and administrative costs (the cost of the Blue Cross Blue Shield contract to administer the plan) exceeded the amount of premiums collected for every month of the period until December 1999, when the campuses made additional payments into the fund to cover costs that had depleted reserves. In March, the health plan received a supplemental appropriation of $33 million to cover the deficit for the remainder of this fiscal year 2000. The Office of Capital Resources staff now project that the health plan will finish the fiscal year with less than the minimum two months’ reserve, which is the prudent level to maintain. Costs, meanwhile, continue to rise.

In March 2000, the Board of Regents approved in concept increases in monthly employee health insurance premiums (indemnity program), with the amounts of premium increases for the indemnity plan to be determined by further analysis of actuarial projections. The Board also approved a Preferred Provider Organization (“PPO”) option for University System employees, retirees, and dependents, with implementation date and premium rates to be determined at a later time. Since that meeting, the staff have further studied the actuarial projections and consulted with the Department of Community Health (“DCH”) on premium increases and the implementation of the PPO. The effective date for implementation of the new PPO will be January 1, 2001, with open enrollment in November 2000. This calendar allows adequate time for the necessary computer systems changes and development of employee information materials. The staff and DCH believe this time line will ensure a smooth transition for University System employees.

To manage the continuing increases in costs, premium increases are needed. The employer premium increase supported by budgeted funds approved by the Governor and General Assembly is proposed at 17.4% to be effective July 1, 2000, with an additional 5% proposed in January. Necessary employee increases are also proposed in two phases. The first increase, effective August 1, 2000, will increase the premium by 15%. The second increase will coincide...
with the start of the new plan year in January and will be determined later when new information is available. It is very likely that this will be a substantial increase. Also in November, members will be offered the opportunity to enroll in the new PPO effective January 1, 2001 for significantly lower premiums, approximately comparable to those currently in effect for the indemnity plan. This phased increase is intended to serve two purposes in addition to managing the increased cost of the program: 1) spread the financial impact of premium increases for indemnity plan members over an extended period to enable employees to prepare for the additional expense and 2) time the changes so that, within a few months, employees have a new health plan choice, the PPO, with a desirable benefit package and affordable premiums as an alternative to the more costly indemnity plan. The PPO option will have broad coverage around the State. Initial information regarding the State PPO indicates that 8,700 out of the 10,000 physicians in the State and 151 out of the 162 hospitals in the State are included in the program. This broad coverage will also be available in the University System PPO.

2. **Approval of Change to Tuition Refund Policy to Meet Federal Title IV Requirements**

Approved: The Board approved the recommended change in Section 704.04 of the Board of Regents’ Policy Manual concerning refunds of tuition and fees effective Fall Semester 2000. The revised refund policy is as follows:

704.04 REFUNDS

Except for those institutions for which special refund policies have been approved by the Board of Regents, the policy for determining refunds to be made on institutional charges, and other mandatory fees at institutions of the System follows. (For the purposes of this section, “institutional charges” are as defined in the Statutory and Regulatory Citations Section 484B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, (Title IV, HEA) and 34 CFR 668.22).

The refund amount for students withdrawing from the institution shall be based on a pro rata percentage determined by dividing the number of calendar days in the semester that the student completed by the total calendar days in the semester. The total calendar days in a semester includes weekends, but excludes scheduled breaks of five or more days and days that a student was on an approved leave of absence. The unearned portion shall be refunded up to the point in time that the amount earned equals 60%.

Students that withdraw from the institution when the calculated percentage of completion is greater than 60% are not entitled to a refund of any portion of institutional charges.

A refund of all non-resident fees, matriculation fees, and other mandatory fees shall be
made in the event of the death of a student at any time during the academic session. (BR Minutes, 1979-80, p. 61; 1986-87, pp. 24-25; 1995, p. 246)

Background: In April 1995, the Board voted to change the Student Tuition Refund Policy to be consistent with the refund requirements established by the U. S. Department of Education for students receiving financial aid under Title IV and other forms of federally funded student financial aid. The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 contain new regulations titled “Return of Title IV Funds,” (34 CFR part 668.22) which must be implemented by October 7, 2000. Schools may choose an earlier implementation date in order to apply the new policy for the entire fall semester 2000. The U. S. Department of Education will no longer dictate institutional refund polices but instead will require that schools determine the “unearned” portion of the total financial aid award and return those monies to federal financial aid sources. The “earned” portion
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is determined by multiplying the percentage of the semester that the student completed by the amount of Title IV aid funds disbursed or to be disbursed. This amount of Title IV aid “earned” is subtracted from the amount of Title IV aid disbursed to determine the amount that is “unearned” and must be returned.

The recommended change in the System’s refund policy is necessary to prevent University System of Georgia institutions from being required to return funds to the United States Department of Education in excess of the institutions’ actual revenues.

From the student’s perspective, the revision to match Title IV guidelines will offer consistency in the refund amounts for all students regardless of payment method. The change to the pro rata calculation will allow students withdrawing to receive a percentage of refund based on the percentage of the semester that they completed. Compared to the current policy of interval percentage calculations, this results in a larger percentage of refund to the student.

3. Pilot Tuition and Mandatory Fee Strategy for eCore /Georgia GLOBE

Distance education continues to expand its visibility and importance in the academic marketplace. Many University System of Georgia institutions are developing or already delivering courses and programs through distance technologies. The Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education (“Georgia GLOBE”) initiative launched last year by the Board of Regents is breaking new ground in the development of innovative distance education programs. In particular, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the institutions are developing a general education program called eCore, which will be delivered by Georgia GLOBE. General education as the first two years of the baccalaureate education is critical as a link in the distance education network. All distance education brings challenges with respect to tuition and fee policies that are based on traditional modes of instructional delivery. Some
rethinking about the tuition and fee policy is necessary. The Georgia GLOBE initiative, including the eCore program, a collaborative effort involving a diverse set of institutions within the University System of Georgia that operate under different tuition and fee structures, is one example of how urgent the question of student pricing for distance education has become.

This informational report was presented by Dr. Richard A. Skinner, President and Chief Executive Officer of Georgia GLOBE. He explained a pilot approach to tuition and fees, which was approved by the Chancellor for the eCore program. The pilot will allow for the opportunity to review the effect of new and different pricing strategies on student demand for the first two years of baccalaureate-level education and how they relate to institutional cost prior to adoption of a permanent policy. At the conclusion of this pilot, which was proposed for a three-year period, a report summarizing findings will be presented to the Board of Regents with recommendations on future policy changes. The Southern Regional Education Board is also promoting a concept of “eTuition” to improve access to learning by reducing tuition as an interstate barrier. Comparisons with other state experiences will also be a part of the future report.
4. **Information Item: Report on Pooled Investment Funds by Trusco Capital Management**

The Committee heard a report on the performance of the University System’s pooled investment funds through the first quarter of 2000 and in prior years. These funds are managed by Trusco Capital Management, which was represented at this meeting by First Vice President James R. Dillon, Jr., CFA, Mr. Mark Snidow, and Mr. Charles Leonard. They reported that effective June 1, 2000, SunTrust will combine Trusco Capital Management, STI Capital Management, and Crestar Asset Management Company. The funds’ performance was not as good in the first quarter as it has been in previous years; however, it was in line with the overall market.

5. **Information Item: Report on Health Insurance Reserve Funds by Peachtree Asset Management**

The Committee heard a report on the performance of the University System’s health insurance reserve investments through the first quarter of 2000 and in prior years. These investments are managed by Peachtree Asset Management, which was represented at this meeting by Mr. Dennis Johnson, President and Chief Executive Officer. Mr. Johnson reported that the two objectives of these funds are to provide necessary liquidity and to produce investment return. As with the pooled investment funds, the performance of these funds was not as good as in previous years, but it was in line with the performance of the market in general.

6. **Information Item: Report on Third Quarter Fiscal Year 2000 Expenditures**

Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes presented to the Committee the third quarter financial report for the University System of Georgia for the period ending March 31, 2000, which is on file with the Office of Capital Resources. The report provides tables which compare actual and budgeted revenues and expenditures through March 31, 2000 for educational and general funds, auxiliary enterprise funds, and student activity funds. In addition, the report contains charts which compare March 2000 financial data with data of March 1999.
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The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, May 9, 2000 at approximately 3:20 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, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, and Glenn S. White. Chair Jones reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 9 of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Naming of Troy A. & Mozelle Cowart Building, Georgia Southern University**

   **Approved:** The Board approved the naming of the Southern Boosters Administration Office and Georgia Southern University Athletic Ticket Office Building at Paulson Stadium at Georgia Southern University the “Troy A. & Mozelle Cowart Building” in honor of Mr. Troy Allison Cowart and his wife Mrs. Mozelle Cowart.

   **Background:** The Administration Office and Georgia Southern University Athletic Ticket Office Building is approximately 3,000 square feet. The Board approved the project December 2, 1998. The building is scheduled for completion in May 2000.

   Biography of the life and contributions of Mr. Troy A. Cowart:

   - The Cowarts lived in Effington County until their deaths. Mrs. Cowart preceded Mr. Cowart in death. Mr. Cowart died in March 1999.

   - Mr. Cowart, as a youth, started his employment career as a dishwasher at Morrison’s Cafeteria and retired as a Vice President of Morrison’s restaurant chain.

   - Mr. Cowart executed three irrevocable Charitable Remainder Trusts, the proceeds of which will total in excess of $1,333,000, which makes Mr. Cowart the single largest contributor to the Southern Boosters and Georgia Southern University Athletics to date.

   - Proceeds of one of the Charitable Remainder Trusts from Mr. Cowart were designated to build this building in Mr. Cowart’s honor.

2. **Rental Agreement, 160 East Washington Street, Athens, Georgia, the University of Georgia**

   **Approved:** The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between David H. Poer Company, Landlord, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Tenant, covering 6,987 square feet of office space located at 160 E. Washington Street, Athens, Georgia for the period July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of $5,796.97 ($69,563.64 per year/$9.96 per square foot per year) with option to renew on a year-to-year basis for three consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing 3% for each option exercised for use of the University of Georgia Legal Aid and Defender Clinic.

   The terms of this rental agreement are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.
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2. **Rental Agreement, 160 East Washington Street, Athens, Georgia, the University of Georgia**
Background: The Board, on behalf of the University of Georgia, has leased this space since January 1994. The previous rental agreement expires June 30, 2000, and a renewal of the agreement is needed. The proposed rent rate is a 3% increase from the current rent amount. The rent is borne by Athens-Clarke County and Oconee County.

The Legal Aid and Defender Clinic occupies the space. Its primary function is to provide legal representation to indigent criminal defendants in Clarke and Oconee Counties. It also provides clinical education for second- and third-year law students.

No suitable space is available on campus. The office’s clientele need access to the office and parking which would not be available at any campus location. Equally important, the office is located directly across the street from the Municipal Court and two blocks from the County Courthouse. The clinic’s attorneys appear in the courts on a daily basis, and the convenience could not be duplicated by any location on campus. Additionally, confidentiality concerns are best met by an off-campus location that is independent and secure from access by other tenants.

Operating expenses are estimated at $27,400 per year for janitorial services, and utilities and are borne by Athens-Clarke County and Oconee County.

3. **Rental Agreement, 2970 Presidential Drive, Fairborn, Ohio, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Georgia Tech Research Institute, Landlord, and Board of Regents, Tenant, for 5,947 square feet of office space known as Wright Executive Center, 2970 Presidential Drive, Suites 310 and 320, Fairborn, Ohio for the period July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of $7,929.33 ($95,152 per year/$16 per square foot per year) with the option to renew on a year-to-year basis for four consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing by 2.5% to 4.2% per year for use of Georgia Tech Research Institute.

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

Background: Georgia Tech Research Institute provides direct support to programs in the Aeronautical Systems Center and Wright Laboratory in the vicinity of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio. Current work is concentrated in electronic warfare and radar. Georgia Tech Research Institute personnel support system engineering and technology assessment in a range of disciplines and provides technical liaison with the U.S. Air Force Program Office. Additionally, the Systems Technique Lab has been added.

This space will replace the existing 2,155 square feet of space in Dayton, Ohio rented for $16.53 per square foot, which is no longer adequate with the addition of the Systems Technique Lab. In addition, the proposed lease is at a reduced cost per square foot.

Rent, which includes all operating expenses, is fully funded by the grants underwriting this facility and programs.
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4. **Rental Agreement, 2015 Yale Boulevard, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Georgia Institute of Technology**
Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Homes by Marilynn, Inc., Landlord, and Board of Regents, Tenant, for 1,240 square feet of office space known as Suite B-1, 2015 Yale Boulevard, SE, Albuquerque, New Mexico for the period July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of $1,050 ($12,600 per year/$10.16 per square foot per year), with the option to renew on a year-to-year basis for five consecutive one-year periods at the same monthly rent amount, for the use of Georgia Tech Research Institute.

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

Background: Georgia Tech Research Institute provides research for projects with the Air Force Test and Evaluation Center and the Air Force Research Laboratory at Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico. This proposed rental agreement will provide space for these activities.

Currently, this research is being conducted on the Georgia Institute of Technology campus with personnel traveling as required to Kirtland Air Force Base.

Rent, which includes all operating expenses, is fully funded by the grants underwriting this facility and programs.

5. **Rental Agreement, Unit 4, College Plaza, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between James E. Chambers, Landlord, and Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 20,800 square feet of space at College Plaza, Statesboro, Georgia for the period beginning July 1, 2000 and ending June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of $7,000 ($84,000 per yr./$4.04 per sq. ft. per yr.) with option to renew on a year-to-year basis for four consecutive one-year periods beginning July 1, 2001 at the same monthly rent amount for use of Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”).

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

Background: The Board of Regents, on behalf of GSOU, has leased this space since May 1995. The last option of the previous rental agreement expires June 30, 2000. The proposed rent rate is a 1% increase from the current rent amount.

The facility is used by Business & Finance for the University Archives and by Academic Affairs for the Division of Continuing Education’s administrative offices and dance/instruction space and the University’s Puppetry Program’s materials and equipment storage.

The physical master plan for the university is presently being prepared. As part of that process, the university is considering options for a new facility and/or augmentation of existing facilities to reduce the need for leased properties.
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5. **Rental Agreement, Unit 4, College Plaza, Georgia Southern University** (Continued)
There is no currently available appropriate space on the GSOU campus that would accommodate these programs. In particular, the conditioned space in which the University Archives is located.

Operating expenses are estimated at $3,702.58 per month ($44,430.96 per yr./$2.14 per sq. ft. per yr.), including utilities, janitorial, maintenance, and pest control.

6. Acquisition (Gift) of 301 West Montgomery Street, Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board accepted title to property commonly referred to as the Hall property located adjacent to the campus at 301 West Montgomery Street, Milledgeville, Georgia, for the use and benefit of Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”).

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

Background: The Hall property was purchased by the Georgia College & State University Foundation, Inc. in October 1999 for $175,000. An appraisal of the property has been performed and indicates a value of $180,000.

The property consists of .94 acres; a single wood-frame house of approximately 3,760 gross square feet with a two-car enclosed garage, concrete driveway, and assorted sidewalks. The house is in generally good condition. Cosmetic upgrades required to permit the functional use of the house and achieve code compliance are estimated to cost $35,000 and will be accomplished utilizing institution funds. Maintenance and operating costs are estimated to be $6,000 per year for utilities, custodial, and general maintenance and will be funded by institutional maintenance and operations funds.

GCSU intends to use the property as a visitors’ center for prospective students and their parents, the institution’s teaching academy to promote excellence in teaching and learning, and geography and archeology work rooms.

A phase I environmental assessment, dated September 24, 1999, has been completed by Environmental Corporation of America, which indicates that the house was built in the 1880s and could be considered historically significant and reportedly has asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint.

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

7. Acquisition (Purchase) of Wray-Nicholson Property, the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 2.843 acres of land located at the northwest corner of Waddell and Hull Streets owned by Athens-Clarke County and known as the Wray-Nicholson property at a purchase price of $2,371,000 for use of the University of Georgia (“UGA”) using interest income from plant funds in fiscal year 2000.
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7. Acquisition (Purchase) of Wray-Nicholson Property, the University of Georgia (Continued)

The legal details involved with the acquisition of this property will be handled by the Office of the Attorney General.
Background: The above-referenced property is located at the northwest corner of Hull and Waddell Streets in downtown Athens, is adjacent to the UGA north campus on the south and east sides, is needed for the logical growth of the campus, and is consistent with UGA's master plan.

Three independent appraisals of the property (all currently vacant) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraiser</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashby R. Krouse, MAI, Augusta</td>
<td>3/15/00</td>
<td>$2,214,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Lee, MAI, Atlanta</td>
<td>3/20/00</td>
<td>$2,350,000</td>
<td>$2,371,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian J. Banister, Athens</td>
<td>2/29/00</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvements to the property include 298 South Hull Street (Wray-Nicholson house and gardens), a 9,945-square-foot two-story frame (plus basement) house built in 1845; 240 South Hull Street, a 2,700-square-foot two-story frame house built in the early 1900s; 290 South Hull Street, a 1671-square-foot one-story frame house built in the early 1900s; 150 Waddell Street, a 1,568-square-foot one-story frame house built in the early 1900s; and 154 Waddell Street, a 912-square-foot one-story frame house built in the early 1900s. The exteriors were all renovated in 1999. Wray-Nicholson was completely renovated in 1999.

The Wray-Nicholson house is in excellent condition. The other four houses are in poor condition. The interiors are in need of updated wiring, plumbing, floors, walls, ceilings, heating and air conditioning, and fixtures and will require abatement of some hazardous materials. UGA estimates that all four of these structures can be completely renovated for $608,000 to $760,000.

This acquisition is subject to the following covenants:

- The public will have access during normal business hours to the Wray-Nicholson House’s front parlor and central hallway located on the main level.

- The public will have access during normal business hours to the grounds and historic gardens that surround the Wray-Nicholson House.

- UGA will maintain the Wray-Nicholson House in its present shape and configuration and shall not add to or take away from the present structure of the house, which shall be maintained in good condition. These covenants do not apply to the other improvements on the property.

A phase I environmental assessment has been completed and indicates no significant problems.

Operating expenses for these properties are estimated to be $92,000.
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8. Conveyance of Property, the University of Georgia, Coastal Plain Experiment Station

Approved: The Board declared approximately 18.47 acres of land known as a portion of Carpenter Road (State Road 15) and a portion of Rigdon Aultman Road, Tifton, Tift County, Georgia no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia (“UGA”) 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 Tift County for the benefit of the University of Georgia Coastal Plain Experiment Station and the University System of Georgia.
The Board also conveyed title to approximately 18.47 acres of land known as Carpenter Road and Rigdon Aultman Road, Tifton, Tift County for the use and benefit of Tift County to provide asphalt paving and maintenance of the road and right-of-way, subject to a reversion of the property if it should cease being used as a road.

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

**Background:** The Board of Regents owns approximately 7,500 acres in Tift County. Along Carpenter Road north from Zion Hope Church Road for two miles, the Board of Regents owns the majority of the property on both sides of the existing dirt road. Rigdon Aultman Road is a cross road that the Board of Regents owns property on both sides of the existing dirt road.

Both Carpenter Road and Rigdon Aultman Road existed when UGA acquired property over 75 years ago, providing Tift County a prescriptive right to the road right-of-way at that time. This conveyance will permit this right-of-way to be of record.

As consideration for this property, Tift County will pave the dirt road and will maintain the road. Use of the road by UGA personnel would be greatly facilitated by paving the road. This will also provide improved access in inclement weather to research plot and related properties by the Coastal Plain Experiment Station University personnel.

9. **Authorization of Project, Center for Wildlife Education, Georgia Southern University**

**Approved:** The Board authorized expansion of the Raptor Center (the “Center”) with the addition of the “Center for Wildlife Education,” Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”), with a total project budget of $3,235,000 to be funded by GSOU through donated funds.

All funding will come from a grant and private sources. The Woodruff Foundation has committed a grant and additional donors have made substantial pledges. The present amount of the donations is approximately $2,220,000.

The facility will be located directly adjacent to the existing Center. The location will enhance and preserve the green space and wetlands between two large parking lots.
9. Authorization of Project, Center for Wildlife Education, Georgia Southern University

(Continued)

An environmental site evaluation indicates that there are no significant adverse environmental effects resulting from this project.

The expanded facility will be used by the Center’s staff, University Facility for Research, school groups, civic organizations, and others.

Major components of the expanded facility will include a low-impact path through the wetlands; aquatic station consisting of exhibits of critical natural water features, exhibits of native plants and animals, and a glass dam; hydrology pavilion consisting of an open-air classroom; ornithological center consisting of display and observation areas; passerine aviary consisting of a walkway for observing native birds; herpetarium consisting of an exhibit of southeastern U.S. reptiles and amphibians; and campgrounds to support overnight programs.

Loose equipment, specialty items, and telephone and data connections will be paid for by the private donations.

The annual cost of operating and maintaining the facility will be approximately $6,200. The funding source for these expenses will be GSOU’s operating budget.

Since the project was approved, the staff and GSOU will proceed with the selection of an architectural consultant.

It is anticipated that the expanded facility will be ready for use in September 2002.

10. Major Repairs and Rehabilitation Allocation Formula

The major repairs and rehabilitation (“MRR”) allocation formula is the method used to allocate the System’s overall MRR allocation to the campuses. Historically, the base factor included in the formula is the “building renewal allowance.” The principal factors in this component of the formula are size (gross square feet), age adjusted for renovations, and replacement cost.

Based upon the success of the MRR program, the preferred method for allocating funds next year (fiscal year July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001) is to continue the methodology used last year (i.e., size, replacement cost, and age) for the base amount of funds (approximately $50 million). However, new funds (approximately $1.6 million) would be distributed based on age. This methodology would provide an increase in MRR funds to all campuses and would give a slightly higher increase to those campuses with older buildings. The age factor will provide for a 25% increase when a building reaches 25 years, an additional 15% when the building reaches its fiftieth birthday, and a final additional 10% when a building is 100 or more years old.

It is important to note that MRR funds are used only to maintain or enhance existing facilities; property acquisitions and/or new construction projects are not eligible uses of MRR funds.
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11. Information Item: Five-Year Major Capital Outlay Planning Process
A five-year planning process was established in 1997 for major capital outlay projects. The major capital projects list developed last June has been reduced by six projects (20 projects remaining). The dollar value of the list is currently about $386 million. This list of project needs is based on the Principles for Capital Resources Allocation (the “Principles”), which are a part of the University System of Georgia’s Strategic Plan.

Major capital outlay proposals have been submitted by the campuses to the Central Office for consideration. Each of the projects submitted is being evaluated by staff based on the Principles and reviewed for consistency in accordance with the capital outlay and enrollment targets. Twelve to fifteen projects will be recommended for review by the Board at the June 2000 meeting. The president of each sponsoring campus will present the proposal. The Board will be asked to rank order these projects by vote. The top-ranked projects will then be added to the major capital outlay list of projects.

12. **Information Item: Master Plan, Georgia Perimeter College**

Georgia Perimeter College (“GPC”) and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the institution at its three campuses. President Jacquelyn M. Belcher and one of the consultants, Ms. Barbara Crum, Principal of the Atlanta architectural and planning consulting firm of Perkins & Will, presented the plan to the Committee. The consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the college’s mission statement, strategic plan, academic and support programs, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented five- and ten-year options for facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian circulation patterns, and campus beautification. Based on the consultants’ findings, GPC’s master plan recommendations included the following:

- Create appropriate future facilities for the growing academic needs, community outreach activities, and continuing education needs, and to accommodate future growth
- Renovate several existing buildings to provide modern teaching facilities
- Create a collegiate architectural image and improve campus identity
- Consider future property acquisition opportunities at the Clarkston campus and the Dunwoody campus
- Continue to preserve and enhance the campus environment and landscaping
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The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, May 9, 2000 at approximately 2:05 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Regent Allgood chaired the Committee in Chair Baranco’s absence. He reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 16 items, 14 of which required action. Additionally, 216 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 Major in Vascular Biology Under the Existing Doctor of Philosophy Degree. Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco to establish the major in vascular biology under the existing doctor of philosophy degree, effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: Vascular biology is an emerging field concerned with understanding vascular functions at the molecular, cellular, organ, and whole-body levels and with designing tools for diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of vascular diseases. The Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) proposed the development of this program in order to provide students with the didactic and clinical instruction to further biomedical research, to provide a mechanism for attracting highly qualified graduate students to the Vascular Biology Center, and to help MCG achieve its strategic goal of becoming a premier health research institution.

Need: Cardiovascular diseases are a major cause of death in the United States. Arteriosclerosis, hypertension, congestive heart failure, and vascular autoimmune disorders disable millions and require billions of dollars in health care costs. According to the American Heart Association, “59 million Americans are afflicted by cardiovascular problems or stroke, 5 million suffer congestive heart failure, yet the field has been depleted of investigators.” At the 1996 meeting of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (“NIH”), two needs were identified in the areas of research and training: 1) improving the integration of molecular approaches into physiological processes that address major health concerns and 2) enhancing the training opportunities for scientists to be knowledgeable in the field. This graduate program will address the scientific and societal need to have trained researchers to engage in the prevention and treatment of vascular diseases. Currently, only two other programs in the country provide instruction at the doctoral level in vascular biology. These programs are located at Vanderbilt University and the University of Virginia.

Objectives: The objective of the program is to provide high-quality trained students to assume leadership roles in diverse methods of biomedical research. The program will also assist MCG in moving toward its goal of becoming a premier health research institution. The existing Vascular Biology Center will be the focal point for research emphasis.
Curriculum: The program will be physically housed in the Vascular Biology Center and administered by the School of Graduate Studies. The curriculum for the doctoral track includes: 1) formal coursework taken during the first two years of study; 2) original and individualized research conducted under the direct supervision of a mentor and leading to a doctoral dissertation; and 3) comprehensive examinations and a final oral examination, as specified by the policies of the School of Graduate Studies. The core sequence courses include instruction in functional cell biology, functional systems biology, research methods in COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

1. Establishment of the Major in Vascular Biology Under the Existing Doctor of Philosophy Degree, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)

vascular biology, research statistics, a breadth course and seminar in vascular biology, scientific communication, ethics, and elective courses. The electives may consist of biochemistry, cell biology and development, physiology, and pharmacological sciences. The examinations are comprised of two parts. The first examination is a written test covering all aspects of the first part of the graduate curriculum. The second examination has written and oral components that test the understanding of the specialized field under study. A final oral defense of the dissertation will be presented before the student’s thesis advisory committee and outside readers.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student enrollment will be 2, 2, and 2. In addition, the program will be marketed through the Medical College’s M.D./Ph.D. program. Since it is anticipated that the program will attract M.D./Ph.D. program students, medical school courses may be substituted for graduate school courses where appropriate. Students pursuing the physician scientist track will also be participating concurrently in a clinical fellowship program or may be holders of an NIH Physician Scientist award.

Funding: The institution will initiate and maintain the program through institutional resources and internal redirection.

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 goals, as indicated in the proposal. In addition, the program will include ongoing mechanisms for self-assessment, which include the student course evaluation system and a system of exit interviews with graduating students. The program will monitor the career progress of graduates to determine what fraction of students complete appropriate postgraduate training and how many assume permanent research positions at recognized institutions. There will be a periodic assessment by the Vascular Biology Center national advisory board.

2. Establishment of the Master of Arts in Nonprofit Organizations, the University of
Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams to establish the master of arts in nonprofit organizations, effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: In September 1998, the Board of Regents formally approved the establishment of the Institute for Nonprofit Organizations (the “Institute”) at the University of Georgia (“UGA”). The Institute initiated several research projects and offered credit-bearing courses. Many of the courses that comprise the degree proposal, master of arts in nonprofit organizations, are already offered but have not been formally coordinated to complete a credit-bearing degree. The proposal was created to address the changes and employment needs of the nonprofit sector. Growth in the nonprofit sector is growing more rapidly than private businesses or government and is outpacing the rest of the economy.
2. Establishment of the Master of Arts in Nonprofit Organizations, the University of Georgia (Continued)

Need: Nonprofit organizations provide for the social, health, educational, religious, cultural, and other needs of Georgia’s citizenry. They work in partnership with government and businesses to ensure effective delivery of public services and are a vital part of the private sector. There are over 1.5 million nonprofit organizations in the country and many more internationally. The total amount spent in this sector in the United States during 1996 was estimated at over $644 billion, of which 37% was from public appropriations. Over 10 million people are employed in nonprofit organizations, while another 90 million volunteer to these organizations. Qualitative information was gathered from telephone surveys and interviews of employers in the nonprofit sector to determine the need for program graduates. These employers included the United Way of America, the American Cancer Society, the Arthritis Foundation, Southeastern Regional Council of Foundations, United Way of Atlanta, the National Center for Nonprofit Boards, Volunteers of America, Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta, and the BellSouth Foundation. Interviewees were asked to express their views on the likelihood that executives would be interested in hiring graduates of a program in nonprofit organizations. Twelve responses received from the sample of interviewees indicated that graduates of the program would be prepared to compete for positions in the nonprofit sector. This is primarily due to the culture of the nonprofit sector, applied fund-raising, managing volunteers, and other areas. General Jerry White, Chair of the Georgia Association of the United Way, indicated, “There are currently no baseline skills or educational curricula to address the problems, inconsistencies, and poor staff preparedness for meeting the criteria for positions in the nonprofit sector.”

Objectives: The objectives of this new graduate curriculum are in response to current trends in the U.S. economy and in public policy that require the need for more effective leaders, managers, and professional staff in the nation’s nonprofit sector. The primary objective of the master of arts in nonprofit organizations is to educate graduate students for careers in the nonprofit sector. The curriculum will provide essential knowledge of the scope, dynamics, and distinctiveness of the nonprofit sector; key skills in the administration and leadership of nonprofit organizations (e.g., working effectively with staff and volunteers, fund raising, program evaluation, and ethical judgment); and practice and application in actual nonprofit organizations through internship opportunities.

In addition, the new graduate degree program will allow UGA to respond to an emerging area of student interest, advance UGA’s strategic objectives of developing new interdisciplinary programs, and conduct research that focuses on community and State needs. It will assist in strengthening university linkages with community organizations for research, development, and technology transfer.

Curriculum: The 33-semester-hour curriculum includes an interdisciplinary set of courses on key aspects of nonprofit organizations, internships for field study and experience with selection
applications problems, supervised research projects, and electives for specialization. Core
courses include management of nonprofit organizations, the legal environment of nonprofit
corporations, managing and developing human resources, quantitative research and evaluation
methods, fund raising and development, and ethics of nonprofit management. Internships will
be developed in partnership with executives of nonprofit organizations in the north Georgia
region. The program was developed collaboratively between the College of Arts and Sciences
and the School of Social Work. It will be housed within the Institute for Nonprofit Organizations,
which was approved by the Board in September 1998.
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2. Establishment of the Master of Arts in Nonprofit Organizations, the University of
Georgia (Continued)

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student
enrollment will be 5, 8, and 11.

Funding: The institution will initiate and maintain the program through institutional resources
and internal redirection.

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 goals, as indicated in the proposal.

3. Establishment of the Bachelor of Science in Environmental Sciences, the University of
Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams to establish the
bachelor of science in environmental sciences (“B.S.E.S.”), effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: Environmental sciences are at the core of the University of Georgia (“UGA”) College
of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (the “College”). The Strategic Planning Committee
of the College in 1995 recommended that the institution develop a bachelor of science in
environmental sciences. Professionals with this training are needed to solve problems in
economic development and in ecological systems and to maintain and improve the
environment.

Need: At the federal, State, and local levels of government, numerous agencies have been
created to protect the environment. Extensive federal legislation, such as the Clean Air Act,
Safe Drinking Water Act, Clean Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act,
Superfund, and Superfund Amendments, has been passed in the 1970s and 1980s and
reaffirmed in the 1990s. This activity has resulted in a demand for environmentally trained
personnel in public and private sectors. The U. S. Public Health Service estimated that 121,000
professionals were needed nationally in various specialties in environmental science. Recent
publications of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges ("NASULGC") have identified water quality management and protection as one of the critical issues facing the nation and have called for the appropriation of resources to train professionals and conduct research in this area.

Within the State of Georgia, the category “environmental scientists” includes such position titles as Environmental Inspectors and Compliance, Agricultural and Food Scientists, Conservation Scientists, and some Biological Scientists. The Georgia Career Information System (www.gcic.peachnet.edu/gcismenu.html) lists 603 workers in these positions in the cities of Albany, Athens, Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus, Gainesville, Macon, Rome, Savannah, Valdosta, and Waycross. It is anticipated that this number will be 690 by 2006. By 2006, it is anticipated that 87 new positions will be available in these geographic areas. Thus, we can infer that 87 students of the first graduating class of the bachelor of science in environmental sciences could be hired as environmental scientists in Georgia.
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3. Establishment of the Bachelor of Science in Environmental Sciences, the University of Georgia

(Continued)

Figures from the Georgia Department of Labor projections to year 2006 indicate that 139 new farm managers will be needed by 2006, opportunities for which B.S.E.S. graduates will be qualified. In addition, B.S.E.S. majors will be ready to fill many of the 9,230 agricultural service jobs anticipated by the Georgia Department of Labor by year 2006.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 160, 200, and 300.

Funding: UGA will initiate and maintain the proposed program from institutional resources and internal redirection.

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 System Office to estimate the success of the program implementation and its achievement of enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness goals, as indicated in the proposal. In addition, individual course offerings will be assessed with end-of-term evaluations by students, peer review, and student interviews. Individual majors leading to the degree will provide annual assessment reports and annually refined plans to the College. In addition, the B.S.E.S. will be reviewed on a periodic basis as part of the university's program review system.

4. Establishment of the Major in Personal Financial Planning Under the Existing Master of Business Administration Degree, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton to establish the major in personal financial planning (“PFP”) under the existing master of business administration degree (“M.B.A.”), effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: Georgia State University (“GSU”) sought to offer the M.B.A. with a major in personal financial planning in order to increase advancement opportunities for graduates seeking employment in the financial services industry. GSU currently offers a major in personal financial planning under its master of science degree. However, offering the personal financial planning major under the existing M.B.A. degree offers students new options and a major emphasis in concert with a thorough understanding of business foundations. Personal financial managers strive to offer individuals, small businesses, and corporations smart financial decisions. Personal financial planner certification is an added bonus to the program’s grounding in business administration principles.
Need: GSU is one of only 11 institutions in the nation offering graduate training in personal financial planning. With the approval of this program, it will become the sixth institution to offer personal financial planning training in conjunction with a master of business administration degree program. Membership in the International Association of Financial Planners has increased 500% in less than two decades (Fortune, December 21, 1998, pp. 136-144). The financial services industry is restructuring itself around the concept of personal financial planning. The premier designation in this area is the Certified Financial Planner COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

4. Establishment of the Major in Personal Financial Planning Under the Existing Master of Business Administration Degree, Georgia State University (Continued)

(“CFP”) credential. There are over 35,000 individuals who hold the CFP nationwide. GSU’s master of science with a major in personal financial planning is currently registered with the CFP board as meeting the education requirement for the designation. Combining the registered personal financial planning major with the M.B.A. core allows an individual the opportunity to advance corporately in the financial services industry. At GSU, approximately 50% of the students who enrolled in the three sections of PFP 8400 (Introduction to Personal Financial Planning) offered during 1999-2000 were M.B.A. students as were approximately 10% of those taking the 1999-2000 upper-division graduate PFP classes. More than 20 inquires have been received by program faculty in spring 2000 alone from current and prospective M.B.A. students with an interest in a PFP major in the M.B.A. program. As a result of this and the previously noted growth in the personal financial planning industry, there is an existing and growing need for the PFP major in the M.B.A. program at GSU.

Objectives: The objectives of the major in personal financial planning include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) provide a degree program for students which prepares them for a career in personal financial planning and simultaneously satisfies the education requirement for the CFP designation and foundational courses in the M.B.A. program; 2) provide an increased supply of qualified practitioners for the profession of personal financial planning; and 3) capitalize on marketplace needs.

Curriculum: In addition to the breadth required of the M.B.A.’s foundational core, the 36-semester-hour program will require courses in personal financial planning, retirement planning, estate planning, valuation of financial assets, global portfolio management, life insurance, and income taxation

Projected Enrollment: The program is projected to attract traditional and non-traditional students. It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 25, 25, and 25.

Funding: The institution will initiate and maintain the program through institutional resources and internal redirection.
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 goals, as indicated in the proposal.

5. Establishment of the Major in Applied Biology Under the Existing Bachelor of Science Degree, Clayton College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of Acting President Michael F. Vollmer that Clayton College & State University (“CCSU”) be authorized to establish a major in applied biology under the existing bachelor of science degree, effective May 10, 2000.
Abstract: Applied biology is one of CCSU’s highest programming priorities. The major offers undergraduates opportunities to conduct supervised research and to obtain science-related positions in sales, marketing, management, regulation, and policy analysis. The applied emphasis of the major affords undergraduate research opportunities in companies that are driven by market needs for new biological products and the regulatory demands for environmental protection. In addition, the major has high societal demand; there is high student demand for biology; faculty retirements created the opportunity to reshape the Department of Natural Science; and the program will build on existing biology and related subject coursework.

Need: The decision to propose a baccalaureate degree in applied biology was based on community need and institutional resources. According to the Atlanta Business Chronicle (January 18, 1999), the Atlanta area is “fast becoming a biomedical breeding ground and its biomed/biotech industry has only just started to take off.” Georgia is investing in its ability to attract and retain biomedical industries with initiatives such as the Georgia Biotechnology Center and the Georgia Biomedical Partnership (a consortium of Atlanta area universities). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook (1999), “biological scientists who work in applied research or product development use knowledge provided by basic research to develop new drugs, increase crop yields, and protect and clean up the environment. They have less autonomy than basic researchers to choose the emphasis of their research, relying instead on market-driven directions based on a firm’s products and goals. Further, biological scientists doing applied research and product development in private industry may be required to express research plans and results to nonscientists who are in a position to veto or approve their ideas.” The applied emphasis of the biology program requires that students understand the business impact of their work. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that “more biological scientists will be needed to determine the environmental impact of industry and government actions to prevent or correct environmental problems.” Several firms have indicated that they support CCSU’s efforts to develop an applied biology program and would host student internships. Examples of these agencies include the following: Cryolife, Inc. (testing and product development of foods, drugs, agrochemicals, and polymers), Quest Diagnostics (medical laboratory products), Porex (bioproducts group), NAMSA (regulatory compliance and contract testing of pharmaceuticals and medical devices), NUTEK (biotechnology development), Premier Research Worldwide (contract field research) and Needle and Rosenberg, PC (patent law research).

Objectives: The major in applied biology is designed to prepare students who are prepared to enter the workforce as entry-level biologists with a solid foundation in biology and biotechnology. The program has been designed with the consultation of an advisory board to fit present and emerging needs of the State. The program will feature special emphasis on
regulatory affairs and compliance, biocomputing, biomedical applications, and quality assurance. Student outcomes associated with the program include the ability to employ the standard array of basic laboratory techniques used in biological research and industrial applications, the ability to effectively communicate scientific ideas, the technical expertise to use software to solve biological problems, and the knowledge to recognize and be conversant on critical issues concerning bioregulatory affairs. It is anticipated that graduates of the program will be prepared for science-related jobs in sales, marketing, and research management.
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5. Establishment of the Major in Applied Biology Under the Existing Bachelor of Science Degree. Clayton College & State University (Continued)

The CCSU program is unique in its applied emphasis on computer applications and regulatory affairs. The required applied biology seminar will bring industry experts to the classroom. The program provides for course electives in health sciences and management. Internships are a mandatory requirement of the program. Finally, CCSU will emphasize bioinformatics by requiring a biocomputing course and will include significant computer applications in most other coursework.

Curriculum: In addition to the 42 hours in Areas A through E, the 120-semester-hour degree program will be comprised of 18 hours in Area F, 22 biology core upper-division courses, 21 to 24 major and major related courses, 3 to 6 hours of internship/practicum, and 9 hours of free electives. The required optional courses and experiential learning experiences will be developed to give the major its applied focus. A standard three-credit-hour internship requires a minimum of 150 hours per semester of approved field experience with formalized observations and reports. Students will be required to take one internship and can choose another as an elective. The applied biology major will be able to choose from an array of options that might not be considered as appropriate in a more traditional program. This would include placements that are focused on managerial, administrative, or marketing tasks in biological or biomedical settings. For example, both traditional and applied biology students might help in the development of a new drug. However, the applied biology student might also be placed in the marketing or professional communications department as well as the development laboratory. In another example, an applied biology Environmental Protection Agency intern might use his/her biology knowledge to compile and interpret field reports to assist in preparation of a regulatory compliance case without actually collecting and analyzing laboratory samplings.

Projected Enrollment: The program is projected to attract traditional and non-traditional students. It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 115, 159 and 197.

Funding: The institution will initiate and maintain the program through institutional resources and internal redirection.
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 goals, as indicated in the proposal.

6. Establishment of the Caraustar Professorship of Purchasing and Operations Management, Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Betty L. Siegel that Kennesaw State University ("KSU") be authorized to establish the Caraustar Professorship of Purchasing and Operations Management, effective May 10, 2000.
6. Establishment of the Caraustar Professorship of Purchasing and Operations Management, Kennesaw State University (Continued)

Abstract: For several years, Caraustar Industries (“Caraustar”) of Austell, Georgia and its Chief Executive Officer, Tom Brown, have strongly supported KSU and the Michael J. Coles College of Business (the “College”). Understanding the significance related to the academic study of purchasing and operations management, Caraustar has contributed a total of $100,000 to establish the professorship within the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship in the College. The philanthropy of Caraustar is indicative of the importance placed upon building collaborative and beneficial relationships with friends of KSU. These collaborative endeavors provide additional opportunities to support scholarship and teaching.

7. Renaming of the Family Enterprise Center to the Cox Family Enterprise Center, Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Betty L. Siegel that Kennesaw State University (“KSU”) be authorized to rename the Family Enterprise Center to the Cox Family Enterprise Center, effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: KSU annually establishes a thematic approach to highlighting the institutional mission to friends of the university and corporate industrial and business leaders. As a result, collaborations have been developed with individual friends of the university, alumni, foundations, and corporations. A significant collaboration is the relationship forged between the College and its Family Enterprise Center with Cox Enterprises, a 100-year-old multinational media corporation headquartered in Atlanta.

Because of its strong advocacy for KSU’s family business initiatives, Cox Enterprises recently made an investment in the academic study of family business with a $400,000 gift to the Family Enterprise Center, originally established in 1987. Corporate officials have indicated a desire to continue financial support up to $1 million over the next several years. The gift signifies KSU’s dedication to enhancing positive relationships with partners in the business community.

8. Establishment of the Dr. Walter L. Shepeard Clinical Pathology Chair, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco to establish the Dr. Walter L. Shepeard Clinical Pathology Chair, effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: The Medical College of Georgia Foundation (the “Foundation”) has on deposit $587,814 in an endowment for the Dr. Walter L. Shepeard Clinical Pathology Chair. Funds for this chair come from two sources: 1) a contribution of $220,000 from the Physicians Practice Group Foundation and 2) $146,000 from the Foundation institutional support fund, which has come from donations by corporations and banks. This endowment will be used to support a
faculty member in the Department of Pathology at the Medical College of Georgia.
8. Establishment of the Dr. Walter L. Shepeard Clinical Pathology Chair, Medical College of Georgia

(Continued)

**Biographical Sketch:** Dr. Shepeard joined the faculty in 1948 as Director of Clinical Pathology at University Hospital. He transferred to full-time pathology faculty status in 1955 and became Director of Clinical Pathology in the Eugene Talmadge Memorial Hospital in 1956. He retired and joined the emeritus faculty in 1971 and continued to teach until his death in 1978. He is most widely recognized by his contributions in the area of blood banking. The blood bank in Augusta has been named in his memory as the Shepeard Community Blood Center.

9. Establishment of the Edgar R. Pund, M.D. Distinguished Chair in Pathology, Medical College of Georgia

**Approved:** The Board approve the request of President Francis J. Tedesco to establish the Edgar R. Pund, M.D. Distinguished Chair in Pathology, effective May 10, 2000.

**Abstract:** The Medical College of Georgia Foundation (the “Foundation”) has on deposit $1,032,382 in an endowment for the Edgar R. Pund, M.D. Distinguished Chair in Pathology. Funds for this chair come from three sources: 1) funds totaling $874,452 from the Foundation account named Edgar R. Pund, M.D. Chair in Pathology, 2) a contribution of $75,330 from the Physicians Practice Group Foundation, and 3) $50,000 from the Foundation institutional support fund, which has come from donations by corporations and banks. This endowment will be used to support a faculty member in the Department of Pathology at the Medical College of Georgia.

**Biographical Sketch:** Dr. Edgar R. Pund was a 1918 graduate of the Medical College of Georgia and served on the faculty from 1921 through 1958. He was Chair of Pathology from 1931 to 1953 and was President of the Medical College of Georgia from 1953 to 1958.

10. Establishment of an Intellectual Property Policy, Valdosta State University

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Hugh C. Bailey that Valdosta State University (“VSU”) be authorized to establish an intellectual property policy, effective May 10, 2000.

**Abstract:** According to Board Policy Section 603.04, Institutional Procedures, “Each institution of the System is required to develop policies and procedures for the administration of an institutional Intellectual Property Policy.” In an effort to meet this requirement and increase the development of academic, intellectual products, VSU sought approval for a policy that covers the activities of faculty, students, and staff. According to VSU’s policy, “The University has a right to ownership of any intellectual property in which it has an interest. An interest is established when the intellectual property results from a specific assignment or when the
institution or system provided specific resources to the development of the intellectual property. Assignment, supervision or resource support that is customary for research and instructional purposes does not establish an interest by the University or System in resultant intellectual property. The policy covers scholarly/aesthetic work, individual effort, commissioned projects, works developed and acquired by assignment, sponsored supported efforts, University-assigned efforts, University assisted individual effort, individual effort, consulting, and research notes, data reports and notebooks. The following table represents the distribution of intellectual property net revenue:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Of</th>
<th>Originator’s</th>
<th>Originator’s</th>
<th>Faculty Research Fund</th>
<th>Administration (VP for Academic Affairs will Distribute)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Sponsor Support</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Assigned</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Assisted</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Effort</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Revised Institutional Statutes, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to implement its revised institutional statutes, effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: The revisions were carefully reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs and were found to be consistent with the current organization and administrative structure at GIT. The changes to the statutes were requested to bring it into compliance with changes to nomenclature that occurred with the implementation of the early semester calendar. The wording changes perform the following general functions: 1) rewrite the definition of “100% full-time employment” to a form in terms of semesters (e.g., this is in reference to the rules for counting years of service for promotion and tenure); 2) change the rules for frequency of meetings of the major faculty bodies to reflect the semester schedule; where meetings were previously held once a quarter, the statutes now say once a semester; (3) redefine the detailed schedule for the conduct of elections to faculty bodies to state these in
terms of the semester schedule; (4) make minor changes to procedures of standing committees to state that periods of service start at the fall semester rather than at the fall quarter.

A copy of the revised statutes is on file in the Office of Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

12. Establishment of the Institute for Leadership Advancement in Business Organizations, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish the Institute for Leadership Advancement in Business Organizations (the "Institute"), effective May 10, 2000.
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12. Establishment of the Institute for Leadership Advancement in Business Organizations, University of Georgia (Continued)

Abstract: Businesses today face challenges that are accelerated by technological change, the pressure to compete in a global market, and the complexity of a networked environment. To compete successfully in this environment, firms need leaders who can satisfy daily demands while building strategic plans for the future. As a result, several business leaders approached Dean P. George Benson of the Terry College of Business (the “College”) in fall 1998 to discuss the development of a leadership program that would serve a broad constituency. Students of the College also expressed their requests to have a more formal leadership program. The Institute will offer five programs: undergraduate leadership scholars program, open-enrollment undergraduate leadership program, master of business administration (“M.B.A.”) leadership program, executive leadership program, and research consortium.

Rationale, Program and Research Details: The College proposed the establishment of the Institute. The Institute’s mission consists of 1) assessment of leadership talent and potential, 2) development of leaders, and 3) research into the foundations of leadership. The assessment component will offer personal evaluations that allow individuals to understand their leadership strengths and weaknesses. The development component will provide educational opportunities for individuals to learn leadership concepts, skills, and behaviors that enhance personal and organizational effectiveness. The research component of the Institute will support a program of research that systematically examines effective leadership behaviors and practices at the individual, group, and organizational levels.

The undergraduate leadership scholars program will supplement the education of high-achieving undergraduate students in the College by providing a series of experiences that assess and develop their leadership skills. A select number of juniors will be admitted into the program based on a variety of criteria, including academic record and demonstrated leadership in university and community activities. Internships and organizational activities will be provided to improve students’ leadership skills. Specialized courses in leadership will also be offered.

The open-enrollment undergraduate leadership program will provide leadership assessment and development opportunities to all College undergraduates. It is projected that these activities will help students assume leadership roles during college and after graduation. A College Executive Speaker Series will invite at least two distinguished lecturers to campus each semester to expose students to leaders from different fields.

The M.B.A. leadership program was developed to offer assessments of leadership skills and behaviors to further develop these skills in College M.B.A. students. The M.B.A. curriculum is designed to develop a variety of leadership skills. M.B.A. students are required to take the following leadership courses: a team-based ropes course, conflict management and negotiation, the leader as a facilitator, strategic planning, leadership skills, and ethics. They can also take electives in topics such as organizational consulting and entrepreneurship.
The executive leadership program will provide continuing assessment and developmental educational opportunities to managers to enhance their leadership skills. Customized and open-enrollment classes will be offered. The program will be developed in conjunction with the associate dean for executive education programs within the College.
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12. Establishment of the Institute for Leadership Advancement in Business Organizations, University of Georgia (Continued)

The research consortium will involve investigation of the effective practices of individual, group, and organizational leaders. The purpose is to promote and disseminate research on effective leadership practices. Activities of the research consortium include faculty grants for leadership research, publication of a biannual newsletter for corporate partners, leadership roundtables of corporate partners to discuss current leadership topics, ongoing research, and the consortium’s activities.

13. Termination of Majors and Degrees, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton to terminate several deactivated majors and degrees, effective May 10, 2000.

Abstract: In accordance with Board Policy 2.03.03, a program may be deactivated for a period not to exceed two academic years. Georgia State University (“GSU”) received permission to deactivate the following academic programs and majors fall 1998. GSU now requests terminations for the following degree programs:

Bachelor of science degree with a major in dance
Master of education degree with a major in education of students with hearing impairments
Master of science degree with a major in recreation
Education specialist degree (“Ed.S.”) with a major in art education
Ed.S. with a major in library media technology
Ed.S. with a major in mathematics education
Ed.S. with a major in middle childhood education
Ed.S. with a major in music education
Ed.S. with a major pastoral counseling
Ed.S. with a major in reading instruction
Ed.S. with a major in science education
Ed.S. with a major in social studies education
Doctor of philosophy degree (“Ph.D.”) with a major in curriculum development and instructional processes
Ph.D. with a major in education administration and supervision
Ph.D. with a major in higher education
Ph.D. with a major in language and literacy education
Ph.D. with a major in library media technology
Ph.D. with a major in mathematics education
Ph.D. with a major in research, measurements, and statistics
Ph.D. with a major in science education
Ph.D. with a major in social foundations of education
Ph.D. with a major in social studies education
Ph.D. with a major in vocational education
13. Termination of Majors and Degrees, Georgia State University  

(Continued)

The program terminations will not have an adverse impact on students or faculty members. The programs were first deactivated to ensure that students already majoring in the programs would be given ample notification and time to graduate or be accommodated through a restructured program. Faculty members were reassigned to similar or comparable roles. These program terminations are requested in order to increase efficiency and effectiveness, provide simplicity of program design, and focus professional studies on central areas of concern to all students. Programs outside of the College of Education were deactivated and are now requested for termination as a result of strategic planning processes and institutional self-studies. Within the College of Education, the doctoral programs have been restructured to emphasize foundational issues such that students will benefit from common seminars, cross content dialogue, shared research interests, and a stronger departmental core. Several of the programs have similar templates with specialized concentration areas. By combining areas as concentrations, faculty members feel that they can better serve students and manage resources.

14. 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>System Institutions by Type</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Research Universities Appointments</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Regional Universities Appointments</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany State University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton College &amp; State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Continued)

Kennesaw State University 15
North Georgia College & State University 2
Savannah State University 0
Southern Polytechnic State University 0
State University of West Georgia 14

Total State Universities Appointments 41

Dalton State College 2
Macon State College 3

Total State Colleges Appointments 5

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College 0
Atlanta Metropolitan College 0
Bainbridge College 0
Coastal Georgia Community College 0
Darton College 0
East Georgia College 0
Floyd College 0
Gainesville College 0
Georgia Perimeter College 0
Gordon College 4
Middle Georgia College 0
South Georgia College 0
Waycross College 0

Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments 4

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS 121

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:


LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:
CHERVENAK, ANN. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.
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(Continued)

ESTEP, DONALD J.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 11, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

MUZZY, JOHN D.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

NESBITT, KATE: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.


SPINGARN, JONATHAN E.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

YALAMANCHILI, SUDHAKAR: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:


PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREEs:


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


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


**MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA**

**EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:**

BRANSOME, EDWIN D., JR.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, PHYSIOLOGY AND SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE AND GRADUATE STUDIES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION
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  EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.
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(Continued)


**TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:**


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


**UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

**EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:**
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(Continued)


LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

CORWIN, SHANE A.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

SPURGEON, EDWARD D.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:


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


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


GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:


PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:
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VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:
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   (Continued)


   UHLIR, RICHARD F.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION DISORDERS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.


PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:


ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

   TOWNSEND, DABNEY W.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM JULY 1, 2000 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:
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14. Administrative/Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:


PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:


KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:


STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:


GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:


GORDON COLLEGE

PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF SYSTEM RETIREES:

15. **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>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>15, 7R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>6, 4R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitals and Clinics</td>
<td>1, 2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCG Research Institute</td>
<td>3, 4R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Communication Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foods and Nutrition</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1, 3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation and Leisure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family &amp; Consumer Sci.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Kinesiology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>9, 3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of West Georgia</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Georgia College</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4, 1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = Renewal
16. **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>Assess refugee needs</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Human Resources</td>
<td>1/10/00 - 4/30/00</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study hindrances to timely placement of foster children in Georgia and South Carolina</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>2/1/00 - 2/28/01</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study advanced market risk for corn growers</td>
<td>Georgia Commodity Comm. for Corn</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study yield performance of herbicide-resistant corn hybrids in Georgia</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate diatomaceous earth as insect suppressant</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical support for extension corn improvement team</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$35,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study high residue conservation tillage system for corn</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare corn diagnostic guide for Georgia</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct corn extension education support for 1999</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study effects of corn planting date and hybrids on yield</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study performance of twin-row planting of corn</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training for post- harvest storage grain fumigation</td>
<td>Georgia Commodity Comm. for Corn</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study peach insect IPM</td>
<td>Georgia Commodity Comm. for Peaches</td>
<td>1/1/00 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study peach chilling and market watch studies</td>
<td>“ ” “ ” “</td>
<td>7/1/00 - 6/30/01</td>
<td>$7,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct “Hands On” program</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of</td>
<td>9/30/99 - 9/29/00</td>
<td>$27,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>Start Date - End Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide income for Codes 2000</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs</td>
<td>10/06-99</td>
<td>$9,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct “Better Home Town” program</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Leadership Institute 2000</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Corrections</td>
<td>3/27/00 - 6/15/00</td>
<td>$25,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop statewide protocol for forensic investigation of child abuse</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Human Resources</td>
<td>3/1/00 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$111,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training program on nutrition</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>12/1/98 - 1/31/01</td>
<td>$19,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct training institute</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>3/1/00 - 1/31/01</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct local government workshops 2000</td>
<td>Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
<td>7/1/99 - 6/30/00</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate training on workplace violence</td>
<td>Georgia Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>2/15/00 - 4/30/00</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct energy conservation programs for local officials</td>
<td>Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority</td>
<td>2/1/00 - 12/31/00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide income for FMT 2000</td>
<td>Georgia Office of Planning and Budget</td>
<td>3/1/00</td>
<td>$5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support for economic development</td>
<td>Northeast Georgia Regional Development Center</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/30/00</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide nutrition education</td>
<td>North Georgia Regional Development Center</td>
<td>10/1/99 - 9/28/00</td>
<td>$28,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate new technology into English curriculum</td>
<td>Georgia Humanities Council</td>
<td>4/15/00 - 10/15/00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia Southern University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Start Date - End Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT - MAY** $928,434  
**TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 TO DATE** $24,629,665  
**TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99 - TO MAY** $30,598,079  
**TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99** $31,358,479
COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, May 9, 2000 at approximately 3:00 p.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor’s Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Elridge W. McMillan, Vice Chair Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., 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; two were continued, and six were denied. The Committee also recommended for approval a revision to the Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 206. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

   a. In the matter of Kent Ellington at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning his suspension from Dental School, the application for review was continued.

   b. In the matter of Vinson Hill at Albany State University, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was denied.

   c. In the matter of Francis Ryan at the University of Georgia, concerning waiving foreign language requirements, the application for review was denied.

   d. In the matter of Jeremy Bingham at Gordon College, concerning his expulsion from the dormitory, the application for review was denied.

   e. In the matter of Rhonda Stowe at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning termination of her employment, the application for review was denied.

   f. In the matter of Barbara Love at the University of Georgia, concerning denial of admission to the Veterinary School, the application for review was continued.

   g. In the matter of Jude Sommerfeld at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning a salary grievance, the application for review was denied.

   h. In the matter of William Day at Gordon College, concerning a request to be absent from registration, the application for review was denied.

16. Approval of Revision to Policy Manual Regarding Presidents’ Meetings

Approved: The Board approved the following revision of the Policy Manual:

Section 206 of the Board’s Policy Manual refers to the old “University System Advisory Council,” which is essentially the same gathering as the current “Presidents’ Meeting” but was chaired by the former Executive Vice Chancellor. Because the position of Executive Vice Chancellor was eliminated several years ago by the Board’s reorganization, Section 206 should be amended to reflect that this meeting is simply one of the Chancellor and the presidents.
2. Approval of Revision to Policy Manual Regarding Presidents’ Meetings (Continued)

206 UNIVERSITY SYSTEM ADVISORY COUNCIL: PRESIDENTS’ MEETINGS

There shall be a University System Advisory Council with membership composed of the Chancellor and the presidents of the institutions of the University System of Georgia. This Council shall have power When directed by the Chancellor, the presidents of the institutions of the University System of Georgia shall convene in order to make recommendations to the Chancellor and through him the Chancellor to the Board of Regents regarding all educational and administrative matters of concern to the University System as a whole.
2000 CHANCELLOR’S AWARD FOR COLLABORATIVE EXCELLENCE

After the Committee reports, Vice Chair Coleman asked the Chancellor to present the 2000 Chancellor’s Award for Collaborative Excellence. He explained that this award is presented each year to a person or unit in the University System in recognition of outstanding efforts to foster collaboration and cooperation. The $1,000 award is presented by the University System of Georgia Foundation from funds donated by Chancellor and Mrs. Portch. This was the sixth annual award.

Chancellor Portch thanked Vice Chair Coleman. He explained that a committee makes the selection of the winner from nominations from the institutions and that this award was established to support collaborative efforts. Previous winners include Bill Ray of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) for his efforts to help Albany State University recover from the floods; Georgia Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”); Columbus State University’s Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP”); Dr. Gary B. Schuster, Dean of the College of Sciences and Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry at GIT, for establishing the faculty development program for System science, mathematics, and computing faculty; and the European Union Studies Certificate Program. This year, the committee, which was chaired by Dr. Richard Sutton, Director for International Programs & Services, had a difficult time selecting a winner among the superb nominees. Among the nominees were the Georgia Application and Electronic Advisement System (“GA EASY”) Web site, the Arts-After-School Program at Georgia College & State University, and a foreign language teaching collaborative among South Georgia colleges, which is led by Darton College. In the end, the Committee selected an individual who created an extraordinary program at Clayton College & State University (“CCSU”). The recipient of this year’s award is Mr. Anthonio P. Finger, Program Coordinator for Information Technology. He was in attendance at this meeting with Interim President Michael F. Vollmer. Mr. Finger has trained capable students to train faculty on technology. The program is called Technology-Enhanced Academic Mentors (“TEAM”). However, the program does not just stop at the campus. The students work with the neighboring Stockbridge schools, other metro Atlanta colleges, and even some initial corporate contacts. Mr. Finger selects these students and mentors them individually, and he has been the brainchild behind some very good innovation. The nomination from CCSU said that Mr. Finger has attained legendary status beyond his years; he has incredible enthusiasm for problem solving, a deep work ethic, and a passion for what he is doing; he can communicate complex technical information in ways that laymen can understand; and “Antonio walks on water, helping to keep an interim president from drowning.” Chancellor Portch commented that Mr. Finger is exactly the kind of person this award was created to honor, a person who has ideas, goes out and makes them work, and then extends them beyond his immediate sphere to be a benefit to the institution, the community, the Regents, student, faculty, and others. He then asked Mr. Finger to step up and receive the award.

Mr. Finger accepted the award on behalf of his “entire Clayton family.” He said that he could not have done anything without the students, faculty, staff, and Vice President for Operations, Planning, and Budget Patrick J. O’Hare. Mr. Finger expects that the program will expand into more middle schools throughout the area and hopefully someday throughout Georgia.

The Chancellor instructed Mr. Finger that the award check must be spent frivolously.

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT TO THE BOARD
After his presentation of the 2000 Chancellor’s Award for Collaborative Excellence, Chancellor Portch gave his report to the Board, which was as follows:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I’ve been thinking a lot lately about the word passages. It’s a word rather recently coined to describe new phases of life that we all experience at one point or another. It is an appropriate word at this time in the academic year. This is, after all, the season to do so, as many of our students celebrate commencements with their parents, spouses, and friends. I still marvel at the range of emotions displayed on these occasions. And I want to thank our graduates for entrusting their education to us, our faculty for the commitment they have shown to these graduating seniors, and our staff who have served them so well.

And, yes, John Fuchko will be graduating this summer. Proving that justice has no bounds, he will be going to work for the State Auditor as well as attending graduate school. We wish him the best and urge that his assignments in the State Auditor’s office be all at DTAE (Department of Technical and Adult Education) institutions!

Another person in passage will be Jerry Segers. After 32 years of service to the University System, both at Tech (Georgia Institute of Technology) and in OIIT (Office of Information and Instructional Technology), Jerry will be retiring at the end of the month. He was the architect of Georgia Tech’s campus network and the visionary behind the development of PeachNet, the first Internet protocol based network in Georgia and one of the first in the nation. Actually, he, not Al Gore, invented the Internet! This is a very smart guy who has the added talent of being able to put technology into plain English. We thank him for his service.

We also thank another person in passage, Dr. Art Dunning (Senior Vice Chancellor of Human and External Resources). Art has been with me from my first day in Georgia. Always loyal, always insightful, always thoughtful, he has served this System extremely well. He will continue to do so as Vice President for Public Service and Outreach at the University of Georgia. In that role, he will have multiple responsibilities on campus and throughout the State. He will be a fine ambassador for the University of Georgia and will thrive on being back on a campus.

Now the master of passages, Mike Vollmer, will soon be here to serve in the Interim Senior Vice Chancellor role. In just a short three years in the System, Mike has been an interim president twice and a permanent fiscal officer once — if serving for five months can be called “permanent”! Zell Miller had the same problem with Mike — his competence was so complete he was asked to start up the HOPE Scholarship Program, launch the Pre-K Program, and fix law enforcement in the State! We will welcome him.
Welcoming is always easier than farewells. This one is particular hard for me... and I'm not quite sure why! For it’s Tom Coleman (Vice Chair). He’s Irish. I’m English. As you know, the relationship between the English and the Irish is built on trust and understanding. We don’t trust them, and they don’t understand us! But I do trust Tom Coleman. And I
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think I understand him. He’s what they had in mind when the phrase “public servant” was invented. We will miss his strength of character and purpose on this Board. And I will miss him as a friend. But the State and the Governor will be well served by him in his new role as DOT (Department of Transportation) Commissioner.

One of Tom’s closest friends, Joe Kennedy, had his final passage remembered by Georgia Southern on April 27. The Joseph E. Kennedy Residential Complex was dedicated, in front of a standing-room-only crowd, by Lieutenant Governor Taylor and Lalah Kennedy. Joe passed away in June 1997 just a few short months after being appointed to the Board of Regents. This was a fitting remembrance for a great supporter of public education.

So we came full cycle. Our responsibility is to ensure that we make possible the best passages for our students.

Now passages are transitions. And as a teacher of writing, I celebrate good transitions. So I have to be honest and admit that this next, and fortunately last, transition is particularly lame — even for me. As a distinguished academic, I search high and low for new intellectual developments. My good friends at Georgia Power, Bill Archer and Ben Harris, know that, so they sent me this latest technological marvel: “Big Mouth Billy Bass.” Let him, for a moment, “Take You to the River” and “Be Happy.”

Some of you may think I’m unashamedly pandering to low taste. Not at all! Can you imagine, though, the world our young people are passing into. As Governor Barnes told the Yamacraw [Mission] faculty, this is a new age; technology is revolutionizing business education, and government — to the extent that a single hacker in a remote corner of the world can send tremors from the Houses of Parliament to the Hong Kong Stock Exchange and everywhere in between. Technology is also leading to a singing, dancing, realistic looking fish for under $20!

Ah, may this too pass.

Mr. Chairman this, none-too-soon, concludes my report!
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Vice Chair Coleman 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 at this meeting, the Board would again hear updates from Mr. James H. Roth, Head of the Higher Education Division of Arthur Andersen LLP (“Andersen”). Andersen has been contracted to work on the benchmarking/management review with Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. and MGT of America. Andersen is also working on the technology master planning initiative. Initial findings of these initiatives will be presented at the June 2000 meeting.

Mr. Roth greeted the Board. He reported that the consultants were nearing the time when they would be creating a draft report on each project. Most of their efforts would be complete in three to four weeks. He reminded the Regents that the objective of the benchmarking analysis is to identify appropriate national peer and aspirational comparator institutions for each of the four research institutions, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University, Medical College of Georgia, and the University of Georgia (“UGA”), and to perform a sectorwide analysis for the remaining institutions. In essence, the consultants are trying to determine comparable benchmarks for a variety of input, output, and performance sources. The purposes of the analysis are to develop a framework by which University System institutions can measure their performance with their comparators, to identify appropriate strategic indicators based on this framework to assess the performance of System institutions relative to the comparators, and to collect the necessary data related to these indicators, present key findings, and identify potential strengths and weaknesses of System institutions relative to the comparators. He noted that benchmarking data for colleges and universities is historically difficult to obtain. The first step in the process is to develop the comparator group selection; the second step is to identify the specific performance indicators that will be used as a basis for evaluating the institutions; the third step is the data collection process; and the fourth step is the data analysis and report preparation. The first two steps have been completed and approved by the project steering committee. Mr. Roth stressed that a great deal of time was spent on the comparator group selection. There are many factors that go into this step, but it is necessarily painstaking to ensure that the data are valid. At this point, the consultants were engaged in step three, the data collection process, and should be finished by mid-May. Then, they will begin the analysis, and the final report should be completed in time for the June Board meeting. The data collection process relies on some information that is already available from a variety of national databases and some that must be obtained directly from the peer institutions. The consultants have had a relatively good response rate, but the difficult part will be evaluating the data they receive.

Mr. Roth explained that for the last three months, the consultants had been performing a management review of the business practices of the Central Office and four selected institutions: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Kennesaw State University, Macon State College, and UGA. The objective of the review is to begin to identify areas where there might be greater efficiencies and effectiveness in the way management operations are performing. The first part of the process was conducting a diagnostic review of each of the institutions and the Central Office by meeting with business function leaders and reviewing applicable documentation to identify processes for a more detailed review during the second phase of the project. Mr. Roth reported that the consultants visited the campuses and the Central Office, met with over 130 individuals, and conducted 10 focus groups of “customers” of business services, including students, faculty, and staff. As of this meeting, the diagnostic reviews have been completed. Based on the visits and discussions, the consultants have selected five areas they felt were most appropriate for further analysis, STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE” which were submitted to the project steering committee. Those areas are the purchasing cycle, budget
process, facilities design and construction, warehouse operation and materials requisition within the Physical Plant Department at UGA, and business services. Evaluation of the purchasing cycle includes evaluating the processes, policies, and opportunities for streamlining processes; assessing the extent to which online procurement is capable of being used; and evaluating alternate purchasing venues. Mr. Roth remarked that purchasing is one of the areas that stands to benefit greatly from technology and combining processes. It is relatively common to find that institutions are not working together to take advantage of their potential purchasing power. Evaluation of the budget process involves the timing, communication, and strategy related to the process. This is an area that many institutions view as a troubled area, but in many cases, the budgeting process can have a significant impact on the overall economics of the institution as a whole. In examining the facilities design and construction, the consultants will evaluate the architect selection and management process, change order management, and approval. The objective is to see whether there are opportunities for savings. Also, the consultants are trying to find opportunities to extrapolate what they have seen at the selected institutions to apply them on a broader scale to the other institutions. In looking at the warehouse operation, specifically at UGA, there are some potential inventory management opportunities, and the consultants will also consider the service assessment to determine the best way to manage the operation. Finally, the consultants will be examining the business services systems as well as the financial systems and subsystems that interconnect with them. The consultants are nearing the completion of their field work, and they will have a final report around mid-June. Mr. Roth asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Chair Leebern asked whether the consultants have been able to find comparator institutions.

Mr. Roth responded that the objective is to find groups of institutions that have similar characteristics. Then, the consultants rank them to assess which particular institutions are better comparators.

Regent NeSmith asked, with regard to the issue of construction, whether the consultants are looking at the process from the beginning through completion.

Mr. Roth responded that this was likely the case. The consultants are reviewing the process as it relates to the financial aspects of it as opposed to which projects are selected.

Chair Leebern asked Mr. Roth to continue with his update on the technology master planning initiative.

Mr. Roth explained that the second project for which Andersen was contracted is the technology master planning initiative. The objective of the project is to develop a master plan for technology for the System. This includes identifying the services best provided by the System, identifying the appropriate technical architecture at the System level, identifying the appropriate Office of Information and Instructional Technology (“OIIT”) organizational structure, and creating a master planning template for use at the campus level. The objective of the template is to maximize the chances that the institutions will perform the master planning process in a comparable fashion. Where there is lack of consistency in the process, there will be inefficiencies in the System. The template will provide a common format for evaluating and establishing institutions’ own priorities and objectives. In working on this project, the consultants met with more than 85 representatives, including the Chancellor, the project steering committee, 17 OIIT managers, Central Office representatives, campus representatives, and technology venders. They shared their **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

preliminary findings with OIIT management, the Administrative Committee for Information Technology (“ACIT”), and the project steering committee. They prioritized and shared their preliminary recommendations with OIIT management, ACIT, and the project steering committee. Mr.
Roth cautioned that the consultants are not yet finished with their analysis, but they hope to have their report completed by June 1. Because there are many complexities and sensitivities associated with this topic, the consultants are proceeding with caution. However, there are some preliminary findings they are comfortable sharing.

Regent Baranco asked about ACIT and OIIT.

Dr. Sethna explained that ACIT includes campus-based representatives who deal with technology and some key Central Office personnel. ACIT meets frequently to discuss technology matters across the System. OIIT is the Central Office technology operations.

Mr. Roth added that OIIT provides guidance to the rest of the System on technology issues and provides specific services to some of the institutions. This is particularly important for the University System because one of the fundamental questions is whether it is better to centralize or decentralize technology functions. When there are 34 institutions with different capabilities, objectives, and needs, the question remains to what extent technology operations should be centralized. He remarked that in higher education, the complexities of this relationship are compounded because of the tendency to want to have autonomy at all academic institutions.

Mr. Roth then returned his attention to the key findings. He noted that in the 1980s when PeachNet was developed, it launched the System as a technical leader in the State and the nation. It has been and remains a major strategic asset to the System, and it is critical to the overall mission of the System. One of the key findings is that in the past two years, PeachNet’s ability to meet the rising demands of the System have decreased due to many factors. One factor is rapidly rising Internet demand, which is not unique to the System. Another factor is incomplete network implementation. The PeachNet II initiative attempted to address part of this issue, but there are remaining issues on the campuses that preclude and limit services the network can provide. There are too many areas within the network where there is a single point of failure. Additionally, there have been challenges related to capacity management. Many people view PeachNet as an unlimited resource, when it is not. The need to manage traffic on PeachNet is something that will increasingly have to be addressed. Mr. Roth remarked that in the corporate world, organizations will very commonly prioritize or structure what can or cannot be done. For example, at Andersen, E-mail takes priority over Internet access. At the campus level, capacity management may mean limiting the potential for streaming technology, such as audio and video, at certain times of day or at certain locations. Finally, PeachNet has been dramatically impacted by the loss of revenue from non-System entities, specifically the drop-off of the K-12 portion of this due to the competitive procurement some months ago.

Mr. Roth noted that while the technology master planning recommendations are not finalized, there are some recommendations being developed. For instance, there is a need to upgrade PeachNet’s network backbone, ease traffic restrictions on campuses, recruit skilled network professionals, and coordinate efforts to implement a long-term network management strategy. Another recommendation will be to establish a Board of Regents Committee on Instructional and Information Technology to increase the visibility of technology decisions. There have been suggestions that the System have a chief information officer who reports directly to the Chancellor or the Chair. The consultants believe that given the complexity, cost, and importance of technology going forward, the establishment of a Board Committee that focuses on technology is something that will benefit the entire System. The consultants will also likely recommend clarifying roles and responsibilities for the support of BANNER and Central Office reporting. The implementation of BANNER has not been met with the same success as PeopleSoft, and there may need to be some refocusing to ensure that BANNER provides consistent, meaningful
information. Mr. Roth noted that this also relates to the benchmarking/management review initiative. The extent that data is captured inconsistently on different campuses dramatically complicates the ability to generate and centralize meaningful management reporting information. The System must standardize the accounting and reporting of certain information that would increase the ability to manage the individual campuses and the System. Finally, the consultants will recommend coordinating support for users of distance learning technologies, particularly as they relate to the eCore initiative, which is part of Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education (“Georgia GLOBE”). The distance learning technologies and initiatives are in many cases taking place at different campuses in different ways. It would make sense to evaluate and coordinate those activities to minimize the extent to which there is redundancy in the System. In closing, Mr. Roth discussed the consultants’ expected next steps, which include drafting the master plan; sharing the draft report with the Chancellor, OIT managers, the project steering committee, and campus representatives; developing an implementation “road map”; developing master planning templates for the institutions; and completing the final master plan. He reported that the consultants anticipate having a finalized report by June.

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

Regent Baranco remarked that she was concerned about the scope of the consultants’ projects. She noted that there are many programs, like Georgia Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”), PeopleSoft, BANNER, and eCore, that are interrelated and interdependent. She asked whether the scope of the project was broad enough.

Chancellor Portch explained that the Board submitted a budget request to the legislature for technology master planning, but it was not successful in securing that funding. Since the technology master planning initiative was already underway, the staff had to scrape together resources because it is considered very important. So, the scope of the initiative was scaled back to fit into the resources. He hopes that one of the consultants recommendations will be that the Board ask the legislature again for additional resources, because the scope of the current project barely touches the campuses in some respects. Rather, it deals more with the relationship between the Central Office and the campuses. This project is just the first step of a number of other steps, but it looks at the larger issues.

Dr. Sethna added that the higher bids for the technology master planning project were in excess of $1 million, and the staff had decided on a limit of $250,000. So, there were obviously some things that got left out of the project. In the end, the Board will have answers to some of the more global questions. There will also be templates for planning at the institutional level. If the Board is successful in obtaining support from the State in the future, it can share that among the campuses to help them with their planning. In any case, the System will have established an iterative process. While the project will not have answered all the questions, it will have enough information to do some campus-level planning.

Regent Baranco asked whether the project is still of value.
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The Chancellor reiterated that the System will need the Regents to generate more legislative support in the next session. The State got enormous value out of facilities master planning, but it is harder to make technology master planning real to people. He stressed that this project has value because when it was scaled back, it still looked at the macro questions.

Mr. Roth noted that there is roughly $110 million to be spent on technology this year, which is a substantial amount of money. The question is how to spend that money in the most efficient and
effective way possible.

Chair Leebern stressed that what the System needs is access to information simultaneously. If the System does not have the resources, it has to manage its capacity. He asked whether that is going to create more anxiety and frustration.

Mr. Roth responded that the current technological architecture already creates frustration. The bottom line is that instruction, research, and community service are most critical and take precedence over all other needs. The System must learn to use its limited resources to the best possible end.

Chair Leebern asked how to communicate this to end users, because someone is likely to be unhappy about imposed limitations.

Mr. Roth replied that there are schools who limit what their students can or cannot do, and by and large, the students, faculty, and staff are understanding. There may be those who complain, but most people understand that there are limited resources. He stated that there are a variety of ways to respond to the problem.

Dr. Sethna emphasized that the System needs more resources. Nonetheless, given a reasonable set of resources, there will still need to be some management strategies. He asserted that neither strategy will work alone.

Chair Leebern thanked Mr. Roth and next asked Dr. Sethna to make his presentation on enrollment target updates.

Dr. Sethna explained that each May, the Board hears a report on enrollment planning as part of its strategic planning process. He reminded the Regents that enrollment feeds into capital priorities, workforce planning, and academic program planning. The dominant theme in the University System remains strong but manageable growth. This is a collaborative and iterative process between the Central Office staff and the institutions. Campus analyses and assumptions are discussed, they are brought to the Central Office, and then a joint decision is reached. The final step is Board approval of enrollment targets. The Board defined an upper and lower range of plus or minus 2% and said that institutions should be within that range. The staff adjusted the targets in May 1999 to take into consideration factors such as semester conversion that had not been fully considered before. Actual enrollment was somewhat below the bottom of the range, but this year, the System is only .4% outside the range. In effect, the adjustment helped in enrollment planning. In the 1998, the forecast average for all 34 institutions together was 3.8% below the target range. Then, the Board allowed the institutions to adjust their forecasts. So, now, the System is doing better in its enrollment management process. Dr. Sethna stressed that 1998 was not only the first year of enrollment STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE” planning, but there were also many things going on in the System, particularly semester conversion. In enrollment planning, some variables can be influenced and controlled and others cannot. Forecasting uncertainties include the State and national economy. If there are jobs abundantly available in the State, the University System enrollment is negatively impacted. Competitive actions in industry and the Department of Technical and Adult Education, for example, also impact enrollments. Changes in HOPE Scholarship Program (“HOPE”) eligibility in fall 2000 and the implementation of new admissions standards in fall 2001 will also impact enrollment. So, there is much uncertainty. However, forecasting ability improves with additional and more current information about each year of prediction. So, as institutions go along in the process, they will improve in their forecasting.
Next, Dr. Sethna suggested that the Board consider adopting a three-year rolling target instead of the current five-year rolling target. If this is what the Board decides to do, nothing will change this year except that the Board will not add another year to its current target. Next year, it would not add another year either, but after that, it will add one more rolling year so that there is a three-year prediction rather than a five-year prediction. He also recommended that the process include System and/or institutional enrollment target adjustments in cases that are clearly justified by analysis of new circumstances and record of experience. In other words, if a target is too far off because of a new circumstance, the Central Office staff and the Board can work with the institution to adjust the particular target. In closing, Dr. Sethna asked whether there were any questions.

Regent Baranco asked whether minority enrollment numbers were considered. She was particularly concerned about African-American males, because their numbers seem to be dwindling drastically.

Dr. Sethna responded that the institutions could provide this information better than the University System, which looks at aggregate numbers. Enrollment varies so much by institution that the Board will have to ask institutions to pay particular attention to this matter. This is both an enrollment forecasting and management exercise. While it might be acceptable to forecast that a particular enrollment will decline, it is not an acceptable management plan. The institutions need to develop strategies so that this will not happen.

Regent McMillan asked whether the institutions that show a variance from the acceptable range have explained why, particularly Savannah State University (“SSU”) and Fort Valley State University, both of which are historically black institutions. He asked whether their projections were out of line or whether there were variables that account for the difference.

Dr. Sethna responded that when there are variations, presidents are asked to respond in multiple ways. The Central Office staff ask for analysis of the forecast models that they use and also ask them to explain their enrollment plans.

Regent McMillan asked why these two institutions were so far off their targets.

Dr. Sethna replied that this was partly attributable to targets that were set some years ago when there were different sets of assumptions. Even after the revisions, institutions were somewhat loathe to bring down their predictions by a significant amount. Even so, former Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs James L. Muyskens had conversations with them about reducing their targets, but these schools were still exceedingly optimistic.
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Chancellor Portch noted that they were among the highest proportional growth plans. Good enrollment planning requires a good infrastructure in terms of data, and at the time, these institutions did not have adequate data on which to base their plans. As a result, SSU expected the most aggressive growth of all institutions.

Dr. Sethna asked Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis Cathie Mayes Hudson to comment on this.

Dr. Hudson stated that their original estimates were extremely high.

Dr. Sethna suggested that the staff go back to these institutions again to discuss more realistic assumptions and aggressive efforts to improve enrollment.
The Chancellor added that SSU was also optimistic about when its new dorms would open. That was a significant part of its enrollment growth plan.

Regent Cater asked what plan is in place to make adjustments when such setbacks as the HOPE Scholarship Program changes and admissions policy revisions take place.

Dr. Sethna responded that the only plan is one of information dissemination so that as many people as possible are informed.

Chancellor Portch added that the Post-Secondary Readiness Enrichment Program (“PREP”) is also in place to help boost admissions.

Dr. Sethna stated that the System has made concerted efforts to get the word out about the higher admissions standards, but he believes the System has acted very responsibly in the last five years in helping students attain college admissions through PREP.

The Chancellor added that the policy requires that each year, the staff report back on the impact of the new admissions standards and any unintended consequences which occur as a result. This fall, there will be a rather significant report. Earlier years were not particularly significant because the phase-in was less dramatic at the beginning, but each year, the impact becomes more significant.

Regent Jenkins asked about the impact of enrollment from a budgetary standpoint.

Chancellor Portch responded that the theory behind the raised admissions standards is that they will ultimately increase enrollments and therefore budgets because more students will be coming into the System with the ability to stay in college. While there may be some impact in the early years on freshman enrollment, there will be less attrition of students in the later years. He commented that the national data is compelling. It shows that if admissions standards are raised, then retention rates increase significantly. So, budgetarily, what may be lost on the freshman level will later be picked up in the higher levels. The System may experience a period of transition, and it could have a negative budgetary effect initially; however, the higher standards are consistent with what Governor Barnes is trying to do about raising standards on the K-12 level. Therefore, the University System will likely get strong support. The STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chancellor mentioned that high school graduation rates are still rising. He also noted that the average Scholastic Aptitude Test (“SAT”) score has increased from 988 to 1016 and the percentage of students in remedial education has decreased. Moreover, the percentage of 18-year-olds entering the System who have taken the right courses in high school is increasing significantly. So, all of this is working, but it is not clear whether it is working fast enough.

Dr. Sethna remarked that this was why he was suggesting cutting back to a three-year forecast rather than a five-year forecast.

Regent White remarked that he did not have a problem with changing to a three-year rolling target. However, he was concerned about Dr. Sethna’s second recommendation, and he asked why Dr. Sethna was making that suggestion.

Dr. Sethna explained that it is based on the information that had been distributed to the Regents. He noted that when the System first created its five-year forecast, it said they were deemed final and could only be added to each year. Last year, the Regents allowed the institutions to adjust their targets and said that it was a one-time only adjustment. So, thus far, institutions were asked to predict five years into the
future and not change their predictions for the following years regardless of what happened. This change provides some flexibility.

Regent White asked whether the Board would be informed in the event of such enrollment target revisions.

The Chancellor assured him that any changes would have to come back before the Board.

Regent Allgood remarked that if an institution changes its target and its time frame, the entire enrollment picture would be distorted. He said that since 1995-1996, most of the System has experienced decreases in enrollment, and he suggested that it may be due to semester conversion.

Dr. Sethna responded that semester conversion accounted for one big dip in enrollment, but students are getting used to the semester system. Now there are additional complicating factors which have been planned for five years. There is no one who can predict the impact on enrollment in 2001.

Regent Allgood asked whether the implementation of the semester system was accompanied by an across-the-board drop in enrollment and significant financial results.

Dr. Sethna replied that this was not consistent.

Chancellor Portch added that the setback was only for one year. The financial impact was alleviated because the Governor and legislature held the University System harmless, which was a great success of the last session. The reason semester conversion is impacting the System now is because of the two-year lag on enrollment from the formula budget. Enrollments only dropped for the one year of implementation. Since then, enrollments have been coming back up. However, this is the year where the formula kicks in for the year enrollments went down.
Dr. Sethna added that this was part of the University System’s case to the legislature, because it is not as if enrollments are still declining.

Regent Allgood argued that his impression was that in 1995 or 1996, two things happened. First, there was a significant drop in enrollment, which many attribute to semester conversion. As a result, that brought the System additional competition. Many schools on the quarter system are attracting potential System students. He speculated that the University System will adjust to that, but he stressed that the Board must be realistic.

The Chancellor asked which institutions are on the quarter system.

Regent Allgood replied that Georgia Military College in Augusta has become a much more significant player on the Augusta market.

Chair Leebern noted that there are very few systems left that are not on the semester system.

Chancellor Portch remarked that this is the trend, but Regent Allgood was correct about that particular institution.

Regent Allgood stated that he felt that the Board needs to recognize and deal with the consequences of semester conversion and not look at information that may be somewhat misleading.

Dr. Sethna replied that the System is recovering from the year of semester conversion but it has not yet reached its pre-conversion enrollments.

The Chancellor stated that there was only one year of decline, which was relatively small in terms of headcount but large in terms of credit hours. After that one year of decline, the System enrollments and credit hours both went back up. The System has not yet reached its previous high, but it is likely the System will reach that point in the next few years.

Dr. Sethna noted that while this trend is turning around, there are two other trends coming: the tougher admissions standards and HOPE revisions.

Regent Hunt asked whether the enrollment figures include all students or only full-time students.

Dr. Sethna responded that the formula budget is driven by the number of full-time equivalent students; however, the figures he presented to the Board represented the actual headcount of students.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Leebern asked for a motion to recess the meeting of the Committee of the Whole. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business at this meeting.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chair Coleman called upon Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning to make some remarks to the Board. Dr. Dunning has accepted the position of Vice President for Public Service and Outreach at the University of Georgia (“UGA”).

Dr. Dunning remarked that he had a lot of help during his tenure at the Central Office and he wanted to take this opportunity to recognize some of his peers. First, he recognized Vice Chancellor for External Affairs Thomas E. Daniel, whom he called “remarkable.” Dr. Dunning meets with Mr. Daniel first thing every morning, and Mr. Daniel has always given wise counsel and advice. Mr. Daniel is from Hogansville, Georgia. Dr. Dunning said this is significant because Mr. Daniel has deep respect for this State and he loves the people. The second person Dr. Dunning recognized was Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources William Wallace. Mr. Wallace is new to the Central Office, and he is a true employee advocate. Dr. Dunning said that Mr. Wallace brings a good work ethic and a good perspective of the University System of Georgia. Mr. Wallace is from Dublin, Georgia, and he has worked for the System for over 20 years. Next, Dr. Dunning recognized Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Elizabeth E. Neely. Ms. Neely advises presidents across the System on complex legal issues and has put together a good staff who save the Board a great deal of trouble. Finally, Dr. Dunning recognized Senior Administrative Secretary Bertha L. Harris. Ms. Harris has worked for the Central Office for 25 years. In that time, she has had two children. One of her children graduates from Mount Holyoke this year. Moreover, now that her daughter is graduating from college, Ms. Harris herself is taking courses at the Newnan Center. Ms. Harris is also a caregiver to her two elderly parents. Dr. Dunning noted that behind a lot of good work of the Central Office are people like these who are not acknowledged very often, but they make the System work. He said that all of these people have “a deep sense of place” in that they love Georgia.

Dr. Dunning turned his attention to the Board. He remarked that the Regents have dealt with some very sensitive and complex issues. He especially appreciates what the Board has said about access. When he was a freshman at a large research university in the South, he needed and received help. So, access has been extremely important in his life. Economic development is also important because too many Georgians have scarcity as a part of their culture. In 1964, Dr. Dunning was finishing two years in Taiwan. In a Sunday New York Times, he read that a Southern governor had made waves by trying to encourage businesses to move south. The governor listed the following as incentives: the taxes are low, there are many unskilled workers, wages are low, and there is a lot of water. The Yamacraw Mission demonstrates that the South has come a long way in terms of economic development.
PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Dunning stated that the Board had given him many opportunities. He has had the opportunity to deeply understand the public policy process of a very complex organization. He has also had the opportunity to work in a System that is concerned with leading and not following. Lastly, he has had the opportunity to establish a policy framework to make a difference in the lives of people because the best exit from poverty is an education. Dr. Dunning said that he will miss the lively discussions in the Committee on Organization and Law. Now, he is moving on to the University of Georgia, a first-rate research university. President Michael F. Adams has put in place a great team, and Dr. Dunning will be doing the work he loves most. In closing, he thanked Vice Chair Coleman for this opportunity to speak.

Vice Chair Coleman thanked Dr. Dunning on behalf of the Board and commended his work over the years.

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, June 13 and Wednesday, June 14, 2000 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

Chancellor Portch explained that the June meeting is traditionally a very different meeting. All day Tuesday will be devoted to capital outlay projects presentations by presidents. At the end of the presentations, the Regents will vote on which projects to add to the five-year rolling capital projects list. On Wednesday morning, the Regents will attend Committee meetings before the full Board meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:20 a.m., Vice Chair Coleman called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Vice Chair Coleman 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, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance were Chancellor Stephen R. Portch, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs Thomas E. Daniel, Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber, and Mr. James H. Roth, Head of the Higher Education Division of Arthur Andersen LLP. 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 12:30 p.m., Vice Chair Coleman 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 12:35 p.m. on May 10, 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