CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, October 7 and Wednesday, October 8, 1997 in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University in Morrow, Georgia. The following Committees of the Board of Regents met in succession on Tuesday, October 7: the Audit Committee; the Teaching Hospital Committee; the Committee on Finance and Business Operations; the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities; the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension; and the Committee on Organization and Law. The Chair of the Board, Regent S. William Clark, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 8. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Clark, were Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Shannon L. Amos, David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Cannestra, A. W. “Bill” Dahlberg, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, October 8 by Mr. Zachary Ross, President of the Student Government Association at Clayton College & State University.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, October 8 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent A. W. “Bill” Dahlberg had asked for and been given permission to be absent on Tuesday, October 7, 1997 and that Regents J. Tom Coleman, Jr. and Suzanne G. Elson had asked for and been given permission to be absent on Tuesday, October 7 and Wednesday, October 8, 1997.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion being properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on September 9 and 10, 1997 were unanimously approved as distributed.
SPECIAL PRESENTATION

President Richard A. Skinner introduced to the Board some members of the honors program at Clayton College & State University ("CCSU") who were present to assist Board members in a presentation about the Information Technology Program ("ITP"). Next, he reminded the Board of the program it approved last year that encourages students to create their own degrees using the courses of the public and private institutions around Atlanta. CCSU is participating in the program through its affiliation with the University Center of Georgia, a consortium of public and private institutions in the metropolitan Atlanta area that allows students to cross-register for courses offered by member institutions. President Skinner then cited the following qualities that make CCSU unique: it is also the only four-year institution that is formally associated with the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, it is home of the second-largest continuing education program in Georgia, and it is also home to ITP.

President Skinner expressed that he wanted to give the Board some hands-on experience with CCSU students and that the laptop computers on the tables in front of the Regents were the same ones used by CCSU students and faculty. He explained that he would be providing an update on ITP and that he wanted to introduce some of the strategic partners of the project. President Skinner reminded the Board that when it approved ITP, it also approved Universal Personal Information Technology Access ("UPITA") and the development of a universal campus card, gave the college the leeway to find a different way of budgeting and financing the program, and made CCSU a prototype for the rest of the System. He explained that the program is already drawing attention from beyond the State of Georgia and that it provides students with access to very powerful computing.

According to President Skinner, the laptops on the tables are more powerful than about 98% of the desktop computers in the United States. He also explained that the laptops mean that students do not have to wait in line to use these tools, which are the basis for education. President Skinner stressed that when the technology changes, the program will be prepared. He expressed that a campus where many students may not have funds to purchase computers should have an alternate way to help students acquire the use of them. Each student is provided with personal use of a laptop computer, unlimited Internet access on and off campus, training and support, and even a protective carrying case. Each student pays a quarterly fee of $200 for ITP. CCSU is in the process of distributing 8,500 computers, which were acquired at a significant discount because of the large volume purchased, and there are already plans to refresh that technology when the need arises. President Skinner expressed that he believes this to be the largest deployment of mobile computing on any campus anywhere. He said that it presents an opportunity to make fundamental changes in how faculty teach, how students learn, and how the institution is managed. There is already interest from schools, businesses, industries, and communities that are intrigued by the concept of mobile computing and how it links people together.

The universal campus card not only has its traditional uses of identification, access, and telecommunications, but it also enables financial transactions, including the financial aid process, which President Skinner said can be improved dramatically. He said that he also felt that this would help students learn to use E-commerce wisely. The most important feature that ITP has is its ability to help expand and improve student services from applying to college to transferring to registering to paying fees.
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President Skinner explained that ITP will be financed through auxiliary funds accumulated over the years so that investments can be planned for, revenue can be generated, and student fees can be kept as low as possible. He said that CCSU had made a commitment to the Board that the program will be self-sustaining and will no longer require State appropriations by the year 2001. He commended the Board and the System itself for Peachnet and GALILEO, without which ITP could not have been implemented. He explained that many other institutions are interested in creating similar programs and in developing a campus card for the entire System. However, he stressed, ITP is more than a prototype for the University System. It is a prototype for the majority of higher education institutions in this country. He reminded the Board that most institutions are public, nonresidential, commuter institutions in metropolitan areas that tend to have community or regional focus and ties.

President Skinner then recognized President H. Lynn Cundiff of Floyd College. He explained that in the case of Floyd College, a two-year associate degree college, ITP is going exceptionally well, and he commended President Cundiff for this. President Skinner said that ITP serves as a model for the majority of new students, who are increasingly nontraditional, older, commuter students who work and have families and who have access to the institution through ITP without having to be on campus. He explained that the honors students at the meeting are technologically savvy and expect technology to be a part of their learning experience.

Next, President Skinner reiterated the goals that CCSU had set for ITP. First, learning would be improved in four ways: learning productivity would be increased, career readiness would be improved, nontraditional students would be better accommodated, and lifelong learning could be made truly practical. Second, services to students would be expanded and improved, both on and off campus. Finally, the program would reduce its reliance on State appropriations but nevertheless continue to improve the learning environment of the students.

“What have we accomplished?” President Skinner then asked. He explained that almost every technical specification of the computers in the program had been improved. He demonstrated how the program cut the cost of a laptop computer for a student by approximately $2,400. Additionally, in its first year alone, ITP was able to attract $1.3 million in matching funds from ITP’s service provider. ITP also received over $50,000 in scholarship funds from the Southern Company, Georgia Power Foundation, Atlanta Journal and Constitution, and others to be directed to students with financial need as well as part-time students.

The partners in ITP have provided two full-time engineers for each of the campuses involved in ITP, which President Skinner explained was uncommon on campuses and for which he thanked Mr. Chang-Lin Lin, President of Arsys Innotech Corporation (“Arsys”), one of the strategic partners. He also thanked the partners at GPTV and the cable channels of Atlanta for enabling ITP to deliver training on the use of the hardware and software on those channels this winter. President Skinner also acknowledged the publishers who created a CD that walks students through the use of their computers. Finally, President Skinner recognized the strategic partners of ITP: AT&T, Microsoft, the Nebraska Book Company, Wachovia, and Arsys.
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President Skinner then introduced Mr. Lin, President of Arsys, which had sales last year of $100 million and was a successful bidder on the $23 million Information Technology Project. Mr. Lin thanked President Skinner and the Board for providing Arsys the opportunity to work on ITP. He explained that his company is relatively young and that it has worked with other educational and governmental institutions. He recognized Twinhead, the manufacturer of the notebook computers, and Mr. Bill Liu, its president, and expressed the appreciation of that company as well. Mr. Lin emphasized his company’s commitment to ITP, reiterating that Arsys is providing two engineers to each institution and that it is establishing local offices to support the program. He then turned the floor back to President Skinner.

Next, President Skinner introduced Mr. Marty Paradise, the Southeast General Manager of Microsoft. Mr. Paradise commended ITP and said that Microsoft is committed to the success of the project and appreciates the support of the Board. President Skinner then asked Mr. John O’Connor of Wachovia to stand as he recognized Wachovia for having selected ITP to be included in its business plan.

In conclusion, President Skinner attempted to answer the commonly asked question: “What are we really trying to do with this project?” He quoted from the cartoon show Pinky and the Brain, “The same thing we do every night, Pinky, try to take over the world!”

Chair Clark expressed the Board’s appreciation to President Skinner and his staff for hosting the October Board meeting at CCSU. President Skinner likewise expressed his appreciation to the Board. Chancellor Stephen R. Portch said that he hoped to continue to see the kind of progress that had been committed to the Board at the inception of ITP and that it would be evaluated on a regular basis to see what could be learned from this important experiment. He also commended the institutions involved in the project.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Clark called upon the Chancellor to introduce the new president of Gainesville College, Dr. Martha T. Nesbitt. The Chancellor then introduced Dr. Caywood Chapman, Chair of the Gainesville College Presidential Search and Advisory Committee, who has worked in the Biology Department of the college for 23 years. The Chancellor expressed that the Committee did an exemplary job, staying on schedule and finding excellent candidates for the position. In fact, of the five candidates selected for the position, three are now sitting presidents and one is a senior administrator.

The Chancellor updated the Board on the former president, Dr. Foster Watkins, who has moved to Alabama. He also expressed his gratitude to Dr. Katherine M. Fuller, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, for her support and leadership during the period between presidents. Finally, the Chancellor introduced to the Board President Nesbitt, who has served the System since 1974, when she began her teaching career in the University System. Since that time, she has served as Vice President for Student Affairs and Vice President for Academic Affairs at DeKalb College and as Special Assistant to the Chancellor. The Chancellor thanked the Regents’ Search Committee, which was chaired by Regent Jenkins and included Regents White and Baranco. The Chancellor then invited President Nesbitt to speak before the Board.
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President Nesbitt thanked the Board for giving her the opportunity to serve as President of Gainesville College. She explained that the college has earned a strong academic reputation and that its retention program is one of the best. Gainesville College serves the area of Gainesville, Hall County, and northeast Georgia, and it has many cooperative programs with Lanier Technical Institute. Additionally, North Georgia College & State University offers four majors in the business program at Gainesville and this year is adding more majors and upper division history courses. Gainesville College also cooperates with North Georgia and Lanier Tech to offer higher education opportunities in Forsyth County. For the first time, Southern Polytechnic State University is offering two engineering technology programs at Gainesville. President Nesbitt explained that Gainesville College is trying to serve the needs of northeast Georgia while retaining its two-year college mission of providing the best core curriculum for those students seeking baccalaureate degrees.

At the core of the campus ideology, President Nesbitt said, is a genuine concern for students coupled with a deep feeling of community. She said this feeling is also reflected in the community’s attitude toward the college, particularly the strong support of Gainesville and Hall County. President Nesbitt explained that many community leaders are alumni of Gainesville College, making for a very healthy relationship between the college and the local people. She said that the college has developed a local PREP program and that it is active in the regional P-16 initiative. The college also participates in a partnership with Brenau University and the Gainesville Theatre Alliance. Another example of community involvement is the fact that every afternoon, children and adults are on the campus walking, biking, or playing sports.

President Nesbitt stressed that her mission for the college is to strengthen the bridges to the students, each other, and the community in order to effectively face the challenges of the twenty-first century. She explained that the institution is establishing a strategic planning committee and the plans from the committee will feed into the plans of the master planning process scheduled for next year. Her first priority, President Nesbitt said, is getting to know the faculty and staff at the college as well as the major players in the community. By doing this, she is getting to know their visions for the future of Gainesville College. In closing, she thanked the Board for the much-needed new science facility. She explained that newly renovated classrooms would provide space for the college’s collaboration with North Georgia College & State University and Southern Polytechnic State University. She said the space would also help with the increase in enrollment, which is up 8% this fall. President Nesbitt then invited the Board to come visit the college and see what a “gem” it is.
AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, October 7, 1997 at 10:00 a.m. in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Charles H. Jones, Vice Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, and Regents Juanita P. Baranco and Kenneth W. Cannestra. Chair Jones reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had three information items for review this month. The items reviewed were as follows:

1. **Report on Medical College of Georgia Audit of Grants and Contracts**

   The audit report was the result of a coordinated effort by a team of professionals from three research institutions outside the University System of Georgia and a team of University System auditors. President Francis J. Tedesco reported to the Committee regarding the results of the audit, audit recommendations, and the college’s responses to those recommendations.

2. **Status Report on Audit Committee Requests From Georgia State University, Medical College of Georgia, and Fort Valley State University**

   Mr. Levy G. Youmans, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Management and Audit Advisory Services, presented to the Committee a review of responses from campuses relating to an Audit Committee inquiry of unresolved audit findings.

3. **Summary Review of Audit Activity for the Period From January 1 Through June 30, 1997**

   Mr. Youmans presented to the Committee a summary of the audit findings for the period under review.
TEACHING HOSPITAL COMMITTEE

The Teaching Hospital Committee met on Tuesday, October 7 at approximately 11:00 a.m. in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Cannestra, S. William Clark, Jr., Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Elridge W. McMillan. Chair Allgood reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had two information items for review this month. The items reviewed were as follows:

1. **Update on Geriatric Lease for MCG Health, Inc.**

   President Francis J. Tedesco of the Medical College of Georgia reported to the Committee that the lease agreement will be ready for the November 1997 meeting.

2. **Update on Hiring Process for CEO for MCG Health, Inc.**

   President Tedesco reported to the Committee that the MCG Health, Inc. Board has selected a firm to assist in the search process.
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, October 7, 1997 at approximately 1:00 p.m. in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Kenneth W. Cannestra, Vice Chair Glenn S. White, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Chair Cannestra reported to the Board on Wednesday that five items were reviewed, all requiring action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Amendments to Fiscal Year 1998 Budget

Approved: The Board approved the consolidated amendment to the Fiscal Year 1998 Budget of the University System of Georgia, as presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR 1998 BUDGET AMENDMENT REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BY BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$3,197,544,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>149,262,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>264,943,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>42,881,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background: In accordance with current policy, the Board of Regents approves all budget amendments submitted by System institutions. The monthly budget amendment report highlights and discusses amendments where changes exceed 5% of the budget or add significant ongoing expenses to the institutions. The following amendments were presented for review by the Board of Regents in accordance with these guidelines:

Auxiliary Enterprises - One institution, Atlanta Metropolitan College, requested an adjustment exceeding 5% of the auxiliary enterprises budget to reflect funds’ carrying forward from prior years being greater than anticipated by 24.38% ($56,268).
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1. Amendments to Fiscal Year 1998 Budget (Continued)

   Capital - Two institutions, Georgia State University and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, requested adjustments exceeding 5% of their capital budgets to reflect the utilization of auxiliary surplus funds and student activity funds for use in various projects at the institutions. Georgia State University requested a 6.54% increase ($283,406), and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College requested a 14.5% increase ($29,000).

   Student Activities - Four institutions requested adjustments exceeding 5% of their student activities budgets to reflect funds’ carrying forward from prior years being greater or less than anticipated. Valdosta State University requested a 6.36% increase ($103,180), Clayton College & State University requested a 15.81% increase ($50,130), North Georgia College & State University requested a 5.8% decrease ($37,183), and Atlanta Metropolitan College requested a 9.63% increase ($7,443).

   Operating - One institution, Albany State University, requested an adjustment exceeding 5% of the operating budget to reflect an increase of 141.61% ($11,656,674) in additional sponsored revenue in nonpersonal services. This increase reflects revenue for student financial assistance which was not included in the original budget due to an oversight by the institution.

   One “B” Unit activity, Marine Extension Service, requested an adjustment exceeding 5% of the original budget. The 37.8% increase ($246,653) in additional revenue is attributed to an increase in boat and laboratory usage fee revenue.

2. Acceptance of Gift to the Georgia Institute of Technology

   Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology a donation from Georgia Power Company consisting of the contents of the Electric Vehicle Research Center valued at $432,000.

   Background: Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than $100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents. The equipment donated by Georgia Power consists primarily of a 200 horsepower dynamometer and a battery test system along with ancillary apparatus. The equipment will be integrated with other National Electric Energy Testing, Research and Applications Center (“NEETRAC”) equipment to enable the creation of an Electric Vehicle Research Center within NEETRAC. Staffing for the center is currently in place.

3. Approval of Student Housing Policy

   Approved: The Board adopted the following policy on student housing:

   Student Housing Comprehensive Plans

   Each campus which provides, or plans to provide, a residential student program shall develop a student housing comprehensive plan that addresses all facets of the creation, expansion, and operation of the student housing facilities. The student housing plan will address academic mission; the specific role or purpose of student housing within that mission including student life programs; access to the campus


COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

3. Approval of Student Housing Policy (Continued)

or other needs; enrollment projections in relation to housing goals; geographic, economic, and demographic factors on the campus and in the local community; and financial considerations, including an evaluation of the desirability and practicality of achieving these student housing objectives through private sector partnerships on campus lands or lands proximate to the campus. The student housing plan will include the following:

- A business plan that explains the role of the student housing program in the context of the institution’s academic mission; includes concrete goals and objectives; and defines an operating strategy, including marketing plans, programs and services, fees, assignment of indirect costs, and use of reserves for repair and maintenance, major renovation, and, if planned, expansion of capacity. The plan should also contain a financial pro forma which projects future revenues and expenditures consistent with stated goals and objectives and includes plans for capitalization, maintenance and operations, and facilities renewal.

- A facility evaluation assessing the appropriateness of rehabilitation versus demolition and new construction.

- A market needs assessment, including justification for additional student housing capacity where appropriate.

- The housing facilities component of the institution’s physical master plan (site, circumstance, and impact on other campus functions).

Student Housing Financial Statements

To support requests for changes in housing fees, each institution shall submit, in accordance with procedures established by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources, a financial statement which projects revenues and expenditures based on estimated housing enrollments, salary adjustments, inflationary expense, and other relevant factors.

Background: The Student Housing Task Force, created in November 1996 and charged to review the current practices and policies associated with the construction and operation of student housing programs, reported its findings and recommendations to the Board in May 1997. The major recommendations of the report call for the adoption of a planning “template” similar to the institutional facilities master planning template to guide future decisions on construction or renovation of residential facilities, the development of guidelines to assist campuses in undertaking facility evaluation efforts, the development of student housing business plans, and the establishment of criteria for setting fee levels by the Chancellor’s office. The report further recommends that the Board clarify existing policy regarding reserves, that different funding/financing options be considered, and that public/private partnerships be recognized as a potential funding vehicle.
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3. Approval of Student Housing Policy (Continued)

In May 1997, the Budget Responsibility and Oversight Committee (“BROC”) issued a report calling for increased monitoring of University System institution auxiliary enterprise programs. Specifically, the report recommended that institutions be required to develop business plans for their auxiliary enterprise programs which would enable the Board and the Chancellor’s Office “to determine if schools are charging fees that are reasonable and in line with financial objectives.” The report further recommended that institutions be required to submit more complete documentation of financial activity to verify that fee increase amounts are necessary and are directly related to the cost of the services provided, as required by current Board policy.

The student housing policy presented for the Board’s consideration and approval is designed to address the major recommendations of both the Housing Task Force report and the BROC report. It also dovetails with efforts underway to modify current procedures and practices with respect to Central Office and Board review of all major auxiliary enterprises, including those supported by mandatory fees.


Approved: The Board approved a one-year extension of an HMO contract with United HealthCare at the rates presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Two Persons</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Two Persons</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>% Incr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>$172.06</td>
<td>$415.56</td>
<td>$455.68</td>
<td>$180.32</td>
<td>$435.52</td>
<td>$477.564.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1998</td>
<td>$180.32</td>
<td>$435.52</td>
<td>$477.56</td>
<td>$189.64</td>
<td>$440.32</td>
<td>$487.134.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the September meeting of the Board of Regents, three of the four HMO contracts currently in existence in the University System were approved. An extension of the HMO contract with United HealthCare was not approved at that time because information on the renewal rates had not been received by the time the September agenda was created. Information from United HealthCare has now been received, as presented above. We have also received notification that United HealthCare has received a full three-year accreditation from the National Committee on Quality Assurance.

5. Approval of Change in Retired Employees Insurance

Approved: The Board approved a change in policy pertaining to the continuation of insurance into retirement. The former policy read as follows:

It shall be the policy of the Board to permit career employees of the University System eligible for retirement to continue as members of the group life and health insurance programs. To this end, employees who are eligible for retirement under the criteria established by the Teachers Retirement System and who have at least ten years of service with the University System, even though they may not be members of the Teachers Retirement System, shall remain eligible for employee and dependent group health and life insurance benefits. The University System shall continue to pay its portion of the cost of group insurance for retired career employees. Nothing in this statement of policy shall be interpreted to reduce the benefit committed to existing career employees.
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5. **Approval of Change in Retired Employees Insurance** (Continued)

The new policy reads as follows:

Career employees of the University System who immediately retire from the University System under the criteria established by the Teachers Retirement System (even though they may not be members of the Teachers Retirement System) shall remain eligible to continue as members of the basic and dependent group life insurance and health benefits plans. In order to qualify for this benefit, the retiring employee must have ten years of continuous service to the State of Georgia of which the final two years of such continuous service must have been to the University System of Georgia.

The University System shall continue to pay its portion of the cost of group insurance for retired career employees. Nothing in this statement of policy shall be interpreted to reduce the benefit committed to existing career employees.

This change in policy was requested in order to allow employees who have at least ten years of service to the State who finish their careers with the University System to continue certain insurance plans into retirement. It will ensure that long-term employees who choose to transfer to University System employment are not penalized in so doing. Finally, it will bring the Board of Regents’ policies on the continuation of insurance into retirement more in line with the policies of other State agencies. It is expected there will be very few employees who will make such a change, and the Central Office is aware of only four so affected in the past 13 years.
COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, October 7, 1997 at approximately 1:30 p.m. in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Charles H. Jones and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Kenneth W. Cannestra, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Glenn S. White. Vice Chair Jones reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee reviewed ten items, all of which required action. With motion made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Sale of Property, Georgia Experiment Station, the University of Georgia**

   **Approved:** The Board declared approximately .405 acre of land located at U.S. Highway 41 and Lyndon Avenue, Griffin, Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing the sale of this property for the benefit of the University of Georgia and the University System of Georgia.

   The Board authorized conveyance of the above property through negotiated sale to Mr. Ward Simonton for $2,500 ($6,173/acre).

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

   **Background:** Mr. Ward Simonton has offered $2,500 for the property, and the University of Georgia concurs with this amount as fair value. The university requested that the property be sold to Mr. Ward Simonton for $2,500 as a fair value.

   The property is a narrow strip between Lyndon Avenue and property owned by Mr. Simonton. The small size of the parcel, the narrow slope of the parcel, and its location between a road and a drainage ditch make this land useless to the University of Georgia and a maintenance burden to the University of Georgia. The configuration of this parcel is such that there is no use except by the adjoining landowner, Ward Simonton.

   The property has no improvements.

   The sale of this property is desired so that further maintenance costs will not be incurred.

2. **Demolition of Buildings Number 6007, 6011, and 6013, the University of Georgia Marine Institute, Sapelo Island**

   **Approved:** The Board declared Buildings Number 6007, 6011, and 6013 at the Marine Institute on Sapelo Island, Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of these buildings.

   The Board requested that Governor Miller issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of the above-referenced buildings from the campus of the University of Georgia Marine Institute, Sapelo Island.
2. Demolition of Buildings Number 6007, 6011, and 6013, the University of Georgia Marine Institute, Sapelo Island (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yr. Built/ Acquired</th>
<th>Proposed Location for Existing Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building 6007</td>
<td>600 sf</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6011</td>
<td>176 sf</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6013</td>
<td>136 sf</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding: The demolition, including environmental abatement, will be conducted by public works contract at an estimated cost of $2,000 using budgeted University of Georgia Marine Institute general operating funds.

3. Demolition of Greenhouse, Augusta State University

Approved: The Board declared Building Number GR, Greenhouse, on the campus of Augusta State University, to be no longer advantageous useful to Augusta State University or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of this building.

The Board requested that Governor Miller issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of the above-referenced building from the campus of Augusta State University.

Background: The building is a 893-square-foot structure built in the 1930s and is on property that was acquired in 1957 as a gift from the U.S. government. The building on this strategically located tract of property is in poor condition and cannot be repaired economically.

The property will be used for an exterior student commons or gathering space.

Funding: The demolition, including lead paint and asbestos abatement, will be conducted by public works contract using budgeted Augusta State University general operating funds.

4. Increase in Project Budget, Amendment of Architectural Contract, Project No. BR-10-9504, “Garden Club Headquarters,” the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized an increase in the project budget for Project No. BR-10-9504 “Garden Club Headquarters,” the University of Georgia, from $1,775,000 to $1,925,000 using funds from a private donor.

Background: This project is a facility which will house the headquarters for the Garden Club of Georgia. The entire project is supported by a donation from Deen Day Smith.

The Board approved this project at the October 11 and 12, 1994 meeting at a budget level of $1,000,000. The Board previously approved budget increases to $1,625,000 in September 1995 and to $1,775,000 in October 1996.
4. **Increase in Project Budget, Amendment of Architectural Contract, Project No. BR-10-9504, “Garden Club Headquarters,” the University of Georgia** (Continued)

The campus, at the request of the donor, is currently requesting an increase in the project of $150,000 to a total project budget of $1,925,000. This increase will provide for a retaining wall at the rear terrace. This project is currently under construction and is approximately 55% complete.

5. **Subrental Agreement, Georgia Institute of Technology**

**Approved:** The Board authorized the execution of an amendment of a subrental agreement between Georgia Tech Research Corporation, as landlord, and the Board of Regents, as tenant, for 6,316 square feet of office space located at the Rosslyn Center Building, 1700 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia, for the period beginning November 1, 1997 and ending June 30, 1998 at a monthly rental of $13,824.15 ($165,889.80 per year/$26.26 per square foot per year) with option to renew for five consecutive one-year periods. The terms of this amendment are subject to the review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

**Background:** The Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia Tech Research Institute have occupied space in this location since September 1992 and provide specialized technical support and analysis to the Department of the Air Force in areas of systems acquisition, test and evaluation resource planning, and combat training range development.

The initial agreement was for 2,537 square feet and was executed in accordance with delegated authority provided by Board policy. A new agreement was executed in December 1994 for this space with a provision to add 2,489 square feet of space (to a total of 5,026 square feet) with 5 one-year option periods.

This agreement will add an additional 1,290 square feet and provide five additional one-year options periods at the following rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
<th>Annual Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$13,824.15</td>
<td>$165,889.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>$14,238.87</td>
<td>$170,866.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>$14,666.04</td>
<td>$175,992.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>$15,106.02</td>
<td>$181,272.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>$15,559.20</td>
<td>$186,710.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating costs for this rental agreement are included in the rental rate.

Georgia Tech Research Corporation leases the space from Rosslyn Center Associates, Ltd. Partnership.

Comparable rent in Arlington, Virginia, was reported by staff.
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6. Demolition of Buildings Number 3061, 3062, 3063, and 3065, Intergovernmental Agreement, the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board declared Buildings Number 3061, 3062, 3063, and 3065, farm buildings on the campus of the University of Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of these buildings.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yr. Built/ Acquired</th>
<th>Proposed Location for Existing Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building 3061</td>
<td>3,600 sf</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Oconee County Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 3062</td>
<td>388 sf</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Oconee County Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 3063</td>
<td>1,894 sf</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Oconee County Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 3065</td>
<td>100 sf</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Oconee County Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board declared approximately 2 acres of land located on Barnett Shoals Road, Athens, Georgia, no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of executing an intergovernmental agreement with the Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County for the benefit of the University of Georgia.

The Board authorized the execution of an intergovernmental agreement between the Board of Regents, and the Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, covering 2 acres of land located on Barnett Shoals Road, Athens, Georgia, for a 25-year period at a yearly rental of $1 with option to renew for an additional 25 years.

The Board declared approximately .341 acre of land located in Whitehall Forest, University of Georgia School of Forestry, Athens, Georgia, no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of executing an intergovernmental agreement with the Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County for the benefit of the University of Georgia.

The Board authorized the execution of an intergovernmental agreement between the Board of Regents and the Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County covering .341 acre of land located in Whitehall Forest, University of Georgia School of Forestry, Athens, Georgia, for a 50-year period.

The terms of these intergovernmental agreements are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Background: The four buildings to be demolished are located on the 2-acre tract and do not have any historical or architectural significance. There is no known opposition to this demolition by an individual or group. The demolition will be conducted by public works contract at an estimated cost of $19,300 using budgeted University of Georgia general operating funds.
6. Demolition of Buildings Number 3061, 3062, 3063, and 3065, Intergovernmental Agreement, the University of Georgia (Continued)

The 2 acres of land to be used by the Athens-Clarke County for a fire station are remote from the main campus. The property was previously utilized by the College of Veterinary Medicine for its large-animal program. Due to urbanization of the immediate area, the land has become unsuitable for farm animals, which have been relocated to a farm in Oconee County. Consideration for this agreement is Athens-Clarke County providing fire protection services to the University of Georgia.

The .341 acre of land to be used for a communications tower for fire and other emergencies is located in Whitehall Forest. Consideration for this agreement is Athens-Clarke County constructing a 400-foot self-supporting tower. Athens-Clarke County will install one 800 MHZ transmission antenna on the tower. The University of Georgia will be permitted to install a minimum of three antennas on the tower, to install RF transmitting equipment, and to install microwave transmission equipment.

7. Sale of Property, Georgia Experiment Station, the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board declared approximately 54.64 acres of land located on Cowan Road, Griffin, Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to the University of Georgia or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing the sale of this property for the benefit of the University of Georgia and the University System of Georgia.

The Board authorized conveyance of the above-referenced property through negotiated sale, provided that the bid received is equal to or greater than the average of three appraisals made of the property.

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

Background: The property has become unsuitable for Experiment Station research purposes due to urban growth and its adjacency to the Cowan Road Elementary School. The property has no improvements.

The University of Georgia desires to sell this tract to purchase land more distant from the urban area in accordance with the current land use plan and with the strategic plan of the University’s College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences for crop research.

An environmental Georgia Environmental Protection Agency report has been conducted, showing no significant environmental effects.

The Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education has requested to purchase the property for expansion of the school system, as it is contiguous to the Cowan Road Elementary School.
8. **Consolidated Lease Agreement, Fort Valley State University, Georgia College & State University, and OIIT**

**Approved:** The Board authorized the execution of an amendment to the existing rental agreement between Arkwright Road Associates, as landlord, and the Board of Regents, as tenant, for an additional 4,360 square feet of classroom/office space located in the CIGNA Building, 3920 Arkwright Road, Macon, Georgia, for the period beginning November 1, 1997 and ending June 30, 1998 at a monthly rental of $6,401.93 ($76,823.20 per year/$17.62 per square foot per year) with option to renew for 1 one-year period beginning July 1, 1998 for use and benefit of Fort Valley State University.

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

**Background:** The Board deferred action on this item in May 1997 and June 1997 so that the terms of the agreement could be consolidated and renegotiated. This has now been accomplished.

The Board, on behalf of Fort Valley State University and Georgia College & State University, has had a presence at this location since 1989. This agreement will consolidate space for all users under one agreement.

This amendment will be to the existing lease that is for the use and benefit of Georgia College & State University. This amendment will add the space that Fort Valley State University is currently occupying for the use and benefit of Fort Valley State University at the same terms and conditions as the existing lease. This is a savings of $6,016.80 per year from the rate for the last option period for this space.

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

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

**Background:** At the June meeting, the Board rank ordered 27 major capital outlay projects, and staff has commenced the process that will result in the selection of a project design firm for each project. This process included the placement of an advertisement for the first 14 projects in seven newspapers of general circulation throughout the state, together with a personal letter enclosing a copy of the advertisement to over 200 architectural firms that had previously submitted their credentials. A process was identified for all firms that were interested in pursuing a design commission for one or more of the first 14 projects. This process included the firm’s submission of a standardized qualification questionnaire, followed by a staff/campus group identifying the three or four firms that appeared to be most qualified to perform each particular project.

Each of these firms was then offered the opportunity to submit a more complete statement that included its team’s qualifications to the staff/campus committee who compiled the recommendations included below. This process resulted in over 515 firms being considered for the 14 projects (although some firms competed for more than one project).
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9. Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia (Continued)

Eight of the first 14 projects were presented at the Committee meeting. The following projects are listed in rank order, as determined at the June 1997 meeting of the Board:

**Project No. I-1, “Classroom Replacement - Phase I,” Augusta State University**

Project Description: 116,000 gsf Classroom Building, including 25 standard classrooms, 3 distance learning classrooms, 4 lecture halls, 6 class laboratories (dry labs), 60 faculty offices, 5 faculty administrative offices, 8 campus administrative spaces, together with 9 technology support areas and work rooms.

- Total Project Cost $18,194,000
- Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation) $13,595,000
- A/E (fixed) Fee $817,400

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 47

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

A. Sizemore Floyd Architects of Atlanta, in association with The Woodhurst Partnership of Augusta
B. Stanley, Love-Stanley, PC of Atlanta
C. Jova/Daniels/Busby Architects of Atlanta

**Project No. I-2, “Classroom Building,” Georgia State University**

Project Description: 174,200 gsf Classroom Building, including 40 standard classrooms, 5 distance learning classrooms, 7 lecture halls, 26 faculty offices, 13 administrative offices and 14 study areas.

- Total Project Cost $39,074,000
- Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation) $22,637,000
- A/E (fixed) Fee $1,361,400

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 42

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

A. Lord Aeck & Sargent, Inc. of Atlanta
B. Stang & Newdow, Inc. of Atlanta, in association with Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott of Boston, MA.
C. Thompson, Ventulett, Stainback & Associates, Inc. of Atlanta
D. Cooper Carry & Associates, Inc. of Atlanta
9. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia** (Continued)

**Project No. I-3, “Science Building,” Armstrong Atlantic State University**
Project Description: 115,917 gsf Science Building, including 29 student classrooms, 2 distance learning classrooms, 4 lecture halls, 40 class laboratories (dry labs), 20 class laboratories (wet labs), 72 faculty offices, 20 administrative offices and 3 technical support areas. The project also includes the renovation of two existing buildings (61,963 sf) for existing academic programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$28,001,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$20,939,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$1,325,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 48

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

A. Lott + Darmer Architects of Savannah, in association with O’Neal of Atlanta
B. Cogdell & Mendrala Architects of Savannah, in association with Nix Mann Perkins & Will of Atlanta
C. Stanley, Love-Stanley, P.C. of Atlanta, in association with Ramsey/Sherrill of Savannah

**Project No. I-4, “Renovation and Addition to Science Building,” Gainesville College**
Project Description: 19,700 asf renovation of existing Science Building, including new HVAC system, demolition of wet labs, and cosmetic upgrades to all spaces. 32,000 gsf free-standing Science Annex, including 6 class laboratories (wet labs), and 4 chemical prep/storage rooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$8,852,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$6,683,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$423,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 57

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

A. Warren Epstein & Associates, Architects, Inc. of Atlanta
B. O’Neal, Inc. of Atlanta
C. Pieper O’Brien Herr Architects, Ltd. of Atlanta
9. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia** (Continued)

**Project No. I-5, “Technology Enhanced Learning Center,” State University of West Georgia**

Project Description: 103,016 gsf new building, including 14 standard classrooms, 26 distance learning classrooms, 5 lecture halls, 10 class laboratories (dry labs), 11 class laboratories (wet labs), 18 research labs, 63 faculty offices, 8 administrative office, 1 technical support area and 16 seminar/multi-media areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$19,352,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$14,792,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$888,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 47

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

A. Nix Mann Perkins & Will, Inc. of Atlanta  
B. Cooper Carry & Associates, Inc. of Atlanta  
C. Gensler *Architecture, Design & Planning Worldwide* of Atlanta

**Project No. I-6, “Odum Library Addition,” Valdosta State University**

Project Description: 94,601 gsf expansion, including 1 standard classroom, 1 distance learning classroom, 1 class laboratory (dry lab), 17 faculty offices, 13 administrative offices and 5 technology support areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$14,248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)</td>
<td>$10,911,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E (fixed) Fee</td>
<td>$655,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 41

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

A. Jova/Daniels/Busby Architects of Atlanta, in association with IPG of Valdosta  
B. Gensler *Architecture, Design & Planning Worldwide* of Atlanta  
C. Gardner Spencer Smith Sarden & Partners of Atlanta
9. **Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia** (Continued)

**Project No. I-7, “Learning Resource Center (North Campus),” DeKalb College**

Project Description: 71,500 gsf Learning Resources Center, including a replacement Library, 5 administrative offices, instructional support laboratories, and media services spaces.

- Total Project Cost: $8,685,000
- Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation): $6,849,000
- A/E (fixed) Fee: $427,100

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 56

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
- A. The Architecture Group of Atlanta, in association with Marcellus, Wright, Cox & Smith of Richmond, Virginia
- B. Leo A. Daly Company of Atlanta
- C. Tippett Clepper Associates of Atlanta

**Project No. I-8, “Health & Physical Education Building,” Fort Valley State University**

Project Description: 145,000 gsf Health & Physical Education Building, including 3 standard classrooms, 2 classroom labs, 10 faculty offices, 2 administrative offices, gymnasium, natatorium, weight training, infant & child development and related support spaces.

- Total Project Cost: $18,927,000
- Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation): $15,167,000
- A/E (fixed) Fee: $910,600

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 61

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:
- A. Stanley, Love-Stanley, P.C. of Atlanta
- B. Heery International, Inc. of Atlanta
- C. Goode Van Slyke Architecture, Inc. of Atlanta

10. **Increase in Project Cost: Science Building, Augusta State University**

Approved: The Board authorized an adjustment in total project cost from $17,893,654 to $19,422,841 for the construction of a new science building at Augusta State University. The increased amount will be provided by the campus and will allow GSFIC to accept a construction bid proposal and allow this project to proceed.
10. Increase in Project Cost: Science Building, Augusta State University (Continued)

**Background:** This project was authorized as part of the fiscal year 1994 major capital outlay program.

Construction bids have been received, with the lowest responsive construction proposal exceeding the anticipated construction cost by some $1.5 million.

Completion of the construction drawings was unexpectedly delayed, in part due to the opportunity to relocate an ancient water tower to allow the new building to be more appropriately sited on campus. The resiting necessitated a redesign of the foundation drawings which, together with the added time, accounts for $500,000.

The delay in completing the construction drawings is partially the cause for the increase (approximately $1,000,000 in increased cost due to an 18-month delay).

Based on a review of the bid proposals, it could not be expected that a rebid would result in lower costs. Likewise, a redesign of the building to reduce the size and scope of the project would result in an additional delay and, potentially, added costs due to time and inflation.
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The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, October 7, 1997 at approximately 2:15 p.m. in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Edgar L. Rhodes and Regents Shannon L. Amos, David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, and Elridge W. McMillan. Chair Rhodes reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 15 items. Of these items, two were discussion items, three were information items, and ten were action items. There were 185 appointments reviewed and recommended for approval. All action items, with the exception of section B of item 4, and all appointments were recommended for full approval by the Board. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Presentation/Discussion Item: Regents’ Teaching Excellence Awards

The Regents’ Teaching Excellence Awards were created by the April 1996 Board recommendations for the professional development initiative. In July 1996, Chancellor Stephen Portch announced that one faculty or staff member and one department or program from each of the institutional sectors would be selected for these awards each year. The primary criterion for these awards is demonstrated excellence in teaching and service to students. In March 1997, a call for nominations from all University System of Georgia institutions led to the submission of an outstanding group of nomination portfolios. Each of these portfolios highlighted the exceptional work being done by faculty and staff and departments and programs on our campuses. Six winners were selected by a review committee composed of faculty members from across the System. Following is a list of the winners, their institutions, and the institutional sectors they represent:

FACULTY/STAFF AWARDS

Research Universities
Dr. C. Henry Edwards, Professor of Mathematics, the University of Georgia

Regional and State Universities
Dr. JoAllen Bradham, Professor of English, Kennesaw State University

Two-Year Colleges
Dr. Charlyn Harper Browne, Professor of Psychology, Atlanta Metropolitan College

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM AWARDS

Research Universities
Department of Biology, Georgia State University

Regional and State Universities
Department of Geology, State University of West Georgia

Two-Year Colleges
Honors Program, Macon College
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Dr. James L. Muyskens, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, led a discussion of the scope of the Committee’s responsibilities and presented a preview of some of the issues that will be coming before the Committee during the upcoming year.

3. Approval Item: “University College” Organizational Unit

Approved: The Board approved the establishment of a transitional administrative entity called a "University College" at Augusta State University and at Columbus State University.

The Board directed in the new Admissions Policy that, in areas of the State where students do not have access to two-year colleges, senior institutions develop pathways for students who are unable to meet the higher admissions requirements being phased in by 2001. In response, Augusta State University and Columbus State University have each devised pilot projects that call for establishing an administrative entity called a "University College," a two-year college surrogate where a student denied admission to the senior institution can take a course of study that will provide him/her with the necessary skills and course work for subsequent admission to a senior institution.

In addition to the proposed pilot projects at Augusta and Columbus, East Georgia College and Georgia Southern University have collaborated to meet the needs of students who do not meet the admissions standards of Georgia Southern University. A consortium of two-year schools is working with Valdosta State University to devise another model to meet such needs in the Valdosta area. All models are to be viewed as pilots to be eliminated as the new admissions standards are phased in. It is anticipated that programs such as PREP will improve the preparation of students over time.

In contrast with these models, those developed at Augusta and Columbus call for the establishment of an administrative entity, the “University College.” Establishing such an administrative entity required Board approval, which the Academic Affairs staff requested.

4. Discussion and Approval Item: Regents’ Test Policy Revisions

Approved: The Board approved one change to Regents’ Test Policy, item A below. This change was endorsed by the Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs.

A. Converting Policy to Semesters

The first proposed change converts the Regents’ Test Policy to semesters. Under the semester system, the Regents’ Test will be administered during one testing period each fall and spring semester after approximately 10 to 12 weeks of instruction. The test will be administered on a flexible schedule during the summer. The proposed policy requires students to take the test no later than the first semester of the sophomore year. Those who have not passed the test by the second semester of the sophomore year (after earning 45 credit hours) must take remediation each semester until they have passed both parts of the test. The proposed policy permits institutional flexibility in allowing or requiring students to take the test before they have earned 30 credit hours or to take remediation before they have earned 45 credit hours. Students who are not enrolled may be permitted to take the test at the discretion of the institution.
4. **Discussion and Approval Item: Regents’ Test Policy Revisions** (Continued)

A. **Converting Policy to Semesters** (Continued)

Board Policy 308

An examination (the Regents' Test) to assess the competency level in reading and writing of all students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs leading to the baccalaureate degree in University System institutions shall be administered. The following statement shall be the policy of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia on this examination.

The formulation and administration of the Regents' Test shall be as determined by the Chancellor.

Each institution of the University System of Georgia shall assure the other institutions, and the System as a whole, that students obtaining a degree from that institution possess certain minimum skills of reading and writing. The Regents' Testing Program has been developed to help in the attainment of this goal. The objectives of the Testing Program are: (1) to provide System-wide information on the status of student competence in the areas of reading and writing; and (2) to provide a uniform means of identifying those students who fail to attain the minimum levels of competence in the areas of reading and writing.

Students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs leading to the baccalaureate degree shall pass the Regents' Test as a requirement for graduation. Students must take the test in their first semester of enrollment after earning 30 credit hours if they have not taken it previously. (Institutions may not prohibit students who have earned at least 30 credit hours from taking the test for the first time.) At an institution’s discretion, students may be permitted to take the test during a semester in which they are not enrolled.

Each institution shall provide an appropriate program of remediation and shall require students who have not passed both parts of the test by the time they have earned 45 credit hours to take the appropriate remedial course or courses each semester of enrollment until they have passed both parts.

Students with 30 or more semester credit hours transferring from outside of the System or from a System program that does not require the Regents’ Test should take the test during their first semester of enrollment in a program leading to the baccalaureate degree. Those who have not passed before their third semester of enrollment are subject to the remediation requirement.

The Regents' Test is not a requirement for an associate of applied science degree or an associate of science degree in an allied health field, although institutions may choose to require the test for these degrees.

A student holding a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education will not be required to complete the Regents' Test in order to receive a degree from a University System institution.
4. Discussion and Approval Item: Regents’ Test Policy Revisions (Continued)

Tabled: Item B below was tabled to be reconsidered by the Board at a later date.

B. Limiting Regents’ Test Attempts

The second proposed change was in response to a request by members of the Education Committee to limit the number of times that students may retake the Regents’ Test.

Currently, there is no limit to the number of times students may take remediation and retake the Regents’ Test. As suggested by members of the Education Committee, the proposed policy would limit the number of attempts. Once students have earned 45 semester credit hours, they would be permitted to retake the test no more than four times and to enroll in remediation no more than three semesters. Under the proposed policy, students who still have not passed would be suspended for at least two years.

It was proposed that the following paragraph be added to Board Policy 306:

After students have earned 45 credit hours, they may not retake either part of the test more than four times and may not enroll in remediation for either part more than three semesters. This limitation prohibits students who have not passed from enrolling in college-credit courses for more than three semesters after earning 45 credit hours. Those students who have not passed within three semesters of enrollment or four attempts at the test after earning 45 hours are not permitted to enroll at a System institution or to retake the test for at least two years. After two years a student may, at the institution’s discretion, be permitted to retake the test no more than twice and enroll in remediation once. Students readmitted to take remediation may not take other courses until they have passed both parts of the test.

5. Establishment of a Major in Computer Networking Technology Under the Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) Degree, Clayton College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard A. Skinner to establish a major in computer networking technology under the existing associate of applied science degree, effective October 8, 1997.

Abstract: The goal of the major in computer networking technology under the existing associate of applied science degree is to provide educational opportunities to individuals that will enable them to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to succeed in microcomputer support and local area network (“LAN”) installation, operation, administration, and service.

Program: In addition to preparing support personnel for entry-level positions in microcomputer support and local area network installation, operation, administration, and service, the A.A.S. program will prepare students in Internet working concepts, network management, UNIX, protocol analysis, computer peripheral devices, troubleshooting, and customer relations. The addition of the associate degree will compliment the existing computer network certificate and will allow the university to meet the needs of the region with more highly qualified students. The demand for computer support specialists in Georgia is predicted to grow by 112.7% from 1994 to 2005 (Planning for Tomorrow: Industry and Occupational Outlook, Georgia Department of Labor, 1996, p. 10). Approximately 20 students in the computer network certificate program have expressed an interest in completing the A.A.S. degree program. It is anticipated that students will
5. Establishment of a Major in Computer Networking Technology Under the Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) Degree, Clayton College & State University (Continued)

acquire the skills for employment in education and the transportation, communications, and utilities industries.

Curriculum: The 92 to 95 quarter hour program (61 to 63 semester hours) will be taught by regular full-time and part-time faculty members at Clayton College & State University. In addition to the program core, students will be required to exhibit proficiency in such technical areas as network administration, microcomputer repair, computer peripheral devices, troubleshooting, and customer relations.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 45, 55, and 65.

Funding: Clayton College & State University will initiate and maintain this program through the reallocation of existing funds. No new state allocation is requested.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2000, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the System Office to determine the success of the program’s implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, viability, and cost-effectiveness indicated in the proposal.

6. Transfer of the Master of Public Administration Degree From Georgia Southern University to Augusta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of Presidents William Bloodworth, Jr. (Augusta State University) and Nicholas Henry (Georgia Southern University) to transfer the master of public administration degree from Georgia Southern University to Augusta State University.

Program: The degree program is currently offered on the campus of Augusta State University. This completes the smooth transition of program authority from an external degree program of Georgia Southern University to Augusta State University. The success of the external degree program arrangement was the catalyst for this transfer of academic and administrative responsibility. Augusta State University faculty have designed courses to follow instruction provided in the Augusta/Fort Gordon program of Georgia Southern University. This will allow students who began their degree program with Georgia Southern University the opportunity to complete their necessary requirements through the continuation of the program under the auspices of Augusta State University. The master of public administration core faculty will be comprised of individuals from the Departments of Political Science and Sociology, School of Arts and Sciences, and School of Business Administration. As Augusta State University assumes responsibility for this program, the university will seek accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.

Curriculum: A student who is currently employed in the public sector or who has had significant public management experience will take 24 hours (8 courses) of required public administration core classes, 9 hours (3 courses) of electives, and the 3-hour capstone/thesis course. This completes 36 hours of semester study. A student who has had no public agency experience will take 24 hours (8 courses) of required public
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6. Transfer of the Master of Public Administration Degree From Georgia Southern University to
Augusta State University (Continued)

administration classes, 6 hours (2 courses) of electives, a 3-hour internship course (PA 7000), and the 3-hour capstone/thesis course. This also completes 36 hours of semester study.

Enrollment: As of September 17, 1997, the number of students accepted into the master of public administration program totaled 17. Eight students are provisionally accepted, and a total of five students who began the program under the auspices of Georgia Southern University are completing the program.

Funding: Augusta State University will maintain this program through the reallocation of existing funds.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2000, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the System Office to determine the success of the program’s implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, viability, and cost-effectiveness indicated in the proposal.

7. Transfer of the Associate of Science External Degree Program in Dental Hygiene From the Medical College of Georgia to Floyd College

Approved: The Board approved the request of Presidents Francis J. Tedesco (Medical College of Georgia) and H. Lynn Cundiff (Floyd College) that the Medical College’s external associate of science in dental hygiene degree program currently offered in Rome in cooperation with Floyd College be transferred to Floyd College, effective July 1, 1998.

Background: In line with its recently revised mission, the Medical College of Georgia has been moving toward the elimination and/or transferring of all of its associate degree programs. Currently, the Medical College offers an external associate of science in dental hygiene degree program in Rome in cooperation with Floyd College. The proposed program transfer would result in the transfer of all four faculty members, all of whom are nontenured, from the Medical College to Floyd College in the same rank and at the same salary level. The sole staff member would also be transferred at the same salary level. All faculty members and staff have agreed to the transfer. Floyd College will assume the Medical College’s lease on rented space for this program, and all equipment will be transferred to Floyd College. The current budget for this program, which in fiscal year 1998 is $334,099, is a separate appropriation and will be transferred in its entirety from the Medical College to Floyd College.

Students who are currently enrolled in the program will receive their degrees from the Medical College, and all subsequent classes will receive their degrees from Floyd College. Floyd College will notify the Commission on the Accreditation of the American Dental Association of this transfer in anticipation of the next site visit. Dental hygiene associate degree programs are designed to prepare graduates for clinical practice under the supervision of a licensed dentist. The graduates will have developed knowledge and skills in the prevention of dental disease. Other skills developed during training include taking and recording medical and dental histories, performing an oral inspection, exposing and processing dental radiographs, removing deposits and stains from teeth, polishing teeth, applying preventive agents, preparing diagnostic casts, and other duties that may be assigned by the dentist which are legal in the State of Georgia.
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8. Termination of the Associate of Science Degree in Histologic Technology, Medical College of Georgia
**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco to terminate the associate of science degree in histologic technology, effective October 8, 1997.

**Background:** In accordance with the Medical College of Georgia’s mission statement, the Medical College is phasing out its associate degree programs. This request to terminate the associate of science degree in histologic technology is one more step toward that goal. The termination process has been underway for several years. The last student graduated from this program in 1993, and none have been enrolled since that time. In addition, the faculty member who taught in the program has retired. Therefore, no students or faculty will be affected by the termination of this program.

9. **Revised Institutional Statutes, Georgia Southwestern State University**

**Approved:** The Board approved the revised institutional statutes presented by President Michael Hanes of Georgia Southwestern State University, effective October 8, 1997.

The revisions have been 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 Georgia Southwestern State University. A copy of the revised statutes is on file in the Office of Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

As a result of the change in the name of the institution, all official policies and procedures have been reviewed to ensure that they contain current language and nomenclature.

10. **Intellectual Property Policy, Georgia Southern University**

**Approved:** The Board approved the intellectual property policy presented by President Nicholas Henry of Georgia Southern University, effective October 8, 1997.

The policy has been carefully reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs and is consistent with Board of Regents Policy 603. A copy of this policy is on file in the Office of Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

11. **Termination of the Major in Consumer Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Science Degree in Family and Consumer Sciences, Georgia Southern University**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Nicholas Henry to terminate the major in consumer studies under the existing bachelor of science degree in family and consumer sciences, effective October 8, 1997.

The major in consumer studies has experienced low enrollment and has been judged to be a low-priority program. Its resources have been redirected to higher-priority programs. No faculty or students will be negatively impacted by the deletion of this program.

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

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

The following administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Education Committee Chair Edgar L. Rhodes and were approved by the Board. All regular appointments are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.
CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS: AT THE REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENTS OF VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM, THE BOARD CONFERRED THE TITLE OF EMERITUS UPON THE FOLLOWING FACULTY MEMBERS, EFFECTIVE ON THE DATES INDICATED:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY


(B) MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA


(C) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA


(D) ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY


(E) STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA


(F) BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE


(G) DALTON COLLEGE

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

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

APPELBE, WILLIAM F.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF COMPUTING, LEAVE FROM JAN 5, 1998 TO JUN 12, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

BOTTOMLEY, LAWRENCE ANDREW: PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY & BIOCHEMISTRY, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM SEP 1, 1997 TO AUG 31, 1998, WITH PAY.


KENNEDY, ROBERT: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, IVAN ALLEN COL OF MGT, INT’L AFFAIRS AND POLICY, LEAVE FROM NOV 1, 1997 TO DEC 31, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

SERFOZO, RICHARD F.: PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND SYSTEMS ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, LEAVE FROM SEP 24, 1997 TO MAR 20, 1998, WITH PAY.

WALKER, NEFF: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM SEP 22, 1997 TO JUN 12, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

YU, NAI-TENG: PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM JUL 1, 1997 TO JUN 30, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

ATHENS, LUCIA ELENA: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN, LEAVE FROM SEP 12, 1997 TO JUN 11, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

LADIS, ANDREW: FRANKLIN PROFESSOR OF ART, LAMAR DODD SCHOOL OF ART, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM JAN 4, 1998 TO JUN 11, 1998, WITH PAY.


MYERS, JULIA ANN: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN, LEAVE FROM SEP 12, 1997 TO JUN 11, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

(C) GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY


LOVETT, REBECCA F.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF MIDDLE GRADES EDUCATION, JOHN H. LOUNSBURY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, LEAVE FROM SEP 1, 1997 TO JUN 13, 1998, WITH PAY.

(D) DALTON COLLEGE


APPROVAL OF FACULTY FOR TENURE STATUS CHANGE: THE BOARD APPROVED TENURE STATUS CHANGES FOR THE FOLLOWING FACULTY MEMBERS, EFFECTIVE ON THE DATES INDICATED:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PETRAGLIA-BAHRI, JOSEPH: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF LITERATURE, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE, IVAN ALLEN COL OF MGT, INT’L AFFAIRS AND POLICY, THREE
YEARS PROBATIONARY CREDIT TOWARDS TENURE, EFFECTIVE OCT 8, 1997.

(B) MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA


(C) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY


APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

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

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY


PAYNE, CALVIN LEE: TEMP ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING SEP 22, 1997 AND ENDING JUN 12, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

WANG, JAMES T: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING SEP 22, 1997 AND ENDING JUN 12, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(B) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY


(C) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
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12. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions (Continued)

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

(C) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA (CONTINUED)

DIXON, MARY LOUISA: EXTENSION ASSOCIATE, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE - HOME ECONOMICS, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1997 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.


HARRIS, JOHN W.: BOAT OPERATOR, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUN 24, 1997 AND ENDING JUN 25, 1997, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.


(D) ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY


(E) AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY


(F) CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY


(G) GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY


REESE, RICHARD P.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING SEP 1, 1997 AND ENDING AUG 13, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(H) STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

12. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions

(Continued)

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

(H) STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA (CONTINUED)


(I) COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

OGDEN, FAYE C: CLERK III, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1997 AND ENDING AUG 31, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(J) DEKALB COLLEGE


(K) GAINESVILLE COLLEGE


APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

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

(A) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA


SEAGRAVES, MARY R.: CLERK I (ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION), AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1997 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.


(B) FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY


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

- GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY: 17
- GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY: 10
- MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA: 4
- UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA: 37
- GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY: 7
- VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY: 9
- ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY: 10
- ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY: 2
- AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY: 3
- CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY: 3
- COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY: 1
- FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY: 8
- GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY: 6
- GEORGIA SOUTHERN STATE UNIVERSITY: 1
- KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY: 15
- NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY: 8
- STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA: 7
- ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE: 10
- BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE: 1
- DALTON COLLEGE: 3
- DARTON COLLEGE: 2
- DEKALB COLLEGE: 10
- EAST GEORGIA COLLEGE: 1
- FLOYD COLLEGE: 1
- GORDON COLLEGE: 2
- MACON STATE COLLEGE: 4
- SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE: 4
13. **Information Item: Establishment of the Center for Digital Commerce, Georgia State University**

President Carl V. Patton has informed the Board of Regents that Georgia State University has established its Center for Digital Commerce.

The center will focus on the means to effect, and the resulting effects of, substituting digital media, transmission, and interaction for the traditional physical counterparts in all aspects of business-to-business and business-to-consumer transactions. Technology, policy, legal, economic, social, and professional dimensions of digital commerce will be examined by an interdisciplinary group of faculty and graduate research assistants with the support of external sponsors and research contracts. Both educational and research missions will be pursued. The center will report administratively to the Department of Computer Information Systems in the College of Business Administration.

14. **Information Item Concerning Clinical Training**

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7 and 8, 1984, the presidents of various institutions of the University System executed 79 memoranda of understanding for clinical training during the month of October. A chart listing the various types of clinical agreements was presented to the Board in the agenda material. The chart is on file in the Office of Planning and Policy Analysis in the Division of Academic Affairs in the Central Office, and copies of each agreement are on file at the institutions concerned.

15. **Information Item Concerning Service Agreements**

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7 and 8, 1984, the presidents of various institutions executed service agreements with various agencies for the purposes and periods designated in a list presented to the Board in the agenda material. A brief synopsis of each agreement was presented. Awards for the month of October totaled $378,443. The list of these service agreements is on file in the office of Planning and Policy Analysis in the Division of Academic Affairs in the Central Office, and copies of each agreement are on file at the institutions concerned.
COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, October 7, 1997 at approximately 3:20 p.m. in room 203, the Meeting Room, of the Harry S. Downs Continuing Education Center at Clayton College & State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Juanita P. Baranco, Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Edgar L. Jenkins, and Donald M. Leeborn, Jr. Chair Baranco reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items of information, one requiring Board authorization. The Committee also evaluated ten applications for review. Nine of the applications were denied, and one was remanded to the college with instructions. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Information Item: Correspondence, Macon State College**

This item regarded a letter to the Regents from Mrs. Merete Daffer. After some discussion, the Committee authorized Ms. Elaine Newell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, to reply to Mrs. Daffer.

2. **Barron v. Board of Regents**

With regard to the case of Winston Barron v. Board of Regents, the Board authorized Ms. Kimberly Lewis, Assistant Attorney General, to settle the case.

3. **Applications for Review**

   A. In the matter of Shirley Reese at Albany State University, concerning nonrenewal of her contract, that the application for review be denied.

   B. In the matter of Josephine Raybon at Albany State University, concerning termination of her employment, that the application for review be denied.

   C. In the matter of Todd K. Gallagher at North Georgia College and State University, concerning his suspension, that the application for review be denied.

   D. In the matter of J. Landrum Kelly at Georgia Southern University, concerning termination of his employment, that the application for review be denied.

   E. In the matter of Phyllis B. Matthews at Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning termination of employment, that the application for review be denied.

   F. In the matter of Richard H. Cotton at South Georgia College, concerning termination of employment, that the application for review be denied.

   G. In the matter of Renee Daniels King at Georgia State University, concerning termination of her doctoral program, that the application for review be denied.

   H. In the matter of Don Cook at Darton College, concerning denial of sick leave and merit raise, that the application for review be remanded to the college with instructions.
COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

3. **Applications for Review** (Continued)

   I. In the matter of Willie Johnson at Savannah State University, concerning his grievance, that the application for review be denied.

   J. In the matter of Denise Adams at Gordon College, concerning her dismissal from Nursing 205, that the application for review be denied.
CHANCELLOR’S REPORT TO THE BOARD

After the Committee reports, Chair Clark turned the meeting over to Chancellor Portch for his report to the Board. The Chancellor thanked Chair Clark and expressed that it had been a treat to be at Clayton College & State University. He said that it is an unusual institution with contrasting strengths; it’s metropolitan yet idyllic, it has Spivey Hall and the Information Technology Project (“ITP”), and it was founded by Harry Downs and now has President Skinner. The Chancellor remarked, “You have to get up very early in the morning if you don’t want to have your pocket picked by Skinner.” For example, he explained, President Skinner was soliciting him all summer for dollars for his anticipated decline in enrollment. The Chancellor had decided instead to wait and see what happened, and in fact, enrollment increased by six students. However, the Chancellor lauded President Skinner for the accomplishment of steady enrollment, considering the $200 increase in student fees due to ITP and the anxiety that some students might have had of the program.

The Chancellor expressed that this had been a fun month for him because he’d had the chance to visit campuses more, including a week that began at Bainbridge College (charging the Presidential Search Committee), continued up the road to Darton College, then to Albany State University, before heading to Americus and Georgia Southwestern State University. From there, the Chancellor traveled to Eastman to cheer Middle Georgia’s impressive football team to victory over Troy State (in the rain). Other trips took the Chancellor to Gainesville, Canton, Kennesaw, Athens, and, most importantly, Bremen where Regent Rhodes and he visited Speaker of the House Thomas B. Murphy and updated his wardrobe, purchasing four suits in 12 minutes. “Which,” he exclaimed, “is exactly my type of shopping!”

On these trips, the Chancellor made it a point to visit numerous legislators, to make editorial board visits, and to spend quality time with faculty, staff, and students. He expressed that nothing is more reassuring than to talk to the System’s students. It impressed him so much that he asked students to make the budget presentation to the Governor. A Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program (“PREP”) student, a former West Georgia Academy student, and a recent HOPE graduate now teaching Spanish in Georgia provided the eloquent voice for the budget request. He explained that the PREP student stressed how the program had increased his attendance, improved his reading and math scores, and, most importantly, raised his aspirations. The West Georgia Academy student, although visually impaired, attended the program at 16 years of age; not quite 18 years old now, he recently entered Georgia Tech only 15 credit hours shy of being a senior because of the program. The student’s mother told the Governor that without the program, her son would have gone out of state for a program like this, then to attend college, and probably to work. The HOPE scholar explained to the Governor how she came to realize the increasing Spanish-speaking population while working in a restaurant as an undergraduate and how she wanted to give something back to the State by helping it make the adjustment to a changing population base. “It was very powerful,” the Chancellor said of the students’ presentation.

On the international front, the Chancellor had the opportunity to sign an exchange agreement with the Jiangsu province of China. This is a Systemwide relationship which dates back to 1985 that was spearheaded by Kennesaw State University. With the Minister of Education, the Chancellor not only exchanged documents, he recounted, “We also exchanged ties!” Further, the Chancellor said that it was also his privilege to travel to Washington to honor Czech President Havel as he received the 1997 Fulbright Prize for International Understanding.
CHANCELLOR’S REPORT TO THE BOARD

The Chancellor stated that our institutions continue to be innovative and successful. He cited Georgia State University’s recent funding and extramural activities as being particularly innovative. For example, Georgia State University is using a new approach in alumni giving. Its offer is simple. The earlier you turn in your gift, the less likely your phone is to ring later. Donors who contribute before September 20 will have their names taken off the telemarketing list for the year! Additionally, Georgia State also has a clever marketing theme in promoting their men’s and women’s basketball games. It’s offering a money-back guarantee! For any home game that the Panthers don’t win, the university will offer any season ticket holder a full refund for that portion of the package.

On the issue of technology in campus life, the Chancellor remarked that at the University of Georgia, if you are unfortunate enough to receive a parking fine but have access to a computer with Internet access, you can file your appeal 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, via the Internet and can even receive your appeal outcome via E-mail. Furthermore, the Chancellor lauded the success of South Georgia College, the only two-year institution in Georgia to be listed in the publication Most Popular Web Sites: The Best of the New From A 2 Z. “Speaking of cyberspace,” the Chancellor continued, “Georgia Tech’s Rambling Wreck pilots Cathy and Larry Lee came up from third place to win, by 17 seconds, their first entry into the world air games this year.” He explained that the race consisted of traveling 6,600 miles in 10 days from Reykjavik, Iceland to Izmir, Turkey. It was a team effort for 15 technical students armed on the ground below with their computer software, guiding the pilots with information regarding their route and weather conditions.

Citing accomplishments of some other System institutions, the Chancellor pronounced that Mr. Louis Squyres, Associate Professor of Business at DeKalb College, was the recipient of the National Award for Outstanding Service to the Two-Year Section of the American Accounting Association. Also, the week of September 15, Armstrong Atlantic State University received a $200,000 grant for Professor Maryellen Cosgrove and P-16, a promise of $300,000 additional funding for the Dewitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Pathways to Teaching Program, $150,000 to establish the Arthur M. Gignilliat, Jr. Distinguished Professorship Fund, and a $20,000 gift from Scottish Rite. The Chancellor went on to say that the System institutions are doing an exemplary job of diversifying their resource bases, as demonstrated by the fact that the Rosalynn Carter Institute at Georgia Southwestern State University received a grant for $351,000, the largest in its ten-year history, from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation of Princeton, New Jersey. In conclusion, the Chancellor said that Professor James B. Whitenton of Southern Polytechnic State University had E-mailed him about the success of the new faculty development program. Professor Whitenton was one of the “first generation” of participants at Georgia Tech this year, and the Chancellor relayed that he had said that the experience had proven to be particularly deep, “certainly one of intellectual, emotional, and even spiritual development.” The Chancellor shared more of the E-mail about the faculty development program experience: “The most important and long-lasting effect [of this program] is the quality improvement within and - this being harder to define - a sense of greater significance in what I am, what I do, and how both I and my field (which is physics and much more than physics) touch the lives of others.”

The Chancellor concluded that this had been a good month and that this is a good time to reflect. He said that at the beginning of an academic year, it is important to feel that “hope springs eternal.” Students have a chance to make better grades this year, freshmen have a chance at a fresh start after high school, and the Board can see the power of the experience of the students in the System. In closing, the Chancellor thanked Chair Clark for allowing him to speak before the Board. At approximately 10:00 a.m., the Board took a short break.
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

At approximately 10:15 a.m., Chair Clark convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole, and he turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern thanked Chair Clark and the Vice Chair of the Committee, Regent Allgood. He explained that this meeting would be the first of a number of sessions dealing with the issue of teacher preparation, and he welcomed on behalf of all the Regents Dr. Sharon James, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University of Wisconsin System, who was formerly the Special Assistant to the Chancellor.

Chair Leebern reminded the Board that it had decided to review teacher preparation as a specific project related to its vision for a more highly educated Georgia. As Chair Clark pointed out in July, this project will be a complement to the work being done by the State and regional/local P-16 councils. He said that Chancellor Portch and Dr. James L. Muyskens, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, would be introducing the topic. Chair Leebern encouraged the Regents to ask questions and discuss the issue, and then he called on the Chancellor to introduce the teacher preparation agenda.

Chancellor Portch stressed the importance of this project and the importance of avoiding “quick fixes.” He noted how the schools of today and tomorrow look very different from the schools that the Regents attended. In the 1950s, for example, only about 10% of the adult population had completed high school and only about 4% had completed college. In Georgia today, there are about twice as many students as there were then. Additionally, most of the children in school in the 1950s were raised in homes that had two parents, one of whom likely stayed home. Today, a minority of students come from such backgrounds. In the 1950s, there were very few career opportunities for African-Americans of either gender, and career options for women of all ethnic groups were largely limited to being teachers, secretaries, and nurses. Today, there are many more career opportunities for women, which has had an impact on the schools. Working conditions have also changed in schools, the Chancellor said. Many students now have to enter schools through metal detectors. Georgia has a higher percentage of students in poverty than the national average; 42% of elementary students and 26% of secondary students in Georgia receive free or reduced-price lunches. Moreover, Georgia ranks sixth among the states for teachers’ reporting weapons possession as a problem, and physical conflicts are reported in over half of Georgia’s secondary schools every year. The Chancellor further reported that nationally, teachers perceive themselves as having little influence over decision making in schools. They also earn less than others with equivalent education. As the Regents examine this issue during the year, Chancellor Portch asked that they keep in mind the reality of what today’s schools are like as well as how they would like the schools to be.

The Chancellor’s final cautionary note to the Board was that teacher preparation is an exceedingly complex and multifaceted issue. For example, when he goes to deliver his Rotary Club speeches, he hears two opinions on the issue. The first opinion is that the Board should eliminate the “touchy-feely” teacher education courses. The second opinion is that, in response to the assumption that the schools are turning out ill-prepared students to the University System, the schools are complaining that the System produces poor-quality teachers. Those are the gut reactions from the general public when you discuss such issues, explained the Chancellor. He expressed that he hoped that as the Board looked at these issues, the Regents will see that the issues are much more complicated and that it will take many partners to solve the problem. He stressed that such partnerships are being formed. The information from these Board meetings is being shared in advance with key education leaders in K-12, and such leaders are being invited to participate in this process. The Chancellor acknowledged that Dr. Bill Barr, Executive Director of the Georgia Association STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”
of School Administrators, and Mr. Herb Bernell of the Georgia Association of Education Leaders were both present at the meeting. He said that he expects others to join in this effort. Although he recognized that the University System is a part of the problem, the Chancellor stressed that alone, it cannot solve all of the ills of teacher preparation. A number of those ills are societal ills, including the fact that the profession of teaching is not valued as highly as other professions.

In closing, the Chancellor said that the Board should anticipate that by the end of the year, there will be some innovations and new ideas, but he cautioned against expectations that the Board could fix everything. He said, “In education, you must have an urgency about getting better but a patience for the results, and too often, the two are not hand in hand.” The Chancellor urged that over the first three months, the Board should learn as much as it can about the issue. He said that the first of three questions would be addressed at this meeting: who are Georgia’s teachers, and how did they get here? In November, the Board will focus on what happens when one enters a teacher preparation program. Finally, in December, the Board will learn what happens when a person graduates and begins teaching. Then, the next few months will be spent developing some principles for change and finally creating some actions for change. The Chancellor then introduced Senior Vice Chancellor Muyskens.

Dr. Muyskens thanked the Chancellor and reiterated that this project must be a team effort. He said that the Central Office staff had been looking for people across the State to work with the Board on this and that it had put in place the Teacher Preparation Advisory Committee, which includes people from the System and teachers and leaders in the school systems. In an effort to be all-inclusive, Dr. Muyskens stressed that as much input as possible was needed from various people who have ties to the efforts already underway in the State. He expressed that he was pleased to report that the Central Office is planning to bring on board a master teacher in residence to work in the Office on this project. He stressed that although many ideas sound good in theory, they also have to be good in practice, and the master teacher would be able to provide “reality checks” to the effort. Dr. Muyskens said that the Teacher Preparation Advisory Committee had been formed and that there had been a meeting of vice presidents for academic affairs, deans of education, and deans of arts and sciences, so the initiative is well underway.

The Board has already taken some actions which can be built upon, explained Dr. Muyskens. In 1991, the Board adopted “A Plan for Change,” which had two strong recommendations. The first of these recommendations was that all people being prepared to teach must have stronger academic preparation. The second recommendation was that there must be more hands-on experience in the classroom during teacher preparation, since students learn by doing. Dr. Muyskens explained that the impact of these changes can already be seen and that these two reforms will help immensely going forward. After these recommendations had been adopted, the Board looked at how to continue the momentum across the State. The result was the P-16 initiative and the establishment of 16 P-16 councils, covering virtually all areas of the State. Dr. Muyskens stressed that with the P-16 councils, there are 15 institutions with teacher preparation programs, and 6 of those have Challenge grants. He explained that this indicates that some very good ideas have been developed, since to get a Challenge grant, one has to be thinking “outside the box” and there has to be national recognition that something is being done to make a difference which has a chance to contribute to really solving the problem. He explained that this is a very promising note as the Strategic Planning Committee begins working on the issue of teacher preparation. Dr. Muyskens said that the effort is also connected nationally. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future is working on teacher preparation and some of the same issues that the Chancellor had stressed as well as how more STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

professional support can be provided for teachers in the classroom. The University System is also a part of the Council for Basic Education/American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, which is working on questions about teacher preparation and considering the issue of how teachers can be better
prepared to deal with the broad range of students that exists today. Perhaps what is most important, Dr. Muyskens affirmed, is the fact that there is collaboration within the State. He stressed that the effort being made here, P-16, is one that includes all sectors of education in Georgia. The Board of Regents is working hand in hand with the Department of Education and the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”).

The Board is entering this year’s agenda with much already accomplished, Dr. Muyskens said. Several years ago, for example, the Board established a policy that requires the System’s teacher preparation programs to be accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (“NCATE”), which has certainly raised standards within the State. The Board must also be mindful of the magnitude of the challenges before it, he said. The schools are overloaded with problems and solutions that do not work. Dr. Muyskens expressed that he did not want the Board to spend time coming up with more solutions that do not work, creating a larger problem. He stressed that solutions are needed that work. Therefore, the Board will begin by examining data and trying to get a better understanding of the problem, so that it can work from there. Several people will be helping the Board examine the present situation. Later, the Board will begin to formulate some principles. Toward the end of the year, the Board will examine some best practices and make some recommendations. Dr. Muyskens then asked the Board to return its attention to the question of the day: who are Georgia’s teachers, and how did they get there? He then asked Dr. Cathie M. Hudson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis, to present some data.

Dr. Hudson explained that she would be giving a broad overview of information on teachers in Georgia as well as information on majors and graduates in teacher education in the University System. She explained that all of the information on public schools was obtained from the State Department of Education. In general, school districts follow county lines or city lines in Georgia, but several counties have merged their districts. There are over 2,000 schools in over 180 districts with about 320 high schools in Georgia. Over 1.3 million students are educated by over 80,000 teachers. Nationally, there are approximately 2.6 million teachers in public schools, and more than half of those are in elementary education, while about a third teach in high schools. There is no central source of information about private schools in Georgia, but there are approximately 215 private high schools in Georgia.

According to Dr. Hudson, the following information comes from a survey conducted by the Southern Regional Education Board in 1993-1994. The proportion of women in the education workforce increased during that period. While more men have come into teaching over the past few decades, the workforce is still predominantly female. Nationally, the proportion of teachers who are female is approximately 70%, but Georgia has a much higher proportion of approximately 81%. In the past few years, the proportion of male teachers has decreased rather than increased. A problem both in Georgia and in the nation as a whole is that the proportion of minority teachers lags behind the proportion of minority students. In Georgia, the proportion of minority students is approximately 42%. About 90% of minority students in Georgia are African-American, while the proportion of African-American teachers is about 20%.

Dr. Hudson then presented some data from the summer of 1997. A larger percentage of women are now teachers than in 1994. About half of Georgia’s teachers have graduate degrees, just slightly less than the national average of 53%. Georgia’s education workforce is slightly older than the nation’s; the average age of Georgia’s teachers is 42. However, Georgia has the largest proportion of teachers in the nation with only one to two years of experience. There are 15 System institutions and 19 private institutions in the State offering teacher education programs. The following institutions were founded with the primary purpose of producing teachers: Fort Valley State University, Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, and Valdosta State University.
Next, Dr. Hudson discussed the issue of majors. She explained that students in the University System can declare their majors at any point, but teacher education majors are not admitted into such programs until their junior years; therefore, the numbers sometimes shift in the first two years. For over ten years, education has remained among the top three majors for System graduates. In the last five years, education has been second only to business as the most popular major. The proportion of students majoring in teacher education has remained very stable at around 9% to 10% over the last ten years. Approximately 9% of Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") takers in Georgia declared that they wanted to be teachers, the same percentage as the nation as a whole. The number of teacher education majors has increased at a rate of about 65% over the last ten years.

Dr. Hudson then shifted her presentation from the subject of majors to the subject of degrees conferred. The number of bachelor’s degrees in education has increased by approximately 65%, and the proportion of master’s degrees has increased at the same rate. In the University System, the number of educational specialist degrees has decreased slightly over the last ten years; 715 education specialists graduated this year, as opposed to about 800 ten years ago. Similarly, the number of doctorate degrees has very gradually decreased; 160 doctorate students graduated this year, as opposed to about 190 ten years ago. Although the percentage of female teachers has increased in the State as a whole, in the University System, the percentage of female graduates has remained fairly stable. Similarly, although the percentage of African-American teachers is decreasing in the State, the percentage of African-American education graduates is increasing in the University System. However, whereas the proportion of African-American education majors is 20%, only 14% of education graduates are African-American, indicating a loss of some African-American education majors. In 1997, bachelor’s degrees in education represented about 16% of all bachelor’s degrees conferred in the University System, compared to 9% nationally.

The most popular education major is early childhood, explained Dr. Hudson, followed by a group of unspecified majors who can teach on any level (e.g., physical education). In general, teacher education graduates enter college less prepared than their counterparts who major in other areas. Last year, education graduates had an average SAT score of 972, somewhat lower than the average SAT scores of other graduates. Moreover, the PSAT scores of students who want to major in education are lower than the PSAT scores of other students. The same pattern holds true on the national level. Education graduates also have a slightly lower high school grade point average ("GPA") than other graduates. On a positive note, Dr. Hudson added, in Georgia, the HOPE Promise Scholarship Program began three years ago to encourage better-prepared students to enter teacher education, and it is open to all juniors with a cumulative grade point average of 3.6. If such a student is accepted into a teacher education program, he or she will receive up to $3,000 per year in forgivable student loans in addition to what he or she gets from the HOPE Scholarship. The student must commit to repay the loan after graduation by teaching in one of Georgia’s public schools. So far, only 450 students have received Promise Scholarships, and about 75% of those awards have gone to students attending System institutions. Approximately 50% of the awards were granted to early childhood majors, while only STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

about 21% were granted to middle grades education majors. She explained that the next speaker would elaborate on that phenomenon.

At that time, Dr. Muyskens interjected that there were several key points in Dr. Hudson’s presentation that he wanted to emphasize. One of them was the problem of how to get more men into teaching. Regent Baranco responded, “Raise the salary,” while Chair Leebern queried as to why it was important. Dr. Muyskens asked if anyone on the Board would like to respond to Chair Leebern’s question. Regent Baranco said that men were needed as role models, particularly in the elementary schools. Dr. Muyskens agreed.
The second point Dr. Muyskens wanted to draw attention to was that more African-Americans need to be drawn into teaching. He said it should be considered by all of the partners involved in the effort, because the issue goes beyond the University System.

Dr. Muyskens’ third point was how to attract better-prepared high school students into teaching. He said that Regent Baranco’s suggestion to raise salaries may also apply here, but other answers may apply as well.

Regent McMillan expressed that he believes there is more to be considered than just salaries, since from the statistics, it appears that many teachers are leaving the profession after only one or two years. He said that some attention needs to be put on that phenomenon as well.

Regent Baranco expressed that she felt that Regent McMillan’s response was a “cop out.” She said that if the teaching profession were dominated by men, salaries would not be as low as they are.

Regent McMillan stressed that it was certainly part of the reason but that he believed that if asked why they were leaving the teaching profession so soon, 90% of those teachers would give answers that have nothing to do with salary, whether male or female.

Regent Baranco said that only about 1% of males even enter the profession. In response, Regent McMillan said there were many other reasons for that.

Regent Leeber stressed the strong recruitment efforts of many colleges. The Chancellor asked himself what the University System is doing to recruit people to go into fields such as teaching. He expressed that the Board should consider how to recruit better students into education. He acknowledged that salaries and working conditions play a role in attracting students, but he said that there needed to be a strong emphasis on recruiting.
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Regent Cannesta reitered that an effort needs to be made to understand why teachers are leaving the field. Secondly, he stated that he felt education has always had a very restrictive sense of where the teachers come from, focusing exclusively on colleges and universities. He expressed that he felt many qualified people have been excluded from teaching because they do not come from those backgrounds. As examples, Regent Cannesta cited people who retire early from industry and the military. He said that he felt it was a big mistake not to look at such people as a valuable resource for potential educators.

Dr. Muyskens explained that Regent Cannesta’s point was a part of what Dr. Margaret M. (Peggy) Torrey, Executive Secretary of the Professional Standards Commission (the “Commission”), would be discussing next. Dr. Muyskens recognized that other Regents had been waiting to comment and asked...
them to speak.

Regent McMillan expressed that he wanted to respond to Regent Leebern’s question regarding why African-Americans do not go into teaching in great numbers. He explained that the popular response to that was that there have been so many other opportunities in recent decades. However, he said there is also a correlation with the historic difficulties that African-Americans have had passing such standardized tests as the SAT and the Teacher Certification Test. He also cited such factors as the percentage of African-Americans entering higher education and many other reasons requiring the type of effort Regent Cannestra had suggested. Regent McMillan explained that this is an issue which he has been working on for about ten years but that he would like to hear what Dr. Torrey had to say.

Dr. Muyskens expressed that the Board needs all of the input it can get and that such discussion is the purpose of these sessions. He then introduced Dr. Torrey and said that there would be more time for further discussion and questions after her presentation.

Dr. Torrey thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak and said that she would be addressing some of the issues that the Board had raised. She explained that she heads the Professional Standards Commission, the agency that both licenses educators and accredits teacher education programs around the State. She said that a number of changes had been made in the Commission in the last five years, some of which were designed to address the very issues brought up by the Regents. She began by addressing the issue of supply and demand. She stressed that the information provided by Dr. Hudson focused only on the University System; the data that she would be presenting was inclusive of both the 15 System institutions and the 19 private institutions with teacher education programs. Dr. Torrey explained that her information was also based on student teacher data, compiled during the final stage of teacher education. She said that 5,389 student teachers were in the 34 public and private institutions with teacher education programs in 1995. Of those, only 4,827 actually received certification. In other words, about 10% were lost in the transition from graduation to certification, either from moving out of state, taking a break before getting certification, or some other reason. Of those receiving certification, only 2,548 were actually employed as teachers. In other words, only about half of those students who graduate in teacher education end up teaching in Georgia.

According to Dr. Torrey, in 1996, 8,368 new teachers were hired in Georgia. She explained that approximately 36% of these teachers were returning after having been out of the profession for a while, while 30% were new graduates. There were approximately 19% from other states, and only 7% were on provisional certificates. Provisional certificates are offered to people who hold bachelor’s degrees, who have a minimum GPA of 2.5, who have passed the content knowledge exam required for certification, and who have been hired by a school system. These persons can begin to teach, and they have three years to finish any courses they need to get their professional certificates. She said that this was part of an attempt to attract people with bachelor’s degrees into teaching. In 1993, the Commission went to an approved program model for certification, through which students who went through approved programs were granted certification. When people with bachelor’s degrees came forward to teach, they were told to affiliate with a teacher education program, which would tell them what courses they needed. That had very mixed results, because such people got very diverse information from the institutions. For example, a 1994 Duke University graduate in English with a 3.9 GPA was told by one of the institutions that she would have to complete another 90 hours of course work, 60 of which were in English. Dr. Torrey expressed that such instances should not occur, and she said that deans of such institutions are being encouraged to be more flexible. She said that preparation was also being opened to other entities. Regional Educational Service Agencies (“RESAs”) and school systems can now collaborate in offering
preparation programs in endorsement fields (e.g., gifted, English as a second language, etc.). The Commission is working with the RESAs to ensure that they go through the same process as the institutions do. They are being held to NCATE standards, on-site visits are being conducted, and if they pass, they may produce teachers in those endorsement fields just as colleges can. This process is attracting many people with bachelor’s degrees.

Regent Dahlberg questioned why only 30% of new graduates were hired. He asked if there were not jobs or they were not offered jobs. Dr. Torrey responded that there were jobs available but that geographic placement probably had a lot to do with it. She explained that a lot of these graduates were in metropolitan Atlanta and were not willing to move to rural Georgia. Many of the positions, on the other hand, were in rural Georgia.

Regent Baranco asked for the simple numbers of supply and demand. Dr. Torrey responded that overall, there are enough teachers, except in some fields, which she would be addressing next. She presented to the Board the six most prevalent teaching fields: history (7-12), math (7-12), social science (7-12), English (7-12), middle grades, and early childhood. In other words, these are the fields in which the largest number of teachers are trained. She pointed out that interestingly, in many cases, more people are being trained in these fields than are needed. For example, 2,241 teachers were trained in early childhood, but only 1,167, or 52%, were hired.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Board that many Regents had received letters on this issue. However, when the Board has tried to put caps on programs to try to balance the supply and demand, parents and students have been very upset.

Dr. Torrey pointed out that in history (7-12), 102 persons were trained but only 24 were hired, a 24% hiring rate. However, in math (7-12), 158 were trained and 128 were hired, an 81% hiring rate. So, there is a large difference between how many people are needed and how many are being produced.

Next, Dr. Torrey discussed the areas of critical need: special education, sciences, behavior disorders, foreign languages, speech and language pathology, and learning disabilities. She pointed out that four of these areas are special education areas.

Regent Baranco expressed that she felt, with regard to the alternative routes to certification, these were the kinds of statistics that need to be considered. She said that although it did not make sense to train someone the quicker, alternative way for early childhood, it seemed that this should be done for these areas of critical need. Dr. Torrey assured Regent Baranco that the Commission does not even offer provisional certificates in early childhood.

The Chancellor reminded the Board that school superintendents would prefer to have a larger supply of teachers than demand, because they want a pool of candidates to choose from.

Regent McMillan questioned whether the Commission has considered paying more for the higher-demand positions as industry would do. In other words, science and special education teachers would be paid better than early childhood teachers. Dr. Torrey replied that the Commission was certainly looking for ways to attract people, but there is only one pay scale and it does not differentiate according to need. The Chancellor said this was the fundamental difference from higher education, where the market drives the salary fields.

In response to requests for clarification from various Regents, Dr. Torrey said that the Commission is encouraging the deans and advisors of the institutions to tell students what the market is like. She
explained that with regard to the area of behavior disorders, the need is very desperate, but the teachers are not being produced. In fact, she said, there is not a single behavior disorders program at the bachelor’s degree level being offered in the State. There are many institutions approved to offer it, but they are not offering it.

Chair Leebern reiterated the issue of salaries’ reflecting the market and questioned if there could be some way to do that. Dr. Torrey said that right now, this is not being done. Regent Baranco responded that some states have found legal ways to do this. Chair Leebern questioned how financial incentive could be offered to attract applicants into the critical needs fields without disturbing the entire System. Dr. Torrey said that the Commission is looking at several ways to provide incentives to get people to enter those fields, but the salary issue has not yet been considered.

Regent Dahlberg asked if, when there was greater demand than supply of qualified teachers, those positions went unfilled. Dr. Torrey responded that those positions were filled with persons who may not be qualified. One way of filling such a position is by granting a person a probationary certificate. Many early childhood certified teachers have probationary certificates in special education. Such certificates give teachers a number of years to get the course work necessary to continue teaching in that field. So, there are means to fill the critical needs positions, but the teachers are not necessarily trained for those jobs.

The Chancellor commented that once teachers in such positions are afforded the opportunity, they likely go back to their chosen fields.

Regent Dahlberg asked what happened to the 3,000 or so education graduates who were not placed in positions. Dr. Torrey explained that they were still in the pool of candidates, but they were not necessarily placed in critical needs positions. She stressed again the geographic problem that many do not want to teach in rural areas.

Regent McMillan said that there was not really a large shortage of teachers in the critical needs area; only about 1,000 teachers are needed. If the extra early childhood teachers could be channeled into those areas, there would still be a surplus. Dr. Torrey reiterated that the issue is not about having enough teachers. Rather, it is about having enough teachers in the right geographic locations and in the right fields.
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Chancellor Portch said that if he were an early childhood education graduate who wanted to teach in the metropolitan Atlanta area and the only job he could get was teaching special education in a rural area, he would probably choose reading meters for Regent Dahlberg until something came along. Regent Dahlberg said that the future of that could be pretty good.

Regent McMillan expressed that it bothered him that the teachers in these critical needs areas are not competent to teach them, because the students end up having to take remediation in college as a result. He said this is a problem that needs to be corrected, because it is a source of the problem that creates the developmental studies difficulties. Dr. Torrey agreed and stressed that a superintendent would not hire an unqualified candidate over a qualified one, if he or she had the choice. Probationary teachers are only hired because no one else is available.

Dr. Torrey said that there are 444 initial certification programs in Georgia, mostly undergraduate programs. There are some graduate programs that lead to initial certification. For example, at Georgia College & State University, a student has to have a master’s degree in any secondary field to begin his or
her education career. She expressed that the Commission is very committed to developing nontraditional routes, as long as those routes are high quality. Several institutions have master’s of arts in teaching programs designed for the postbaccalaureate student. Such programs typically take only one year. There are also postbaccalaureate nondegree programs for certification only, which vary in their flexibility. She reminded the Board of the graduate from Duke University who was required to take 90 more quarter hours to be certified.

There are two things the Commission is working on, said Dr. Torrey. The first is working with RESAs and school systems to develop the “professional sequence.” If a person does not have an education background, the Commission currently tells that person to affiliate with an institution that provides teacher certification. Now, the Commission is saying to RESAs and the school systems that if they would like to prepare such a person, they can submit a proposal and the Commission will visit them, apply NCATE standards, and approve the effort to do that. The second issue has to do with drawing the military into teaching. There are two programs in Georgia that are designed to encourage military personnel to enter teaching, Dr. Torrey explained. The first is based on the Troops to Teachers model and is based at Armstrong Atlantic State University. The second is at Paine College in Augusta. Dr. Torrey said that there is also the Pathways to Teaching program, which draws a number of males and minorities. She asked if there were any more questions, and seeing that there were none, she thanked the Board.

Dr. Muyskens thanked Dr. Torrey and asked for questions. Regent Jones asked from which states the out-of-state teachers were coming. Dr. Torrey answered that they were predominantly coming from the contiguous states but also from all over. The Chancellor said that in a teacher education study performed in Wisconsin, he found that many Southern states were sending recruiters into Wisconsin, particularly Texas.

Regent Cannestra said that the Board really needs to concentrate on the problem that needs to be solved: why the supply is not meeting the demand. He said that finding remedies to solve that problem needed to be the primary concern and focusing on that would increase the chance of resolving the issue. Dr. Muyskens agreed that the Board needs to look at the specific rather than the general. He then asked for other comments.
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Dr. Torrey expressed that she had forgotten to address the issue of attrition. She said that the Commission is doing a survey for the first time this year of teachers who leave during the first three years to try to find out why. She said that the Commission would take that information to figure out what it can do to prevent this phenomenon from occurring. If the issues are environmental issues, such as a lack of supplies or administrative support, that can also be addressed. The Chancellor asked what the time frame of the survey would be. Dr. Torrey explained that it would be sent out twice: in April, the teachers who do not renew their contracts will be surveyed, and in August, the teachers who decide not to go back will be surveyed. School principals have been solicited for help with this effort. She said that all of the data would probably not be compiled until September 1998. In addition, she stressed that Georgia, at 30%, is below the national average of 50% in attrition over the first five years.

Regent Dahlberg asked if the first three years were the most critical, and Dr. Torrey said that they were and that if teachers stay for the fourth year, they tend to keep teaching. Chancellor Portch reminded the Board that this aspect of teacher education would be addressed further when the third part of the teacher preparation issue is addressed in December.

Dr. Muyskens thanked Dr. Torrey and the Board. He stressed that ways must be found to encourage students to choose and prepare for critical fields. If a way to balance supply and demand is not found and schools are forced to hire less than qualified teachers, then the schools will be in the predicament that Regent McMillan described. Dr. Muyskens reiterated that this discussion had introduced the issue of recruitment. In November, the Board will learn about and discuss what happens when a student enters an education program, and in December, it will deal with the issue of support for teachers in the field as well as the issue of attrition.

In conclusion, Dr. Muyskens expressed that he had two final comments. First, he said, the Regents’ briefing books will be added to each month with new, relevant materials. Second, he recognized Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, as a very important member of the team who had acted behind the scenes to prepare this presentation to the Strategic Planning Committee. He then turned the floor back over to Chair Leebern.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Muyskens, Dr. Hudson, and Dr. Torrey on behalf of the Board. He then recognized Dr. Jimmie Greene McEver, who was present, as a past president of the Student Advisory Council. Returning to the issue at hand, Chair Leebern said that the Board has its work cut out for it.

Chancellor Portch then interrupted Chair Leebern for an important announcement. He said that President Skinner had just informed him that Armstrong Atlantic State University’s Pathways to Teaching program had just been awarded a $100,000 grant from the Ford Foundation’s Innovation in American Government competition. Regent McMillan added that the program had also received an in-kind gift of $45,000 from the Chatham County Board of Education.

Chair Leebern expressed congratulations. He then reminded the Board that in June 1996, it reviewed the mission review statements. At this time, he said, a few wrap-up items would be presented by Dr. Muyskens, Dr. James, and Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers.
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Dr. Muyskens said that this would be a wrap-up on mission review. When the mission review document was approved in June 1996, 32 of the 34 System institutions had their mission statements approved. The remaining institutions, Albany State University and Georgia Southwestern State University, were awaiting new presidents. He recognized that Dr. Michael L. Hanes, President of Georgia Southwestern State University, was present at the meeting. Dr. Muyskens said that the Board had wanted the presidents to work with their staffs to develop their mission statements and that they had done so. He said that the Central Office staff had reviewed the mission statements and that they meet all Board requirements.

The second item before the Board, Dr. Muyskens explained, had to do with core mission statements for the regional and State universities. He reminded the Board that it had asked that each sector have a mission statement. He said that the proposed changes are simply editorial. One change is necessary because developmental studies is no longer being offered. So, the words “learning support” are being substituted for “developmental studies.” The other change is that State colleges are now State universities. For example, Albany State College is now Albany State University.

The third item that Dr. Muyskens wanted to comment on regarded the fact that the mission statement report said that the name of DeKalb College did not appropriately reflect the breadth of its mission, and therefore, consideration should be given to a new name. Dr. Muyskens said that in November, there should be a wrap-up of that issue. In addition to the nomenclature changes, another objective of the mission review was to see how the University System is meeting various State needs. Several councils were set up to deal with that issue, one being the Central Georgia Council. Out of that effort, a recommendation was made that Macon College offer some select baccalaureate programs. Those programs have been approved and implemented, and therefore, changes in the college’s mission statement are necessary to reflect the new mission. The institutional name change from Macon College to Macon State College also needed to be reflected.

In addition to the Central Georgia Council, the mission review also looked at other parts of the State to determine whether local initiatives met the needs of their respective areas. In light of the mission review recommendations and as a result of last year’s Comprehensive Planning session, a task force has been set up to look at north Georgia. The task force is expected to issue a report in early spring, and as a result, another baccalaureate program may be requested to be established at Dalton College to meet the specific needs there. He said that these were all the items of the mission wrap-up that the Board was being requested to endorse, except for one major item: off-campus instructional sites, the final item of this report.

Chancellor Portch interjected that there are no other mission changes anticipated in the five-year planning period that the Board adopted.

Dr. Muyskens then reminded the Board that the “blue ribbon” mission review team said that the System had a bewildering array of outreach and extension programs and that the Board needed to take another look at that. He said that the next two presentations would demonstrate that this had been done, and he asked Dr. James to step forward.

Dr. James expressed that it was nice for her to be back with the Board and to have the opportunity to hear the Board engage in really substantive dialog about something as important as teacher education. She said that this was the most important place to be for someone interested in higher education and innovative approaches in setting new directions. Under the Board’s leadership, this System has become one of the best
Dr. James explained that she was at the meeting to report to the Board the findings and recommendations of the Study Team on Off-Campus Instructional Sites. The team consisted of Dr. James, as team leader; Dr. Jane Wellman, Senior Associate of The Institute for Higher Education Policy; Dr. Marshall A. Hill, Assistant to the Commissioner of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board; and Dr. Raymond Dawson, Professor of Political Science and Retired Vice President for Academic Affairs at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. The charge to this team from Dr. Desrochers was to recommend a set of general policy guidelines that would help the Board make decisions about establishing off-campus instructional sites. The team began by reviewing current policies on off-campus instruction as well as a number of other important and pertinent documents and reports. It found that there are very few policies in the System that govern off-campus instruction, and those policies that do exist seem to provide little guidance that would help the Board make good decisions about the issue. In fact, she said, Board approval is not required for most off-campus instruction. Currently, Board approval is only necessary for external degree programs where the entire degree program is offered by a System institution at an off-campus site. Any and all other off-campus instruction is not subject to approval by either the Board or the Chancellor. The study team felt strongly that the Board should approve off-campus instruction, especially in cases where financial obligations are involved.

Dr. James said that in developing a set of guidelines for off-campus instruction, the team focused on three major issues. The first issue was whether and when off-campus instruction is warranted. This issue requires the consideration of several factors, including the existing capacity within the System, demographic demand, and special educational program needs. If the decision is that off-campus instruction is warranted, then one must consider what form of instruction is needed. The extent and type of the educational programming needed, the kind of facility that will be necessary to meet those programming needs, and the best methods for program delivery should also be considered. The third issue is when cost sharing for off-campus instruction should be considered. The primary consideration here is whose educational needs are primarily served by the off-campus instruction. The report gives specific guidelines to address these three issues.

Dr. James did not outline those guidelines before the Board, due to time constraints, but instead summarized the major recommendations made by the study team. First, the team recommended that the Board adopt a policy requiring Board approval of off-campus instruction. Second, the team recommended that the Board use data to distinguish when proposed off-campus instruction would primarily serve the convenience of a local community versus when off-campus instruction would serve long-term State and University System needs. In a case where the convenience of a local community is the primary justification for off-campus instruction, the team suggests that the Board look to the community to provide facilities and/or to assist in securing a low-cost lease. Third, the team recommended that the Board make long-term facility commitments only in those cases where the data indicate that there will be long-term educational demand and that such demand cannot be met by existing programming. Fourth, the team recommended that the Board encourage the use of distance education and collaboration among campuses in the System in providing off-campus instruction. Finally, the team recommended that the Chancellor’s staff develop specific decision rules to assist the Board in using the general guidelines that the study team has recommended. She said that Dr. Desrochers and her staff have already drafted such rules, which Dr. Desrochers would present to the Board next. Dr. James expressed the hope that the Board would find the study team’s recommendations helpful as it makes future decisions about off-campus instructional sites and that she would be happy to answer any questions.
Regent Baranco asked when the Board would be getting serious on this issue, and Dr. Muyskens replied, “Right here.” Dr. James assured Regent Baranco and the Board that these decision rules are very specific.

Dr. Desrochers approached the Board with her report on the decision rules. She explained that as an outgrowth of the off-campus instructional sites report, the Central Office staff had decided to move quickly on the issue of what kinds of specific decision rules it would recommend to the Board. Before she discussed those rules, however, Dr. Desrochers wanted to make one point to the Board. She explained that for off-campus instructional sites that are temporary and that have no facility costs involved and no degree program approvals required, the Central Office staff recommends that the Chancellor review those and approval be given by him. However, when temporary sites do involve facility costs and/or degree program approval, they should first come to the Chancellor for initial review and recommendation and then to the Board for approval. She expressed that this recommendation responds to Dr. James’ report that there should be a policy for Board involvement in the expansion of off-campus instructional sites.

With respect to permanent off-campus instructional sites, Dr. Desrochers said, the Central Office staff strongly recommends that the Board approve these sites, because they often involve facility costs and because they involve matters of need around the State. She explained that the Central Office staff has developed a set of specific areas for analysis, and before the staff brings a recommendation to the Board, it intends to do analysis in the following four areas: demographics, economy, academic programs, and community financial participation. With respect to demographics, the staff will examine what is happening in the region where an off-campus permanent site is recommended, past and future population trends, as well as other indicators which would help it assess consistent community demand over time. Secondly, the staff will study the nature of the economy of the area, the workforce demands and labor trends, business trends, and housing trends as well as the local and State infrastructure with respect to economic development in the area. In the area of academic programs, the institution that is proposing to create an off-campus site should have a mission which justifies the proposed academic plan. The Central Office staff will investigate what other programs within that region are offered, both public and private, as well as what program needs within the area are not being met and which of the programs that are offered are within a reasonable commuting distance. Finally, each proposal must attend to community financial participation, and at a minimum, for a permanent off-campus site, the expectation should be that land and site infrastructure should be provided by the community or a permanent site should be located with a permanent lease situation, preferably with some assistance from the community in making the lease reduced cost or, if it involves local debt, resulting in eventual ownership by the Board of Regents. Dr. Desrochers told the Board that the last point was a suggestion by Regent Coleman.

The overall goal, Dr. Desrochers stressed, is that the Central Office staff bring to the Board recommendations based on analysis so that the decision rules make sense. She expressed that she was open to any suggestions and that she had received feedback from various institution presidents. She said that there were a few points that the presidents raised that merit some consideration. The first point is that particular attention needs to be paid to the DTAE mission of some of the System institutions. Also, perhaps there should be a lead institution which has an off-campus site that involves collaboration between institutions. She said that a few
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other recommendations would be integrated into the document. Dr. Desrochers then asked the Board if there were any questions.

Regent Baranco presented a hypothetical example. She asked what would happen if Georgia College &
State University wants to open a campus in Macon because it has done research to determine that there is a demand in that region in the field of widget making, but Macon State College and Fort Valley State University do not realize that there is this demand. Regent Baranco asked if one of these institutions could offer courses in that field, what would the Central Office recommend?

Dr. Desrochers said that the first question the staff would ask is “What is the mission of the institution that is proposing to offer the widget-making course, and what is the mission of the institution in the locale where [the proposed course is suggested to be offered]?” Additionally, there may need to be some interaction on the part of the Chancellor’s Office with both campuses regarding under which mission statement the course more appropriately falls.

Chancellor Portch said that this is the key to the issue. He said that prior to this report, sometimes the first the Regents knew of a new off-campus instructional site was when someone saw a sign along the road to the site. Requiring Board approval of such sites would ensure that such off-campus sites would actually belong in their respective communities.

Chair Leebern asked if the Regents had any other questions, and none replied. Dr. Muyskens reiterated what was being recommended for adoption by the Board, including the various mission statement items he outlined earlier and that the Board accept the report of the study committee that had just been presented by Dr. James and Dr. Desrochers. As a footnote to the study committee presentation, Dr. Muyskens added that there are a few fine-tuning issues which Dr. Desrochers had mentioned that need to be further developed in the next 60 days. He stressed that this presentation had outlined the general direction of the issue and that Board adoption at this time would facilitate matters and give the Central Office a chance to work out the specifics.

Again, Chair Leebern asked if the Regents had any questions, and there were none. He then asked for a motion to approve the proposed items. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board adopted the proposed mission statement items and decision rules regarding off-campus instructional sites.

Chair Leebern asked for a motion to recess the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Clark made a motion to amend the November 1997 meeting of the Board of Regents to a one-day meeting on Wednesday, November 12 with Committee meetings in the morning and the Board meeting in the afternoon. He explained that this was necessary due to the fact that on Tuesday, November 11, State offices will be closed. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted the Board authorized the schedule change.

NEW BUSINESS

Regent Baranco asked that the following issue be put on the agenda for the Board to address at a later date. She expressed that there is an increasing concern among business people about the quality of employees entering the workforce, particularly in the Southeast. She said that she would like the Board to be thinking about this issue.

In response, Chancellor Portch said that he would like to mention two things. The first was that the Central Office would soon have some information for the Board on that issue, because last year, it performed a base-line survey of chief executive officers in the State on the preparation of the System’s graduates and, this year, the human resource directors have been surveyed. The second thing he mentioned was that the Governor has formed a task force on workforce preparation and has invited about nine chief executive officers, the Chair of the Board of Regents, and the chairmen of the boards of the Department of Education, Department of Technical and Adult Education, and Department of Industry and Trade as well as the chief executives of each of those departments. The task force is charged to come back in about 90 days with some recommendations on workforce development in Georgia. Chair Clark said that he looked forward to reporting to the Board regarding his and the Chancellor’s participation on its behalf.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber announced that those Regents who were going to Washington, D.C. that afternoon should gather for just a moment after the Board meeting to ensure that they had all the correct information.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon on October 8, 1997.

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

s/ 
S. William Clark, Jr. 
Chair, Board of Regents 
University System of Georgia