

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
August 8, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Glenn S. White, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. Present at that time, in addition to Chair White, were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Kenneth W. Cannestra, Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Elridge W. McMillan, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Regents Joe Frank Harris, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, and Charles H. Jones arrived later.

Because of the changes in the Board's previously announced schedule and agenda, Chair White asked for a motion to suspend for this meeting Bylaw 3 regarding meetings of the Board. Regent Baranco made the motion, which was variously seconded and unanimously approved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:15 a.m., Chair Glenn S. White called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a legal matter. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair White, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Cannestra, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Also in attendance were Mr. Mark Cohen, Special Assistant Attorney General; Mr. Dennis R. Dunn, Deputy Attorney General; Mr. Stephen Shewmaker, Executive Director of Legal Affairs at the University of Georgia; Ms. Elizabeth E. Neely, Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs; Chancellor Stephen R. Portch; and Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (Amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 11:45 a.m., Chair White reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

REPORT ON TRANSITION OF STATE LIBRARIES TO UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

Chair White explained that the Board would next hear a report on transitioning the state libraries to the University System of Georgia. He reminded the Regents that during the past legislative session, the legislators moved the state libraries to the University System. He then called upon Ms. Margaret Taylor, Deputy to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources, to give an update on the transition process.

Ms. Taylor thanked Chair White. She began by explaining that the Office of Public Library Services (the Office) was one of the first state library commissions. It was established in 1898. It was assigned to the Board of Education in 1943 and shifted to the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE) in 1996 and then to the University System this year. The Office itself has a \$3 million budget and 34 staff members in three locations in metropolitan Atlanta. There are 57 library systems within the larger system. Some of these are single-county systems, and others are multi-county systems. Some of the larger single-county systems have multiple library locations around the county. Libraries are locally governed by their own library boards. They are not directly governed by the Board of Regents Central Office or the University System. There are a total of 368 public library facilities around the state, 33 book mobiles, over 600 professional librarians, and over 15 million volumes.

Ms. Taylor explained that with this new partnership, the University System has assumed responsibility for the allocation of about \$30 million in state funding to the public library system. That funding is formula-driven based primarily on population. There is also an approximate \$3.5 million federal grant that helps support the libraries through the Institute for Museums and Library Services in Washington D.C. The University System is also accountable for the federal funds that flow to the libraries and is responsible for submitting a five-year state plan and annual reports on the use of the federal funds. Through the Office, the University System supports the accounting systems of the libraries, which rely on the Office for assistance in developing and installing software for their accounting. The University System also supports the Office's information technology needs. The local library boards set policy for the library holdings and for their activities. They obtain local funding for the libraries. They are accountable for library expenditures, have their own local accounting, and are subject locally to audits. The library staff are employed locally by the boards; they do not become employees of the University System. The local boards also own and maintain the local library facilities. Often, these are facilities that are provided by municipal or county governments. To a limited degree, through some major repairs and renovations (MRR) funding, the University System supports the libraries' facilities.

There are a number of important library information links, explained Ms. Taylor. The libraries have greatly expanded their access to technology and, through that, the access of the public to library materials. They are the University System's primary statewide partners of Georgia Library Learning Online (GALILEO) and serve as local access points for GALILEO all over the state. Citizens can go to their local public libraries and get the password. Libraries have also taken advantage of technology to create the Public Information Network for Electronic Services (PINES), which is an electronic catalog of all materials in the 98 participating Georgia libraries that allows sharing of materials across those libraries. A library patron can go to one library and find out through PINES whether resources are available in another library and have those materials sent to his library so he can use them. The libraries also participate in the Georgia On-Line Database (GOLD), which is a larger database that serves a variety of types of libraries, including academic libraries and school libraries. Libraries also have a program called Georgia HomePLACE (Providing Library and Archives Collections Electronically), which is in the process of digitizing a number of local records, such as county marriage records and the vanishing Georgia historic photograph collection. All of those digitized resources will be available through GALILEO.

There is also a library for the blind and physically handicapped, which is located on Murphy Avenue in Atlanta. It is a regional library, and there are also 13 sub-regional libraries around the

state located in some of the library systems. They obtain materials free from the Library of Congress, including books on tape and books in Braille. They send these materials out to people who are unable to use books either because of blindness or other physical disabilities. This is an important service to which the University System will give attention over the next few years.

The immediate goal, however, is simply to complete the transition of the public libraries to the University System. There are a few details that remain in doing that, Ms. Taylor reported. For example, the University System needs to recruit a state library director, because that position has been vacant for some time. There are also a number of other vacancies and staffing needs. There is funding for the expansion of the PINES electronic catalog to include approximately 100 additional libraries. The installation of a new accounting system called Statewide Accounting and Management System ONline (SAMSON) will also be completed within the year. In terms of future challenges, it is always important to keep expanding and updating the library collections around the state, and that is an important strategic goal of the library system. Another strategic goal is to create more reading programs for children. There are also a number of other issues to address in the areas of facilities and improving technology to improve access to library services. Next, Ms. Taylor introduced Mr. Tom Ploeg, Acting Director of the Office of Public Library Services, who has been with the Office for many years.

Mr. Ploeg greeted the Board. On behalf of the staff of the Office and the staff and trustees of all the state public libraries, he thanked the Regents for accepting them into their family. He said that it is a pleasure to be a part of the University System and he looks forward to the potential that lies in that partnership. For many years, the public libraries have had an association with the Board of Regents. In fact, the libraries began their first uses of technology with the help of the Board's Office of Information and Instructional Technology. So, the Office has had a relationship with the University System for a number of years. Many people have asked Mr. Ploeg what the public libraries have to do with the Board of Regents. This brought to mind an old library in Massachusetts called the People's University. The one thing that the public libraries and the System institutions have in common is that they are all educational institutions dedicated to providing resources for people to learn in the best way they can. The Office has a very diverse and committed staff and is involved in a number of activities, some of which are administrative. Much of what the Office does is coordinating. For instance, the vacation reading program involves over 200,000 children, who last year read over 300 million volumes. The program cost only about \$1 per child. When Mr. Ploeg began working in libraries, he was most energized by the patrons. Now, his patrons are the public libraries of the State. He explained that a nationally recognized publication titled *Library Journal* honors one library each year, and this year, the Gwinnett Public Library was recognized as the "Library of the Year". Mr. Ploeg then introduced Ms. Jo Ann Pinder, Director of the Gwinnett Public Library.

Ms. Pinder remarked that libraries have a long history. She noted that this year, the Library of Congress is celebrating its bicentennial. Thomas Jefferson said, "I've often thought that nothing would do more extensive good at a small expense than the establishment of a small circulating library in each county to consist of a few well-chosen books." Ms. Pinder stated that the services offered by the Gwinnett Public Library are not unique, but *Library Journal* and the Gale Group, a publisher of business sources, decided about ten years ago to honor libraries for three criteria, and Gwinnett Public Library was selected the winner this year. Ms. Pinder was pictured on the cover of *Library Journal*, and the library received \$10,000. The library also won the admiration and recognition of its peers. The first criteria of the contest is service to the community. The

library tries to provide access to the community in many ways. One way it provides access is through its ten buildings, all of which were built since 1986 and most of which were built using state dollars. The library has also provided Internet access since 1986. Citizens can use the Internet at the library or access the library from home via GALILEO and similar databases. The library is locally governed by a five-member board whose members are appointed by the county commissioners. The majority of the library's \$13.8 million budget comes from the commissioners, although there is \$1 million in state funding that will now come via the University System. The library was also honored on the basis of its creativity and innovation in developing specific community programs. It does this by having Dewey the Dinosaur and its cyber camp for people of all ages. There is also Story Time a Go-Go, which takes story time to the children in daycare. In Gwinnett County, 75% of families are dual-income, so there are many children in daycare. They cannot come to the library, so the library comes to them. The last criteria for which the library was honored was leadership in creating programs that can be emulated by other libraries. The library was recognized for its staff training programs, its guidelines for collection development, the way it provides access to electronic resources, and its innovative facilities. In closing, Ms. Pinder remarked that if information is the currency of democracy, then libraries are its banks.

Chair White thanked the presenters for their informative report, and at approximately 12:15 p.m., he recessed the Board meeting for a lunch break.

RECONVENING

At approximately 12:55 p.m., the Board was reconvened in its regular session. Chair White welcomed new Regent Hugh A. Carter, Jr., who had been sworn in at the Governor's Office that morning.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 by Chair Glenn S. White, who made a special dedication to Regent and Mrs. Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. He then called upon the Chancellor to make a few remarks.

CHANCELLOR'S TRIBUTE TO REGENT AND MRS. THOMAS F. ALLGOOD, SR.

Next, the Chancellor gave the following tribute to Regent Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. and his wife, Thelma ("T"), who were killed in a plane crash on Wednesday, August 4, 2000.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Many of you have told me that you consider the Regents to be your second family. That's why we feel the loss of Tom and "T" as if they were family members.

When we lose family members, we always hope that the last time we spent with them was the best time. It was that way for me with my Dad. The last time I saw him was at my inauguration as Chancellor. It was the happiest of times for him and my mother, thanks to many of you. It was that way for me with Tom and "T". The last time I saw them was two weeks ago today at their "cabin" in South Carolina. That visit was quintessential Tom and "T".

Let's be honest. Tom was a rascal and a leader. "T"? Well, "T" was just "T", a gracious hostess

(can we ever forget the goldfish centerpieces?) and a strong businesswoman. They were both larger-than-life characters. The mold was surely broken when these two people were created. We'll never see the likes of them again. Come with me two weeks ago as I'm traveling to Augusta to charge the [Medical College of Georgia] Presidential Search Committee. I'd sent Tom two memos about the meeting. I'd placed calls to Janice, to the farm, to the cabin, to Maine. All to no avail. You couldn't always track Tom down, and you could certainly never tie him down.

But true to form, as I'm driving past Thomson, Georgia, the car-phone rings, and it's Tom wanting to know "if we had some sort of meeting today." I told him the time and place. He was there, resplendent with pocket handkerchief immaculate. As always, his comments were exactly on-target. Afterwards, he spontaneously asked me "to come for vegetables at the cabin." I knew this would be news to "T". I also knew "T" would come through for Tom. She always did.

Whenever I'd talked to Tom at the "cabin," I had always felt sorry for him, imagining him without running water, no electricity, just plain roughing it. Not quite. The "cabin" was a glorious yet comfortable place surrounded by Oz-tested water.

We took a boat ride on an unseasonably cool evening. Contrary to popular opinion, we didn't scheme Regent business. He did talk affectionately about his fellow Regents and the staff for sure, but he wanted to talk dogs and grandchildren.

Tom had never had a dog until Oz. To know Oz was to love him. He was totally devoted to Tom and "T" both. They flew privately to Maine in part because Oz loved Maine. Yes, Tom was even nice about my dog Lurch that night. No more asking me "Is he well?" with that twinkle in his eye. His pride was palpable as Oz not just retrieved with style, but also obeyed Tom's unconvincingly stern commands.

Then he talked grandkids. In particular, he talked about Sara, a student at [Georgia Institute of Technology]. Oh what pride. He knew her every test score in her classes, before and after the curve had been applied. He loved how his grandkids were smart but also well-rounded enough, for instance, to beat him at golf. Yes, Tom was a very proud customer of the University System as well as one of its leaders.

Over vegetables (and oh, how he fussed at "T" as she cooked them and oh how impervious she was to his fussing), we talked a little politics. His friend Zell Miller had just been appointed Senator. His friend, Roy Barnes, was burning 'em up in the Statehouse. Clearly Tom had taught them all he knew. That's the last time I talked to Tom or to "T". It was the best of times.

Yes, as Chancellor, I do indeed recall the leadership of Regent Allgood.

Without Tom Allgood, we would not have MCG Health, Inc. up and running. We owe it to him to make sure it works. He put his heart and soul into that effort. Reading every ream of paper (and there were reams), encouraging people behind the scenes to give it a chance, just plain providing the finest of leadership.

For Tom was indeed a leader. The Senate recognized that, making him its Majority Leader early in his career. The Board of Regents recognized that making him its Chair in 1996, just four

years after joining the Board. In his year as Chair, we held the first electronic Board meeting of any agency in Georgia; we implemented mission review and nomenclature changes; we adopted our guiding principles for comprehensive planning; we developed the workforce development strategy that catapulted [the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program] into prominence; we approved the laptop projects at [Clayton College & State University] and [Floyd College]; and we had our very first capital process with presidents presenting. It was quite a year.

Yes, I'll remember those accomplishments and leadership. But I'll remember even better having to interrupt Executive Session so that "T" could deliver musical boxes full of candy to each Regent. Tom acted embarrassed; he wasn't the least.

I'll remember that yellow legal pad being picked up and written on, never quite knowing what was coming - just knowing something was coming. One day what came was a little note about the leadership of Juanita Baranco, whom both Tom and "T" loved. The note read:

"Not many years ago, a few Georgians wondered if we would ever see all of our people, regardless of race and background, working together as friends and colleagues for the good of all. Sitting here today, I see very clearly for the first time that we have achieved a dream. Remarkable! Isn't it beautiful! Most area's peoples of the world could learn a lot if they were here today."

I'll remember the flight we took on Air Leebern, picking Tom up - with an at-the-last-minute plan, of course - at some lonely airstrip in South Carolina. We visited two presidential candidates that long, long day. At one candidate's house, Tom was attacked by the family cat. (How do cats pick out dog people so easily?) And how that story had grown, almost unrecognizably, by the time it was retold and retold to his fellow Regents. Tom could spin a yarn with the best of them.

I'll remember the Board, on Don Leebern's motion, adopting an unprecedented spousal resolution for "T" for her "selfless devotion and unending patience that went beyond the probable limits of human endurance." For this Board knew Tom - and loved "T."

And I'll remember Tom, "T," and Oz that last night I was with them. Genuine to the core. Caring to the limit. And just plain fun to be around. I'd just shake my head at their plans and escapades. It was the best of times.

Yet, now, these are the hardest of times. We extend our love and sympathy to the families that they so admired and so loved. We say goodbye with deep thanks for helping make the University System what it is today. And for providing leadership, so memorable in style and substance. Goodbye "T." Goodbye Tom.

Thank you for that personal privilege, Mr. Chairman.

* * * * *

After the Chancellor's remarks, Chair White asked for a moment of silence for Regent and Mrs. Allgood.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent Martin W. NeSmith had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on June 13 and 14, 2000 were unanimously approved as distributed.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS TO THE BOARD

Next, Chair White gave his remarks to the Board, which were as follows:

It is an honor to be in this position. I will work hard to continue the great efforts of my predecessors. Continuity is key to our efforts as a Board. Particularly so in three critical areas that we have been addressing in recent years: benchmarking, business relationships, and technology.

First, benchmarking. This process was formalized under Regent Cannestra. It is a fortunate coincidence that just as we began to seriously focus on this, so did Governor Barnes, in terms of state operations/agencies. The result has been a good partnership effort with our consultants and the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. Over the past year, we have accomplished a great deal in this area as both a Board and as a System. We owe a lot to [Regent Cannestra's] focus on this issue and his drive to initiate and make it a top priority for the Board. For this, Ken, we thank you for your leadership. We are now deep into this process, and it is a complex process. There is a tremendous amount of data coming forward. It will take much time and effort to review, analyze, and reach some conclusions, especially about best practices that we'd like to see throughout the System. I predict these activities will take a year of work. Benchmarking is critical for long-term effectiveness of the System. I'm especially pleased that we are benchmarking nationally. Therefore, we should continue our focus as a Board on this process over the upcoming year. As chairman, I want it to be our top priority. It is the best way I know to measure how effective the System is in implementing the Board's 1994 Vision Statement and Guiding Principles and the policy directives and special initiatives that have come out of these statements. It may also lead us to conclude that it's time to revise or add to our strategic plan.

One area the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles targeted back in 1994 was the relationship between the System and Georgia's business community. Again, we have made a great deal of progress in this area. [The Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (ICAPP)] has spearheaded our efforts and has achieved not only national and statewide recognition, but more importantly, significant successes for Georgia's economic development. [Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development & Economic Services] Annie Hunt Burriss and her staff have worked long, hard hours in this key area. And we have put in place some measurement tools to gauge how effective the System is in meeting the needs of the Georgia business community and the state's workforce needs. It is easy to become complacent. But we all recognize that in today's economy, complacency is dangerous. We cannot afford this attitude if we want to continue to be recognized as players in the state's economic development/growth. This is a good opportunity to

review our efforts in this area and see where we can build upon our successes and strengths. I think it is crucial that the System continue to build a bridge to Georgia's business community. It is important to remember this bridge has two-way traffic: communication from us to business and information and data from the business community to us. Therefore, I intend to make our economic development efforts another key priority for the Board during the coming year.

A third issue I would like the Board to continue to address - and one it took up several years ago - is that of technology. Given the work that was done on the Board-approved technology principles and the information gained through the Arthur Andersen study, I feel that it is important to formalize the Board's ongoing activity in this critical area. Therefore, I would like to initiate the formation of a Committee on Information and Instructional Technology as a new standing committee of the Board. Given the increasingly important role of technology in every aspect of the System's operations, I believe this is a prudent and necessary step. And, of course, we will focus on these areas while dealing with many other known and as yet unknown issues. This Board does not shrink from the challenges - it is an activist board that understands its responsibilities to the state, to the citizens, and to the students. I know we will work hard. I look forward to the coming year and my continued association with each of you.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

After his remarks to the Board, Chair White convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern explained that there were two items of business on the agenda at this meeting. The first was a vote on the final report and recommendations of the technology master planning initiative. A draft report was presented at the June 2000 meeting for the Regents' consideration and input. It had since been on the table. At this meeting, the final draft of the report and recommendations was up for a vote. Chair Leebern asked for a motion to approve the final report and recommendations.

Regent Cannestra made the motion, and Regent Cater seconded it.

Chair Leebern asked whether there was any further discussion.

Chancellor Portch noted that President Beheruz N. Sethna of State University of West Georgia was available to answer any questions regarding the report.

Dr. Sethna reminded the Regents that the consultants presented findings structured in five major areas. PeachNet was the main focus of their findings. Some of the recommendations will be coming back to the Board as part of the budget process, because Arthur Andersen LLP recommended that \$7.7 million be invested in PeachNet, and the Regents will have an opportunity to vote on this recommendation with the budget recommendations in September. The second largest part of the project was recommendations for the University System as a whole. At this meeting, Chair White had already announced the establishment of a standing Committee on Information and Instructional Technology. The third part of the findings related to restructuring of the Office of Information and Instructional Technology. The fourth piece was Systemwide recommendations about data collection practices, which tie in very closely with

scope three of the benchmarking/management review study. The final part of the project related specifically to campus-level technology master planning, and that will be an ongoing effort for the coming months. Dr. Sethna stated that the Regents had been invited to have input into the final report, but there had been no recommended changes.

Chair Leebern thanked President Sethna and the staff for their hard work on this project.

President Sethna noted that there was a Systemwide committee that had worked on this project.

Chair Leebern noted that there was a motion and a second. He asked if there was any further discussion.

Regent White remarked that the report was very good and addressed the infrastructure needs of the System. He noted that it did not address technology in education and pedagogy.

Dr. Sethna responded that the Board's technology principles will be the System's road map to implementation. Whereas the report was not entirely focused on instruction, it builds on the Board's technology initiative from the preceding year. There is a piece of this report that refers to distance learning. The consultants' calculations for PeachNet take into account that the System will need more bandwidth to support innovative educational programs.

Regent White thanked Dr. Sethna.

Chair Leebern noted that there was no further discussion and called for a vote. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board adopted the final report and recommendations of the technology master planning initiative.

Regent White noted that a number of Regents had still not arrived at the meeting but were en route. He stated that the benchmarking/management review initiative was very important and asked to recess the meeting until the other Regents arrived.

Chancellor Portch interjected that the Board had special guests at this meeting. He then introduced Senator Vincent D. Fort (district 39) and Representative Douglas C. Dean (district 48). He thanked them for helping the Board secure property for Atlanta Metropolitan College at the June 2000 Board meeting.

The Board meeting recessed at approximately 1:15 p.m. and reconvened at approximately 1:25 p.m., after Regents George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, and Charles H. Jones had arrived.

Chair Leebern explained that Dr. Alceste Pappas would be discussing the results of the benchmarking/ management review study, which had been performed by the Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. with Arthur Andersen LLP and MGT of America, Inc. He then called on Chancellor Portch to introduce the presentation.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair Leebern. He stated that the University System had reached another milestone in its benchmarking and accountability project. He thanked the Governor's Office for giving the System the opportunity to benchmark itself against others, which will establish a baseline that will enable the University System to perform future examinations of its

progress. The Chancellor recognized the project steering committee (PSC) and the consultants for bringing the project to this point in this year-long exercise. He explained that the resulting report is extremely long. The report has thousands of data points, so it is important that those data points are checked and double-checked. The Chancellor reported that the PSC would likely sign off on the report in the next week. The report would then go to the institutions to again double-check the accuracy of the data. From there, the report would go to the printer, and it would be sent to the Regents around September 1, 2000. Chancellor Portch cautioned the Regents not to feel overwhelmed by the length of the report, because at the September 2000 Board meeting, Chair White will lead the Regents and staff in breaking the report into digestible pieces to develop a year-long work plan. The staff will need the Regents' input about how to cluster the performance indicators to develop this concrete work plan. The year-long focus will give the Board an opportunity to get a deeper understanding of the data. We will look for outliers, and we will look to institutions with exemplary performances within the System and without to identify best practices. Chancellor Portch recognized Dr. Pappas for her hard work on this project. Not only did she have to work with two state agencies, but she also worked with two other consulting agencies. The level of collaboration made this project a major feat, but for decades to come, it will set standards for accountability in the nation. With that, the Chancellor called upon Dr. Pappas to present to the Board the big picture of the thousands of data points in the benchmarking/management review report.

Dr. Pappas greeted the Board. She stated that this has been an effort unlike any other she had experienced in her 31 years in higher education. The consultants were now at the point where they could begin to share some of the results that would make a difference in the Board's continuous goal to improve the quality of the University System. Before her presentation, however, she recognized the PSC co-chairs, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor Madlyn Hanes and Mr. Charles Freedman, Director of Program Evaluation and Management with the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB). She also recognized Mr. Ron Jackson, Director of Strategic Planning, and Mr. David Watts, Director of Education Development, also from OPB, and Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers. The PSC dealt with the practicality of developing deliverables for the Board of Regents in a very short time frame.

Dr. Pappas reminded the Board that the timing of the benchmarking/management review initiative was serendipitous both in terms of the Governor's agenda and the Board's agenda. As the focus of the Board's recent strategic planning efforts, benchmarking is extremely important. Also, this happened at a time when the Governor called for audits of state business practices, in which the particular focus is on improvement and cost savings. The third convergence of items is the implementation of PeopleSoft. That is particularly important because PeopleSoft has enabled the University System to begin to redesign business practices, which was the main focus of scope two of this study. Dr. Pappas reminded the Regents that the objectives of the benchmarking/management review study were to continue to increase System and institutional effectiveness and efficiency, to develop a baseline for future System and institutional performance, and to begin to put in place a sustainable process to support the Governor's and Regents' long-term accountability agenda.

Next, Dr. Pappas discussed the benchmarking study itself. She reminded the Board that this study is the most comprehensive to date for the University System and represents only the beginning of what the Board will undertake as its year-long strategic planning agenda. She stressed that this study was not just a one-year effort. Rather, it represents the beginning of a

long-term effort for the Board and the University System. When the benchmarking milestones were established, the consultants worked very closely with the PSC and institutions to come to an agreement on the criteria or variables for peer/comparator selection. From this process, 18 mission-related criteria/variables were used. Then, the PSC and the institutions came to agreement on the peer/comparator lists, which after a thorough analysis, included a grand total of 195 institutions clustered into four categories: research universities, regional and state universities, state colleges, and two-year colleges. The next step was to delineate the performance indicators/ benchmarks for use with peers/comparators, and 31 indicators were agreed upon. Dr. Pappas explained that the result of having 31 indicators for 34 institutions with 195 peers was 7,099 data points. Dr. Pappas reminded the Board that the data were collected through surveys generated by the Central Office and institutions as well as Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS) data from the National Center of Education Statistics. The PSC decided to calculate a normative range that would provide for each of the 31 indicators a sense of the outliers so that the Board could begin to put together a management reporting system that makes sense. For the purposes of this presentation, Dr. Pappas would present some very high-level findings clustered in three ways: academics, financial/administrative, and economic development/research. She noted that the preponderance of the benchmarks would relate to academics and that this is very appropriate, because fundamentally, the core mission of the University System is teaching, learning, and public service.

Dr. Pappas explained that the System institutions generally performed well on freshman to sophomore retention rates, an area that attracts a great deal of attention nationally. It is important for many reasons, including improving the quality and number of students in the University System. It is also important from a business perspective, because recruitment is a costly process, and losing students through retention drop off is very costly. Another strong point of System institutions was the diversity of the student body, which is reflective of state demographics. Dr. Pappas said that the Regents can be proud of the percentage of students in the two-year sector completing associate's degrees and/or transferring to senior institutions, because many institutions across the nation are dealing with articulation agreements and the fall-off that occurs between two-year and four-year institutions. Dr. Pappas stressed that this is a very positive sign that may in fact have to do with the structure of this particular system of public higher education. Another positive thing the data reveal is that the System institutions have strong relationships with K-12 schools. Dr. Pappas said that this is likely due in part to the P-16 initiative. Both Georgia and Maryland perform very well in the nation for the efforts they are undertaking in this area. These are among the four most important positive messages the consultants wanted to highlight in terms of the academic benchmarks.

Next, Dr. Pappas addressed the University System's performance within the normative range. She stated that fundamentally, the System institutions spend about the normative amount of money per full-time equivalent student (FTE) on instruction, and actually, it is a bit on the high end of the range. She noted that many University System institutions employ more tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach undergraduates than do their peers. It is not at all unusual for undergraduates to be taught by research or teaching assistants in institutions across the nation. So, while the System's instruction costs are high because the Board has made a commitment to use more tenured and tenure-track faculty in undergraduate classrooms, they are still within the range. Dr. Pappas stressed that this is important with regard to the quality of education. Next, she noted that regional and state universities involved in continuing education and public service

are also within the normative range. This is a means of public outreach that should be studied and reviewed even more closely.

There are two items that the consultants were recommending the Board put on its year-long strategic planning agenda. Those items are the two areas in which University System institutions generally perform below the normative range, and they both relate to graduation rates. Dr. Pappas noted that the data for the four-year graduation rates were generally from fiscal year 1995. The six-year graduation rates at some regional and state universities were not in place long enough to yield reliable results, because they were from fiscal year 1993. She reiterated that the freshman to sophomore retention rates are very good. In around 2005-2006, the graduation rates should logically improve, but the consultants urge the Board to take a hard look at how to improve graduation rates. Dr. Pappas noted that there may be other demographics playing into the issue of the four-year and six-year graduation rates. For instance, some System institutions enroll greater percentages of students in developmental or learning support classes than their peers. Also, many System institutions on average enroll greater percentages of part-time students than do their peers, which obviously affects the length of time necessary to complete a degree. These are mitigating factors that the Board and the institutional leadership will have to review to better understand the relationships.

In the financial/administrative area, that the System is within range with regard to allocating resources to instruction at most of the institutions, which ties back to the finding about the use of tenured and tenure-track faculty in undergraduate teaching, explained Dr. Pappas. She noted that there are higher administrative expenditures compared to the peers for several System institutions, but the preponderance is still within range. This is another issue the consultants were suggesting the Regents delve into deeper.

The third cluster of benchmarking findings that Dr. Pappas presented was in the area of economic development/research. There is evidence that the System has strong ties to local community and businesses. This is seen in an increase in fund raising in the corporate community as well as the number of contacts that many institutions have with individual business leaders and corporations through continuing and extension education. Also, the aggregate of the four research universities shows that there is an increase in the research dollars generated among research universities set aside for research.

Next, Dr. Pappas discussed the focus of the PSC on the Georgia-specific indicators to begin to give the Board the initial discussions that need further deliberation and will be helpful in helping the Board create its strategic planning agenda for the upcoming year. The Georgia-specific measures have to do with developing some indicators and outcome measures that relate to the tripartate mission of the University System: instruction, research, and public service. In that regard, the consultants make suggestions in the report related, for example, to the production of quality graduates. They asked questions such as the following. How have the individual institutions in this System helped students meet their career and life goals? How does the research that is going on contribute to the state's well-being? How do we measure that long-term impact? Finally, how do all of the public service elements, which are very hard to define and measure, contribute to the state's economic development? These are among the series of questions with which the PSC is still grappling and that will provide the Board some direction to help inform the deliberations in the coming year.

Another area that Dr. Pappas addressed was the Board of Regents Central Office. As part of the benchmarking exercise, one of the issues the consultants reviewed was the relationship of the Central Office relative to other system offices across the nation. In this part of the study, the consultants relied on data provided by the Association of Governing Boards. The consultants examined 14 variables, such as the role and responsibilities of the Central Office and its relationship and initiatives with grades pre-kindergarten to 12. There are a total of four comparators selected with which the consultants could make some comparisons, but Dr. Pappas stressed that comparisons are very difficult to make given the very different missions of each of these individual state systems of higher education. The comparators include the University of Minnesota Board of Trustees, the Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State College and Universities, the Board of Regents of the Wisconsin System, and the Board of Trustees of the State Universities of New York. Among the initial findings are that there is much diversity in terms of the numbers and types of institutions as well as the board constitution and governance roles. There are also some similarities in functions and responsibilities, which mainly relate to strategic planning, policy, and providing support services to smaller institutions that cannot afford them. When all the data is compared, it is apparent that the Board of Regents Central Office accomplishes a great deal with a relatively small staff.

Next, Dr. Pappas discussed what the consultants are suggesting the Board do with the results of this broad-based benchmarking study. As the data are further verified, the Board will be able to get at the institutional level, but at the broadest level, there are four areas that the consultants strongly urge the Board to consider as part of its work plan this year. The first is that the Board needs to delve into the System's graduation rates. The Board should use the normative range of peer graduation as a baseline measure against which progress over the next five years is measured. It also needs to establish a separate benchmark that evaluates actual graduation rates compared to predicted graduation rates and then monitor progress toward the predicted rates. The second recommendation is that the Board must begin to invest very heavily in developing a common format for surveys of student, alumni, and employer satisfaction. The Board and institutions should consistently distribute surveys and collect and analyze the results. Model surveys exist, but human resources and technology are needed. The third recommendation is that the Board needs to begin to measure the achievements of the System's graduates by collecting data Systemwide. This too will require resources. Finally, the Board needs to get a handle on expenditures for institutional support and administration at several of the institutions which are outside of normative ranges. If in fact the expenditures are below the norm, then there is a great opportunity to identify best practices that already exist. Dr. Pappas stressed that outliers are not always above the norm, but are sometimes below. This is important because it ties in with the second scope of this project. Project scope two addresses the issues of management and administrative processes. So, these will be interrelated as the Board does its further analysis.

Next, Dr. Pappas turned her attention to the results of the second scope of the study. She reminded the Regents that the study focused on five institutions in particular: the Central Office, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Macon State College, Kennesaw State University (KSU), and the University of Georgia (UGA). The consultants conducted diagnostic reviews of approximately 110 processes in the administrative and financial areas as well as student enrollment areas at UGA and KSU. They performed detailed analyses of the purchasing cycle, the budget amendment process, facilities design and construction, the warehouse operation at UGA, the materials requisition within the plant operations at UGA, business services, and the UGA Georgia Center for Continuing Education (Georgia Center). Dr. Pappas stressed that the

data found at the five sites studied in the second scope cannot be extrapolated across the University System, because to do so would be fallacious. She also stressed that the five sites were purposely very different with different missions, different ways of doing business, and different historical contexts. Dr. Pappas also said that in a number of cases, the University System will not reach cost avoidance unless it works directly with the state, in particular with the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (GSFIC), because these costs are not under the total purview of the Regents or the Central Office. By summarizing by functional area, the consultants found opportunities at UGA to look at savings in terms of FTEs. This is based on a manually driven purchasing process, which is not atypical of many institutions. There are also annual estimated cost savings in the area of business services of about five to six FTEs. Here the focus was primarily in the Central Office and the UGA Center. In the budget office, the consultants identified some potential savings, but they were recommending that the Board redeploy both the budget and business services staff to address staffing for the report card, because that will take considerable time and energy going forward. In terms of annual estimated cost avoidance, this primarily falls in the facilities design and construction area. Also at the UGA warehouse, there are some opportunities going forward for cost avoidance. Again, Dr. Pappas reiterated that achieving any cost avoidance will require the effort of the Board and the Central Office as well as the state.

Some of the recommendations in scope two are as follows. In purchasing, the consultants recommend that the state raise the purchasing threshold to help eliminate a lot of time and redundancy in signing off businesses that have been through the process before and to integrate the purchasing and accounts payable systems through PeopleSoft. With regard to the budget, the consultants recommend that only budget transfers in excess of \$1 million be sent to the Central Office for processing. In the area of facilities design and construction, the consultants recommend that during the selection process, consideration be given to working with the state to pre-qualify for low-cost, standard projects, to focus in on how to streamline the change order review and approval process, and to develop building commissioning policies and procedures, based on best practices and coordinated with GSFIC and campuses. As it relates to the warehouse operation and materials requisition within plant operations at UGA, the consultants recommend removing obsolete and standing inventories and reducing the amount of safety stock. A review of the financial reporting function of the Central Office resulted in a number of conclusions and recommendations in the areas of payroll, purchasing, accounts payable, invoicing, accounts receivable, accounting, asset management, and printing/mail/supplies/records. At the Georgia Center, the consultants recommend looking at how to use technology more effectively to minimize paper flow and minimize redundancies of paperwork and shadow systems. The consultants also looked at the custodial staff benchmarking statistics at the four campuses. Data was obtained from the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers, and the consultants determined that the industry standard of \$1.50 per square foot per year is in place and there is no need at this time to go back and analyze deeper in this area.

So, what does this say about the next steps that the consultants would like the Board to consider in terms of the management review? First and foremost, the consultants recommend that the Board continue to take advantage of PeopleSoft and its functionality, said Dr. Pappas. It will provide the opportunity to redesign processes during its implementation. The consultants also want to remind the Board that there are concurrent studies going on. KPMG LLP (KPMG) is examining a number of state agencies and there will likely be convergence and divergence on

some of the recommendations going forward. KPMG's report on facilities is not yet complete, but Dr. Pappas suggested the Board watch for it to ensure consistency in direction and strategy. Also, as the Board develops a long-term system of accountability and report card measurement, it should make some very wise investments in technology and human resources without creating a bureaucracy just to measure. Dr. Pappas stressed that the Board recognize that an investment is needed to achieve new efficiencies and effectiveness in administrative functions, particularly in implementing the benchmarking/accountability recommendations. She commended the Chancellor and Board Chair for their intent to cluster issues and grapple with them from a planning and policy perspective and then put responsibility on the institutions and the Central Office to make it work.

Next, Dr. Pappas asked, "What have we learned?" There are many strengths, she said, that were important to point out. Overall, the University System of Georgia and its institutions fall within normative ranges for a comprehensive set of performance indicators. There is nothing unusual or troublesome to report, except in the areas she had already discussed. The University System institutions perform well on indicators for retention rates, diversity, ties to community and business, and percentages of students completing associate's degrees or transferring from the two-year sector. The Central Office is professionally managed and is leanly staffed. It compares well to other system offices with regard to services offered statewide and to the smaller institutions. The institutions participating in project scope two for the most part are efficiently staffed and operated. In fact, many of the recommendations that the consultants made at these institutions were already underway when they began this study.

Dr. Pappas reiterated that the University System institutions, in general, perform below the normative ranges on the following indicators: six-year graduation rates, although not inclusively; consistent and uniform survey and collection of information to measure student, alumni, and employer satisfaction; and consistent and uniform survey and collection of information to measure graduates' achievements. All of the stakeholders at the state, Central Office, University System, and institutional levels need to come to a consensus on how to meet various needs regarding performance measurement, methodologies for collection and analysis, balance of national versus internal and state indicators, outcome measures, and so forth. Dr. Pappas again stressed that the Board should spend time defining all of this thoughtfully as a Board. The definition of data elements, the reporting of data, and its analysis at the institutional and the Central Office level requires study and improvement. Dr. Pappas stressed that this will be a mammoth undertaking and will require much time and attention this year. Again, she stated that the opportunities the System has for cost avoidance are dependent on the state and the System working together to change some of the current policies and procedures, particularly as they relate to facilities construction. Improvements in purchasing cycle, budget, facilities design and construction, UGA warehouse and materials requisition, and business processes can result in an estimated summary of annual cost savings of \$900,000 to \$1,380,000 and cost avoidance of \$5,425,000 to \$5,850,000. The cost avoidance projections are based on the Board's working with the state.

In closing, Dr. Pappas said that even though she was reporting on scopes one and two at this time, the consultants' work is not quite finished. The task at hand is to determine how to take what they have learned from these two scopes and address another part of the request for proposal, which was how to begin to sustain and develop an infrastructure for all the data that need to be housed and analyzed going forward. So, over the next six weeks, the consultants will

be working with the PSC, the Central Office, and the institutions to ascertain the adequacy and usefulness of the data system administration practices of the University System and to recommend to the Board some formalized processes for collecting data, performing analyses, and reporting accountability. That work should be completed around October 1, 2000.

Chancellor Portch thanked Dr. Pappas for showing the Board the big picture. He noted that looking at the macro level takes a lot of time as it is, but this will be an area of focus at every meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee this year. In September 2000, the Regents will develop their work plan, which will be informed by the areas that Dr. Pappas had highlighted.

Chair Leebern asked Dr. Pappas or the Chancellor to expand on her comments regarding developmental studies and learning support.

The Chancellor responded that every state defines developmental studies differently. So, true comparisons have to be taken with a certain degree of caution. Having said that, there were a number of System institutions that appeared to be above the normative range for the number of students in developmental studies. This is a good baseline for the year it was examined. The trend line, however, is downward. So, when this issue is examined again after the implementation of the 2001 admissions policy, there should be a change.

Chair Leebern stated that the numbers should be going down.

Chancellor Portch said that the numbers are going down. When one looks at Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores, which are low at some institutions that are high in percentages in developmental studies, there are also noticeable trends in retention and graduation rates. There is a very high correlation when one looks at these issues by institution. The lower the SAT scores, typically, the lower the retention and graduation rates. However, there are some outliers that are doing better than expected given those circumstances. Those are the outliers the Board should look to for best practices to be shared with other institutions.

Regent McMillan asked whether the study examined the possible correlation between the institutions that have small administrative infrastructures and more emphasis on instruction and whether they have more tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching. He said that these factors would seem to have an impact on the issues Chair Leebern had addressed.

The Chancellor responded that these are exactly the kinds of issues the Regents will be addressing this year. No single report could answer all of these questions, but this study will lay out the data so the Regents can cluster them and make those connections.

Regent Jenkins asked whether administrative costs are generally in the upper range when instructional costs are in the upper range.

Dr. Pappas responded that when cost of instruction is at the high end, it is usually indicative that an institution is using tenured and tenure-track faculty more than its peers. Generally speaking, the administrative costs in the University System are within normative range.

Regent Jenkins responded that he was under the impression that the administrative costs were also high.

Dr. Pappas stated that when the Regents closely examine the data, they will find tremendous variance. So, within that normative range, there will be some institutions that are operating very efficiently. On the other hand, there are some institutions with multiple missions that do not have the same degree of technology and rely more heavily on staff and manual processes.

Regent Jenkins next asked about the recommendation regarding building commissioning policies and procedures.

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers responded that this relates to working with the GFSIC, which is a state commission, to create better commissioning processes in order to save money.

Returning to Regent Jenkins' first question, Chancellor Portch clarified that the University System is actually in the high end of the normative range for administrative costs.

Regent Jenkins stated that it seemed the System is high in administrative costs and faculty costs, but low on graduation rates.

Dr. Pappas agreed that this is the case.

Regent Baranco asked what percentage of the peer institutions uses PeopleSoft.

Dr. Pappas responded that due to the way in which the data were collected, the consultants could not know. Generally speaking, most of the large state university systems are in the process of implementing PeopleSoft. However, there is tremendous variance from institution to institution and system to system in which some have simply implemented the program and not redesigned their processes. Because there are many variations, Dr. Pappas could not answer the question, and it will take years to know how successful the institutions will be at reducing administrative costs. Dr. Pappas stressed that while there are many other systems who have lost very large sums of money in "runaway" implementations, the Board has been very wise in how it is implementing PeopleSoft and, as a result, has not squandered millions.

Chancellor Portch recognized Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes for his leadership in the PeopleSoft implementation.

Regent Cannestra noted that faculty costs are high because the University System uses more tenured and tenure-track professors in undergraduate classrooms. However, some institutions are not as dependent on tenured and tenure-track instructors. He asked whether the data show the effectiveness and efficiency of both kinds of instruction and whether one can be determined to be superior.

Dr. Pappas responded that it would take longitudinal surveys of students and measures of their success to get a clear picture of this.

Regent Cannestra stated that there are many indicators that could be examined to determine whether it makes economic sense to spend the money to have tenured and tenure-track professors teaching at the undergraduate level.

Dr. Pappas responded that this is also a profound philosophical question because the fact that someone has gone through a very rigorous process has traditionally been valued in higher education by his peers on his campus and nationally.

Regent Cannestra responded that he did not want to take on the tenured versus non-tenured debate. Rather, he wanted to know which is a more efficient way to do business.

Chancellor Portch stated that location plays a role in this issue. At Georgia State University (GSU), for example, there is a relatively high percentage of instruction by non-tenure-track faculty. In Atlanta, colleges are able to attract tremendous talent to teach part-time. This is not a black and white issue, because there are many variables involved. GSU has a high percentage of part-time students, high percentages of students being taught by non-tenure-track faculty, and relatively poor graduation rates. The Chancellor asked rhetorically which variable is resulting in the low graduation rate.

Regent Cannestra insisted that the data will show whether instructors who are tenured or tenure-track do a better job than those who are not tenure-track. Then, the System can justify its preference for tenure-track faculty. If the data could reveal the problem, then the Board could attack the problem itself to get the faculty it really wants.

The Chancellor responded that it is very hard to isolate what contributes to learning because there are many variables. There may be a part-time faculty member who is a working professional and teaches one course who does a wonderful job and whose students learn enormously.

Regent Howell stated that in his opinion, the real issue is not tenure-track or non-tenure-track. The issue is whether there are students teaching students or professors and instructors teaching students. He stated that the fact that the University System is at the high end of the range for having tenured and tenure-track professors is very positive, because one of the truly negative aspects of higher education is when the education of undergraduate students is turned over to graduate students. Regent Howell said he feels very strongly about this, and he is very happy that the University System is not among those institutions. He asked whether the System's part-time instructors are teaching and/or research assistants.

Chancellor Portch replied that this is another classic example of what the Board will be examining this year. The report does not disaggregate this information, but this is the sort of question the Board can ask the staff to answer. The staff will have to do more work on each aspect that the Board wants to further examine.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Pappas for her presentation and noted that the Regents will have a lengthy report to review when it is finalized and back from the printer. He then adjourned the Committee of the Whole and turned the floor back to Chair White.

Chair White thanked Dr. Pappas for her presentation. At approximately 2:30 p.m., he adjourned the Board into its regular committee meetings.

The Board reconvened at approximately 3:35 p.m. to hear the Committee reports.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 at approximately 2:35 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair James D. Yancey, Vice Chair Connie Cater, and Regents Kenneth W. Cannestra, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. When the full Board reconvened, Chair Yancey reported that the Committee had reviewed five items, three of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Acceptance of Gifts, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) gifts-in-kind from the following corporations:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Department</u>
Environmental Systems Products, Inc.	\$200,000	Remote sensing device (model RSD-3000, Unit 503) to gather on-road vehicle exhaust measurements	School of Civil Environmental Engineering - Air Quality Lab
Microsoft Corporation	\$1,457,440	Bundled Software Packages Development	Office of Minority Educational

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. GIT has advised that these items have been appraised at fair market value and there are no material cost implications to be anticipated with the acceptance of these gifts.

2. Reappointment of Regents' Representative on Teachers Retirement System of Georgia Board of Trustees

Approved: The Board approved the reappointment of Dr. Sandra Gustavson as Board of Regents' representative to serve on the Board of Trustees of the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia. The reappointment is effective from July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2003.

Background: Dr. Gustavson has been the Regents' representative to the Board of Trustees of the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia for fiscal year 2000. Dr. Gustavson is head of the Department of Insurance, Legal Studies, Real Estate and Management Science with the Terry College of Business at the University of Georgia. She is the Bradford McFadden Professor of Personal Financial Management. She received her terminal degree from the University of Illinois. She has formal training in risk management, insurance, and portfolio management. She has professional designations (CLU-Chartered Life Underwriter, ChFC - Chartered Financial

Consultant) in life insurance and related areas, including estate planning and employee benefits. Dr. Gustavson has written articles on employee benefits for faculty, portfolio performance, long-term healthcare, and disability insurance.

3. Approval of Tuition Rates for the University of Georgia's Master of Business Administration Program at the Gwinnett Center

Approved: The Board of Regents approved a tuition rate of \$250 per credit hour for in-state students enrolled in the Terry College of Business's part-time master of business administration (M.B.A.) program at the University System Center in Gwinnett County. Out-of-state tuition rates will remain unchanged from rates established for other graduate programs at the University of Georgia.

Background: The Terry College of Business plans to begin a part-time M.B.A. program at the University System Center - Gwinnett in August 2000. The start date is designed to accommodate the growing demand for M.B.A. education in Gwinnett County. It is only recently that the development of program curriculum was completed and the necessary technological infrastructure established to support the program, which relies heavily upon state-of-the art distributive learning techniques (e.g., use of the Internet for between-class interactions among students and between students and the faculty).

As with other professional graduate programs for which differential rates have been approved consistent with rates in competitive programs nationally, the proposed rate of \$250 per credit hour is in line with rates for other part-time M.B.A. programs in other states (e.g., Clemson - \$245/credit hour, Indiana - \$250/credit hour). It is also the same tuition rate recently established for the University System of Georgia's WebMBA program. Out-of-state tuition rates will remain unchanged.

4. Information Item: Report on Health Insurance Contract Process and Other Developments on Employee Health Insurance Matters

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers provided to the Committee an update on the annual negotiation process for renewal of health maintenance organization (HMO) contracts; a report on the status of the pharmacy management contract through the Department of Community Health (DCH); and a report on issues relating to the finalization of the preferred provider organization (PPO) option for University System employees as well as other cost-saving measures related to the self-insured indemnity healthcare plan. Ms. Irene K. Rude, Director of Public Employees Health Benefit Services, and Ms. Valerie Duncan, Director of Board of Regents Services, represented DCH at this meeting. Dr. Desrochers reminded the Committee that the Board had already approved a rate increase of 15% for System employees enrolled in the self-insured indemnity healthcare plan, effective August 1, 2000. She reported that at the September 2000 meeting, the staff will present a recommendation for the next increase in rates based on actuarial analysis by Towers Perrin. Towers Perrin is also helping to identify an appropriate starting premium for the PPO, which will become available for University System employees during an open enrollment period in October 2000 to become effective January 2001. Also at the September 2000 meeting, the staff will present to the Committee recommendations regarding administrative fees charged by Blue Cross Blue Shield, the administrator of both the indemnity and PPO plans, as well as recommendations with regard to renewal of the four HMO

plans. Dr. Desrochers also reported that DCH has selected a pharmacy benefits manager for the University System: Express Scripts. In fiscal year 1999, pharmacy benefits, approximately 17% of the System's medical claims were for pharmacy charges. The intent is to create management techniques that create cost savings. Dr. Desrochers also reported that Mr. William Wallace, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, is working with DCH to find whether the University System can solicit a national network to cooperate with the PPO network to provide cost-efficient services for employees and retirees living out of state.

5. Information Item: The Role and Responsibilities of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers provided to the Committee a review of the role and responsibilities of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations to assist the new Chair and Committee members.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 at approximately 2:55 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Kenneth W. Cannestra, Connie Cater, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. When the full Board reconvened, Chair Hunt reported that the Committee had reviewed seven items, four of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Demolition of Fertilizer Warehouse Building, Vidalia Onion and Vegetable Research Center, Tombs County, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board declared the Fertilizer Warehouse Building located at the Vidalia Onion and Vegetable Research Center, Toombs County, Vidalia, 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 this building.

The Board also requested that Governor Barnes issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of this building from the Vidalia Onion and Vegetable Research Center.

Background: The Fertilizer Warehouse, built in 1960, is a 3,800-square-foot metal frame building formerly used for fertilizer storage. The building is structurally and cosmetically disintegrating, is not serviceable, and is vacant.

The demolition will be conducted by public works contract using funds provided by the legislature as a special grant for the development of the research farm. The cost of demolition is estimated to be \$12,000 by Northstar Construction Group.

The Board of Regents has custody of this building, which is owned by the Georgia Forestry Commission. The director of the Georgia Forestry Commission is in agreement with the demolition

2. Acquisition of Property, Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of property commonly referred to as the Hearn property located at 210 West Moore Street, Valdosta, Georgia at a purchase price of \$115,000 for the use and benefit of Valdosta State University (VSU).

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

Background: The property consists of .443 acres with a single wood-frame house of approximately 1,700 gross square feet in good condition, an outbuilding used for storage, and a paved driveway.

Acquisition of the property is consistent with VSU's master plan.

The property is located adjacent to the campus and will be used by the marriage and family therapy clinic program.

Three independent appraisals of the property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Appraised Average</u>
Crumley & Associates, Valdosta	4/26/99	\$108,000	
Alan Sutton Company, Valdosta	4/23/99	\$115,000	\$115,000
Almand & Company, Valdosta	4/16/99	\$122,000	

A phase I environmental assessment has been completed and indicates that there are no environmental problems.

There are no restrictions on the purchase and there are no known easements or restrictions on the property.

Operating expenses for the property are estimated to be \$3,000.

3. Conveyance of 1.98 Acres of Land to Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board declared an approximately 1.98 acre unimproved tract of land at Armstrong Atlantic State University (AASU) and known as a portion of the Abercorn property to be no longer advantageously useful to AASU or to other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of conveying this property to the Georgia Bureau of Investigation (GBI) to enlarge the GBI facility.

The Board also authorized conveyance of the above-referenced tract of land for the use and benefit of the GBI for construction of a morgue and laboratory addition, subject to a reversion of the property if it should cease being used by the GBI for these purposes.

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

Background: In June 1984, the Board of Regents authorized the transfer of 2.204 acres of unimproved land at AASU to the GBI, upon which the GBI constructed the existing Coastal Regional Crime Laboratory and Regional Drug Enforcement Office.

During the last session of the General Assembly, \$2,295,000 was appropriated to construct a morgue and laboratory addition to the existing GBI facility. The original tract of land is not large enough to accommodate the new morgue and laboratory addition.

GBI Director Milton E. "Buddy" Nix, Jr. and his staff worked with representatives of AASU to identify a way to expand the GBI laboratory facility with minimal impact upon the university's future use of the property. The recommendation to expand the existing laboratory site by 1.98 acres was not opposed by AASU.

4. Appointment of Architects, University System of Georgia

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

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

Project No. I-66, "Expansion of Interdisciplinary Research Center" Medical College of Georgia

Project Description: This project will expand the existing research facilities to include translational research, technology development, core research, and animal facilities.

Total Project Cost	\$21,000,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$18,321,000
A/E (fixed) Fee	\$1,232,500

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 24
Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

1. Lord Aeck Sargent w/ 2KM, Atlanta/Augusta
2. O'Neal w/Hinman Arch., Atlanta/Augusta
3. Howell Rusk Dodson w/NBBJ, Atlanta
4. CUH2A, Atlanta

Project No. I-84, "Health Sciences Building" Medical College of Georgia

Project Description: This project will accommodate the School of Nursing and the School of Allied Health Sciences, consolidating their programs on campus. It will also serve as the distributed learning platform for the university, fostering collaborative

programs statewide.

Total Project Cost	\$34,175,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$24,600,000
A/E (fixed) Fee	\$1,787,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 28

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

1. The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Atlanta
2. Howell Rusk Dodson w/NBBJ, Atlanta

Project No. I-87, "Bartow Center, Phase I"

Floyd College

Project Description: Technology-enhanced instructional/lab space and support services to meet the education needs of this fast-growing segment of the I-75 corridor in a single facility. The center is strategically located to allow for a broad range of public post-secondary (Department of Technical and Adult Education [DTAE] and University System of Georgia) collaborative programs. The location will consolidate Floyd College's programs currently in various leased spaces in the area. In addition, general instructional space Floyd College currently occupies at DTAE's north metro facility will be freed up for needed DTAE programs.

Total Project Cost	\$18,386,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$14,000,000
A/E (fixed) Fee	\$1,085,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 38

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

1. Cooper Carry w/Cheeks Hornbein, Atlanta.
2. Lord Aeck & Sargent, Atlanta
3. Sverdrup CRSS, Atlanta
4. Chapman, Griffin, Lanier, Sussenbach, Atlanta

Project No. I-91, "Meyers Hall Renovation"

University of Georgia

Project Description: A comprehensive renovation and modernization to this residence hall built in 1953 of approximately 132,000 gross square feet of space to house 300 students. Also included are specialized classrooms and administrative spaces to enhance the living and learning interaction.

Total Project Cost	\$19,360,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$13,850,000
A/E (fixed) Fee	\$1,000,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 22

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

1. Duckett VanDevere w/Collins, Cooper Carusi, Atlanta
2. Surber Barber Choate & Hertlein, Atlanta
3. Sverdrup CRSS, Atlanta

Project No. I-92, "Parking Deck, Central Campus"

University of Georgia

Project Description: Structured parking to accommodate 1,100 cars on two sites with one of the structures being built to accommodate a future addition of either academic, administrative, or revenue-generating space.

Total Project Cost	\$12,800,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$11,000,000
A/E (fixed) Fee	\$635,000

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 21
Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

1. Smallwood, Reynolds, Stewart, Stewart & Associates, Atlanta
2. Urban Design Group, Atlanta
3. KPS Group, Atlanta

5. Information Item: Facilities Management

Culminating a year of research and investigation regarding implementation of the major repair and renovation (MRR) program, the Board of Regents received a final report in the form of a guidelines document at the October 1999 meeting. At the January 2000 meeting, the ways in which the guidelines document could be expected to enhance the program were discussed with the Board and the results of a survey regarding maintenance-related work performed by outside contractors were presented.

At the Committee's request, Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham provided a follow-up report and proposal regarding an appropriate facilities management/preventive maintenance program, schedule, and cost at this meeting. Mr. Chatham introduced Dr. George Wingblade, Director of Physical Plant at South Georgia College, and explained that Dr. Wingblade is an expert in preventive maintenance who had been asked to chair a committee to study these issues. The staff will work with Dr. Wingblade to investigate and develop programs and practices that will better ensure cost-effective expenditures for maintenance and operations. The staff will report back to the Committee in approximately one year with a program proposal. Director of Facilities Planning Gita Hendessi distributed to the Committee a draft scope of the work of the committee chaired by Dr. Wingblade.

6. Information Item: Master Plan, Atlanta Metropolitan College

Atlanta Metropolitan College and the Office of Facilities proposed a physical master plan for future development of the institution. President Harold E. Wade and Mr. Alan Toland, Senior Vice President of the Atlanta architectural and planning consulting firm of Harper Partners, presented the plan to the Committee. The consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the college's mission statement, strategic plan, academic and support programs, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive

input and then presented five-year and ten-year options for facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian circulation patterns, and campus beautification. Based on the consultants' findings, Atlanta Metropolitan College's master plan recommendations included the following:

Create appropriate future facilities for the growing academic needs, community outreach activities, and continuing education needs

Renovate several existing buildings to provide modern teaching facilities

Upgrade campus utility infrastructure

Create a new campus entrance utilizing recently acquired land in order to improve campus identity

Continue to preserve and enhance the campus environment and landscaping

7. Information Item: The Role and Responsibilities of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities

Senior Vice Chancellor Lindsay Desrochers briefed the Committee members on the role and responsibilities of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities in an effort to assist the new Chair and Committee members.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 at approximately 2:35 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Joe Frank Harris, Edgar L. Jenkins, and Charles H. Jones. When the full Board reconvened, Chair Harris reported that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 8 of which required action. Additionally, 750 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Presentation/Update: eCore™

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed in full. Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Daniel S. Papp introduced the item and explained that it would be presented in full at the September 2000 Committee meeting. At that time, he will discuss the eCore™ project and explain how University System faculty and institutions are working together to make the first two years of the college education available to students anytime, anyplace.

The educational technology principles and action items adopted by the Board of Regents in June 1999 committed the University System to the integration of technology as a central element of teaching, learning, student services, public service, research, and institutional management. Principle 2 states that the "University System will employ technologies to expand the learning environment ensuring access to information and educational experiences independent of time, location, and physical boundaries for all types of students from undergraduate through life-long learners." One way the System is involved in addressing this principle is to promote and

facilitate expanded student access to the core curriculum using asynchronous instruction and the full spectrum of delivery methods and technologies.

2. Establishment of the Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton to establish the doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.) in computer science degree, effective August 9, 2000.

Abstract: Georgia State University (GSU) proposed the establishment of a Ph.D. in computer science to meet the need for doctoral-level computer scientists. Growth in the information technology industry, both locally and nationally, has created an unmet demand for computer science graduates. Yamacraw, a state initiative that aims at making Georgia the global leader in electronic design of high-bandwidth communications systems and components, is accelerating growth in information technologies and related high-technology industries. The proposed doctoral program will build upon and extend the current master's program in computer science.

Need: To meet the burgeoning need for computer science graduates at the doctoral level, the November 15, 1999 request for proposals for Yamacraw from the Board of Regents, announced a goal for the University System of Georgia to create new faculty positions and courses sufficient to grant 2,000 Ph.D., master's, bachelor's, and certificate degree holders in Yamacraw target areas by 2003. It is anticipated that the increased number of graduates will have the skills required to work in various high-technology companies in Georgia. The University System has only two other Ph.D. computer science programs. These programs are located at the University of Georgia and the Georgia Institute of Technology. The proposed Ph.D. in computer science is an effort to meet the System goal of producing more graduates in the computer science field. A recent article in the May/June 1999 issue of *IEEE Software* reports that in 1998, there was a nationwide labor shortfall of over half a million unfilled positions just in software development. Student demand for computer science at GSU is increasing. Yamacraw, in particular, depends on the production of new Ph.D.s to provide researchers in key areas of computer science. The program is "industry-centered," reflecting the needs and concerns of high-tech industries in the state and mutual cooperation between industry and GSU. A 1994 outside review of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science strongly advocated the creation of a Ph.D. program in computer science. The establishment of the Ph.D. program is aligned with the department's strategic plan.

Objectives: The program will meet the need for doctoral-level computer scientists. The program will also help meet the need in the State of Georgia for Ph.D. academic computer scientists who will expand the teaching and research capabilities of institutions of higher learning in the state and help these institutions meet the strong student demand for computer science education, particularly in Yamacraw target areas. In addition, the institution will be able to produce Ph.D.-level researchers to enhance computer science research and development both in academic institutions and industries. This will be an "industry-centered" program in that it will enable qualified employees of high-tech companies in the metro Atlanta area to pursue a Ph.D. in computer science while employed.

Curriculum: The degree requirements for the doctor of philosophy in computer science degree include 72 semester hours beyond the bachelor of science degree of which 24 hours are in

computer architecture, theory of computation, algorithms, advanced software engineering, principles of programming languages, principles of operating systems, parallel and distributing computing, and theory of computational complexity. Doctoral students must also take 24 hours of electives that will be chosen in concert with and approved by an advisory committee and which reflect the student's research area. A maximum of 12 hours can be directed study or research, and a maximum of 9 hours can be taken from outside the department. At least one hour of Seminar in Computer Science (CSC 9900) must also be taken.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 15, 30, and 45.

Funding: The institution intends to fully fund the proposed program with assistance through Yamacraw funding for the recruitment of faculty through fiscal year 2005.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2004, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness goals, as indicated in the proposal. In addition, the department's industry advisory and development board, required to gain accreditation, will be regularly consulted to detect emerging shifts in technology and to create effective, timely, and orderly curriculum plans.

3. Establishment of the Major in Global Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, State University of West Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of Acting President Thomas J. Hynes of State University of West Georgia (SUWG) to establish the major in global studies under the existing bachelor of arts degree, effective August 9, 2000.

Abstract: Global studies is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of transnational relations (e.g., issues such as arms control, infectious disease, and environmental protection that extend beyond the borders of a given nation). The pace of Georgia's internationalization has quickened since the conclusion of the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta. The number of globally oriented companies now operating in the state is growing, and Georgia continues to export its products around the world. The bachelor of arts in global studies is proposed in an effort to meet the growing needs of business, industry, government, and multinational agencies for graduates with foreign language skills, international experience, and understanding of different cultures. The program will be administered by a faculty coordinator and an interdisciplinary campus global studies committee under the auspices of the Dean's Office of the College of Arts & Sciences, which has accorded this initiative its highest priority.

Need: As U.S. business interests continue to expand overseas, there is an increasing need to train employees about the cultures in which they operate. These same businesses find their ability to operate in another country hindered by a workforce that is monolingual. Graduates of the global studies program, with its focus on language as well as culture, will meet this emerging need. As noted in the most recent Association of American College and Universities' *Peer Review* (Winter_1999), "Universities must globalize their curricula if they hope to produce graduate with the tools demanded by today's marketplace." A survey of approximately 1,000

SUWG students indicated that 40% were interested in pursuing this major if offered. Letters of support for the program were provided from companies and organizations such as Southwire, CARE, the Worldwatch Institute, the Carter Center, and the Council for Global Education.

Objectives: The objectives of the global studies program are to promote global awareness and to produce graduates with the knowledge, skills, and understanding necessary to work effectively in a global environment. The focus will enable students to examine and explain global issues in an analytical framework based on substantive information, experience, and second language proficiency.

Curriculum: The 120-semester credit-hour degree program requires 33 semester hours in the major. Student may chose from four academic tracks within the major focusing on social sciences/humanities, area studies, sciences, and interdisciplinary themes. All students must take a common introductory course and a capstone seminar, both of which will be new course offerings. Existing classes with international content currently in the university curriculum will be used to fulfill the remaining course requirements. Nine of the 33 credits must be earned through a global learning experience, which may be satisfied by one of the following: a) a semester of study in another country, b) study within a separate U.S. subculture, c) extensive involvement with U.S. international populations, or d) an internship with an international non-governmental organization. The institution will collaborate with other University System institutions in providing study abroad opportunities.

Students will also be required to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, equivalent to the 18 semester credits in a foreign language minor.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 10, 20, and 30.

Funding: The institution intends to fund the program through internal redirection. Since the majority of the curriculum is already available, additional costs to the institution will be modest. The university has agreed to release instructors for one course of their normal teaching load in order to teach the required introductory and capstone courses.

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

4. Termination of the Major in Computer-Based Education Under the Existing Master of Education Degree, the University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams of the University of Georgia (UGA) to terminate the major in computer-based education under the existing master of education degree, effective January 2001.

Abstract: UGA requested approval to terminate the major in computer-based education under the existing master of education degree due 1) to low enrollments and 2) to changes in the

discipline such that students and faculty can be accommodated through the existing major in instructional technology.

Rationale: The major in computer-based education was established in fall 1985 as an interdisciplinary program of the UGA College of Education. The major was housed within the Department of Instructional Technology in 1989. The major did not attract a large number of new students (e.g., between 0 and 9 students per year). Over time, the major began to lose its separate identity within the department when compared to the major in instructional technology. When the Department of Instructional Technology's curriculum was revised, in part due to the semester conversion, the College of Education determined that the computer-based education major was no longer viable and should be terminated.

Impact on Faculty and Students: No students have been admitted to this major in the past academic year. The students remaining will graduate by December 2000. In addition, these students report that the major in instructional technology would have met their needs. Termination of the major will have no adverse impact on faculty. The revised curriculum and demand for service courses by students in other parts of the College of Education exceed the college capacity and require the services of external professionals to teach selected courses.

5. Establishment of the Georgia Freight Bureau Chair in Transportation and Logistics, the Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) to establish the Georgia Freight Bureau Chair in Transportation and Logistics, effective September 1, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Freight Bureau, Inc. (GFB) and the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. (from within the School of Industrial and Systems Engineering's [ISyE] logistics activities and advanced funding from unrestricted endowment) have each contributed an equal amount of \$750,000 toward the endowment for this chair.

Information on the Honoree: Established in 1902, the GFB is one of the largest organizations of shippers in the United States. The early efforts of the organization centered on fair tariffs and creating equitable freight rates for their membership. The group has a long proven dedication to furthering the boundaries of the logistics profession through strategic work with GIT, Georgia Southern University, Auburn University, and their own educational enterprises. Another of its significant accomplishments is the international prestige gained through the presentation of the transportation industry's most successful intermodal exhibition each year.

Rationale: The Georgia Freight Bureau Chair in Transportation and Logistics directly supports the strategic vision of the School of ISyE and the many activities in logistics education and research. The vitality of the school, both externally and internally, will be enriched by the presence of this senior scholar of international eminence, whose leadership will contribute in many ways to the learning environment. Each activity with which the chair holder is involved (e.g., new undergraduate and graduate courses, invited lectures, publications, academic conference organization, presentations, professional society offices, committee assignments, and consultations) will promote the number one ranked School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, according to *US News and World Report*, and serve to enhance the caliber of its

programs and participants.

6. Establishment of the Gary T. and Elizabeth R. Jones Chair in Management, the Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) to establish the Gary T. and Elizabeth R. Jones Chair in Management, effective August 9, 2000.

Funding: Gary T. and Elizabeth R. Jones have agreed to fund a \$1.5 million endowment in the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc.

Background: A native of Macon, Georgia, Gary T. Jones earned his bachelor's degree in industrial management at GIT in 1971 and later completed a master of business administration from the Darden School of Business at the University of Virginia.

After spending ten years at L.F. Rothschild, where he served as Managing Director in charge of High Grade Corporate Bond Trading and Sales, Mr. Jones returned to Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette (DLJ), one of the leading investment banking firms in the world. As Managing Director and Global Sales Manager for DLJ's Fixed Income Division, Mr. Jones is responsible for building, leading, and managing the global distribution of all fixed-income securities for the firm to over 2,000 institutional clients worldwide.

Mr. Jones is a member of the Georgia Tech Foundation Board, the GIT National Campaign Steering Committee, and the DuPree College of Management Advisory Board. He also regularly serves as a guest lecturer in finance at GIT.

A 1973 graduate of Agnes Scott College, Elizabeth (Libby) Jones later earned a master of arts degree from New York University and a juris doctorate from Seton Hall, while caring for two children. She is now a partner in a New Jersey law firm.

In addition to lending time and enthusiasm in recent years, Mr. and Mrs. Jones have generously supported GIT through their gifts of \$100,000 to support the DuPree College of Management's professional placement program, providing graduating students with the resources and staff support they need to successfully complete their job search. Furthermore, Mr. Jones has donated \$100,000 to GIT's Alexander-Tharpe Fund to support scholarships for the institute's top student athletes.

In recognition and in continuing support of GIT's and the DuPree College of Management's commitment to excellence, Gary and Elizabeth Jones have now agreed to fund a faculty chair in the DuPree College of Management at the \$1.5 million level.

Rationale: The Gary T. and Elizabeth R. Jones Chair will serve to retain or attract eminent faculty scholars in management. The presence of this highest echelon faculty member will draw other top talent, most importantly outstanding junior faculty, graduate students and undergraduates, to GIT, thereby elevating the DuPree College of Management's reputation and quality programs.

7. Establishment of the William R. T. Oakes, Jr. Chair in the School of Aerospace Engineering, the Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) to establish the William R.T. Oakes Jr. Chair within the School of Aerospace Engineering, effective July 19, 2000.

Funding: The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. has established an endowment fund with a principal balance of \$1.5 million. The chair is established through the generosity of Mr. William R.T. Oakes Jr. and will be administered through the School of Aerospace Engineering.

Biography of Donor: Mr. Oakes earned a degree in aerospace engineering at GIT in 1959, which was followed by an advanced degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a master of business administration degree from Harvard University in 1963. After a brief career in aerospace engineering, Mr. Oakes participated in the founding of a consulting firm, Kappa Systems, Inc., based in Washington, D.C. The company prospered and then issued stock to the public, and eventually, the founding partners sold their majority interests. Since leaving Kappa Systems, Inc., Mr. Oakes has invested his funds in small engineering, specialty manufacturing transportation, or other high-tech companies, often serving as president of these. Mr. Oakes' investment company, The Acorn Group, also invests in technology start-ups. He serves on the boards of several companies, is a director of Med Source, a nonprofit healthcare organization serving developmentally disabled adults, and of the High Technology Council of Maryland. Mr. Oakes is a 42-year member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. He actively supports entrepreneurship in technology fields.

Rationale: William R.T. Oakes, Jr. has made a total commitment of \$2.5 million to endow the William R. T. Oakes Jr. Chair in the School of Aerospace Engineering. Dedicated to the leadership of the school, this prestigious gift is among the first "school chairs" established at GIT. Funds from the endowment will allow the chair to address areas of extreme importance, including faculty development, student life, alumni activities, facilities, and equipment and to support research activities. The flexibility of this type of endowment will also provide the chair with the resources needed to address unforeseen situations, recruit faculty, and meet the administrative needs of the program.

It is expected that the prestige of an endowment for use by the chair will also serve the College of Engineering in the recruitment of an eminent scholar to the position when this specific position is vacant. Such an eminent scholar will, in turn, be instrumental in attracting prestigious faculty members to the program, expanding the reputation of this highly ranked program among graduate and undergraduate students, and continuing to provide the type of leadership that has positioned the School of Aerospace Engineering as a leader in its field.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

8. Establishment of the Institute for European Studies, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approve the request of President Michael F. Adams of the University of Georgia (UGA) to establish the Institute for European Studies, effective August 9, 2000.

Abstract: The UGA Institute for European Studies will serve as a campus coordinating body for the advancement of scholarship, instruction, and service related to Europe. Several historical events have heightened UGA's efforts to establish an Institute for European Studies. The end of the Cold War has given a new impetus to the phenomenon of European integration. Beginning with cooperative institutions and three "communities" established by treaties (e.g., the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Economic Community, and EURATOM, a science community), the process of European integration has progressed over the last 50 years to include a political community (the European Union), a common currency (the Euro), and a common defense policy and capability.

Objectives: The purposes and objectives of the Institute for European Studies are as follows:

- 1) To create an institute on campus to participate fully in the initiatives underway by the University System's new European Union Center, a collaborative effort among the System's 34 institutions to support research, teaching, and public service dealing with the 15-nation European Union. The institute will also support UGA's participation in the European Union Studies Certificate program.
- 2) To stimulate interdisciplinary research connections and cooperation between faculty and students interested in European culture and to create a focal point on campus for the conceptualization of cooperative research projects with European and U.S. centers of science and technology.
- 3) To create a network coordinating various programs, centers, courses, research, and services pertaining to Europe on the UGA campus and to coordinate the various UGA programs for study in Europe.
- 4) To create a UGA certificate program in European studies that integrates its existing certificate in East Central European studies, with expectation of developing a full degree program as the institute grows.
- 5) To mobilize the diverse skills of UGA faculty and students to carry out service projects related to Europe.

Administrative Structure: The Institute for European Studies will be located in the Office of the Associate Provost for International Studies. The administrative structure will consist of an academic director, executive director, administrative assistant, and one full-time staff member. Both administrators will be selected from two different colleges or schools on campus. They will serve for a term of five years. The associate provost will appoint an advisory committee to serve renewable five-year terms. The advisory committee will advise the administrators on all aspects of the institute's activities. Advisory committee membership will consist of prominent faculty from different colleges, schools, and study-abroad programs at the university. The participating units of the university include: the College of Arts and Science, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, College of Business, College of Education, College of Journalism and Mass Communication, and the School of Law.

Funding: The Institute for European Studies will have three categories of funding. These sources consist of the university administration (\$54,000 for fiscal year 2001), contributions

from the participating schools and colleges, and the solicitation of outside contracts and grants. Extramural contracts and grants will be sought from many sources, such as the Fulbright Program; the U.S. Department of Education; the Macarthur, Woodruff, Rockefeller, Soros, and Ford Foundations; The Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration; and transnational corporations of American and European origins. The institute will also work closely with the European Studies Institute of the University of Geneva and the University of Avignon to obtain collaborative project grants from American, Swiss, and European Commission grant agencies. The institute will coordinate its fund-raising efforts with the University System's European Union Center to avoid duplication, to encourage collaborative submissions, and to enhance prospects for successful procurement of external funding.

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

The following administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Education Committee Chair Joe Frank Harris and were approved by the Board. All full-time appointments are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.

SUMMARY OF FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

System Institutions by Type: **Totals:**

Georgia Institute of Technology	52
Georgia State University	60
Medical College of Georgia	15
University of Georgia	114

Total Research Universities Appointments **241**

Georgia Southern University	79
Valdosta State University	17

Total Regional Universities Appointments **96**

Albany State University	9
Armstrong Atlantic State University	13
Augusta State University	19
Clayton College & State University	11
Columbus State University	15
Fort Valley State University	0
Georgia College & State University	25
Georgia Southwestern State University	9
Kennesaw State University	13
North Georgia College & State University.	17
Savannah State University	5
Southern Polytechnic State University	19
State University of West Georgia	35

<i>Total State Universities Appointments</i>	<i>190</i>
---	-------------------

Dalton State College	7
Macon State College	11

<i>Total State Colleges Appointments</i>	<i>18</i>
---	------------------

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	16
Atlanta Metropolitan College	1
Bainbridge College	3
Coastal Georgia Community College	9
Darton College	4
East Georgia College	3
Floyd College	1
Gainesville College	7
Georgia Perimeter College	36
Gordon College	3
Middle Georgia College	4
South Georgia College	3
Waycross College	0

<i>Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments</i>	<i>90</i>
--	------------------

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS 635

SUMMARY OF PART-TIME RETIREE APPOINTMENTS

<u>System Institutions by Type:</u>	<u>Totals:</u>
--	-----------------------

Georgia Institute of Technology	7
Georgia State University	7
Medical College of Georgia	1
University of Georgia	44

<i>Total Research Universities Appointments</i>	<i>59</i>
--	------------------

Georgia Southern University	5
Valdosta State University	0

<i>Total Regional Universities Appointments</i>	<i>5</i>
--	-----------------

Albany State University	0
Armstrong Atlantic State University	3
Augusta State University	1
Clayton College & State University	4
Columbus State University	0
Fort Valley State University	0

Georgia College & State University	0
Georgia Southwestern State University	5
Kennesaw State University	2
North Georgia College & State University.	0
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	1
<i>Total State Universities Appointments</i>	<i>16</i>
Dalton State College	0
Macon State College	5
<i>Total State Colleges Appointments</i>	<i>5</i>
Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	9
Atlanta Metropolitan College	1
Bainbridge College	6
Coastal Georgia Community College	0
Darton College	0
East Georgia College	1
Floyd College	0
Gainesville College	0
Georgia Perimeter College	0
Gordon College	0
Middle Georgia College	0
South Georgia College	5
Waycross College	2
<i>Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments</i>	<i>24</i>
TOTAL PART-TIME RETIREE APPOINTMENTS	109

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MAJOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

BOLTER, JAY DAVID: THE JAMES AND MARY WESLEY CHAIR IN NEW MEDIA STUDIES, SCHOOL OF LITERATURE, COMMUNICATION, AND CULTURE, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 16, 2000.

MULFORD, CHARLES W., JR.: INVESCO CHAIR, DUPREE COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 16, 2000.

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

COPPER, ANDREW J. III: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DUPREE COLLEGE OF

MANAGEMENT, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 9, 2000.

HO, DAR-VEIG: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 9, 2000.

PARSONSON, PETER: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 9, 2000.

ROESSNER, J. DAVID: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 9, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

BOSTROM, ANN.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 16, 2001, WITH PAY.

DEBOER, DAVID E.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM OCTOBER 10, 2000 THROUGH MAY 16, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

HAMPIKIAN, JANET M.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 16, 2001.

STULBERG, ADAM N.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 15, 2001.

SYMINGTON, MARGARET: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 16, 2001.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

FEIN, SETH: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000 THROUGH MAY 10, 2001, WITH PAY

WINKLER, CAROL K.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 15, 2000 THROUGH DECEMBER 18, 2000, WITH PAY.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BINET, EUGENE F.: CHAIRMAN EMERITUS AND WARREN PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF RADIOLOGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 15, 2000.

BRUCKER, PAUL J.: DIRECTOR EMERITUS AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS, CONTINUING EDUCATION AND HEALTH COMMUNICATIONS, EFFECTIVE JULY 13, 2000.

COLBORN, GENE L.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CELL BIOLOGY & ANATOMY AND SURGERY, DEPARTMENT OF CELL BIOLOGY & ANATOMY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

EFFECTIVE JULY 13, 2000.

GARRISON GLEN E.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

GOLDMAN, BARRY M.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS DEPARTMENT OF ORAL REHABILITATION, SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

HAYES, WILLIAM G.: DIRECTOR EMERITUS, HUMAN RESOURCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 10, 2000.

MORGAN, R. BRUCE: DIRECTOR EMERITUS, PUBLIC SAFETY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 10, 2000.

THOMPSON, WILLIAM O., III: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

MAJOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

WRIGLEY, STEVE W.: VICE PRESIDENT FOR GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BARNHART, HAROLD: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

CLARK, DOUGLAS N.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MATHEMATICS, MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

EDWARDS, JOHN C.: LIBRARIAN IV EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

FRIEDMAN, JEAN E.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, HISTORY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

GANSCHOW, THOMAS: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, HISTORY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

HILLIARD, JIMMY E.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF TERRY CHAIR OF BUSINESS, TERRY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

HOLLINGSWORTH, JOHN: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MATHEMATICS, MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

JORDAN, C. WAYNE: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CROP AND SOIL SCIENCES, AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

LEGLER, JOHN B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BANKING AND FINANCE, TERRY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

HOLMES, WILLIAM F.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, HISTORY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

LANGLEY, LESTER D.: RESEARCH PROFESSOR EMERITUS, HISTORY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

LEWIS, WARD B., JR.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GERMAN, GERMANIC AND SLAVIC LANGUAGES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

MANTERO, MANUEL: RESEARCH PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SPANISH, DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

PELLETIER, S. WILLIAM: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DIRECTOR EMERITUS AND PROVOST EMERITUS, INSTITUTE FOR NATURAL PRODUCTS RESEARCH, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

PRICE, SHARON J.: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF CHILD AND FAMILY DEVELOPMENT, FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

RUSSELL, JOHN T.: DEAN AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ADVERTISING, JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

WALKER, JERRY T.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PLANT PATHOLOGY, PLANT PATHOLOGY, AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

ARIAS, ILENA: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

BENNETT-ALEXANDER, DAWN D.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITH PAY.

CRUMBLEY, STEFANIE: TEMPORARY ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

GANTS, DAVID L.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

GROVER, RAJIV: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

KLEIN, PETER G.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM JULY 1, 2000 THROUGH FEBRUARY 1, 2001, WITH PAY.

LIEMAN, DANIEL B.: LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

LUND, ROBERT B.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000

THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

NAGAREDA, RICHARD A.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 15, 2000 THROUGH MAY 14, 2001, WITH PAY.

PLUMMER, PAUL S.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

SHOCKLEY, RANDOLPH ANDREW: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 8, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

MAJOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

BLEIKEN, LINDA: ACTING PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

HILDE, RICHARD L.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MARKETING, DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

NELSON, ROBERT N.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CHEMISTRY, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, AEP COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

GEE, ROSE MARY: INSTRUCTOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH MAY 31, 2001, WITH PAY.

TOMLIN, LAURA: ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATE, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH MAY 31, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

TOTH, FLOYD D.: DEAN AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

UMBERGER, FORREST: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION DISORDERS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

TEPPER, JEFFREY H.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000

THROUGH MAY 9, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY

MAJOR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

JONES, THOMAS Z.: PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY, AND PROFESSOR OF GEOLOGY,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

TOPOLSKI, RICHARD L.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000
THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITH PAY.

CLAYTON COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:

CROFT, SHARON L.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, SCHOOL
OF HEALTH SCIENCES, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK,
EFFECTIVE AUGUST 14, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

CARPENTER, CHARLES BLAINE: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM JULY 1, 2000 THROUGH
JUNE 30, 2001, WITH PAY.

NORDSTROM, LYLE: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000 THROUGH MAY
5, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

WEAVER, HERMAN B.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000
THROUGH MAY 5, 2001, WITH PAY.

GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

CRESWELL, GWENDOLYN S.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF LIBRARY
SCIENCE, JAMES EARL CARTER LIBRARY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

DRAGOIN, WILLIAM B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PSYCHOLOGY, SCHOOL OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

JACKSON, DUKE W.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MUSIC, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

LITWHILER, SHIRLEY F.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF ENGLISH, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

McCARTER, BOBBYE L.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF LIBRARY SCIENCE, JAMES EARL CARTER LIBRARY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

NORTON, JACK: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

SLAUGHTER, HELEN H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA, JAMES EARL CARTER LIBRARY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

SOLE, KENT M.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

TOWERY, ALLEN D.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2000.

KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

LAROSA, THEODORE N.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000 THROUGH MAY 15, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

ADAMS, CHARLES B.: INSTRUCTOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 11, 2000 THROUGH MAY 7, 2001, WITH PAY.

GOLDEN, LOUISE LEWIS: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 11, 2000 THROUGH MAY 7, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

LOGAN, LINDA E.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 11, 2000 THROUGH MAY 7, 2001, WITHOUT PAY.

SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

PATTERSON, PHILIP E.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 15, 2001, WITH PAY.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

CLAXTON, ROBERT H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

GAY, JAMES T.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

POWELL, NOEL G.: PROFESSOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION EMERITUS, RICHARDS COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BAKER, MERLE: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

DONALDSON, ROSALYN: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 10, 2000.

EVANS, JOHN: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, DIVISION OF HUMANITIES, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 10, 2000.

HENDERSON, HAROLD: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

LOYD, HAROLD J.: PRESIDENT EMERITUS AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 10, 2000.

MIXON, MAROLYN: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

ROBERTS, GARY: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

GILES, SANDRA L.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITH PAY.

KATSBERG, SIGNE E.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITH PAY.

SHEIKH, ABUL K.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITH PAY.

10. Information Item: Establishment of the Center for Educational Excellence, Medical College of Georgia

As of April 2000, the Medical College of Georgia (MCG), under the leadership of President Francis J. Tedesco, established a Center for Educational Excellence (the Center) located in the School of Medicine. The Center was established to maintain and strengthen the quality of the institution's educational programs and simultaneously enhances faculty members' education-related skills. It is projected that the increased emphasis on educational enhancement will strengthen the medical school's curricular goals and objectives and increase the effective use of assessment measures.

Mission: The proposal to create the Center was developed as a collaborative effort between MCG and the Institute of Higher Education located at the University of Georgia to support faculty in enhancing their education-related teaching and research skills. An executive advisory committee will include representation from MCG and the Institute of Higher Education. The mission of the Center is to foster the highest standards of excellence in medical education at the MCG School of Medicine by collaboration with basic science and clinical, full-time, and volunteer faculty to support educational skills development, communication of education innovations, and educational scholarship.

Operating Procedures: The Center was established according to the Academic Affairs Handbook (Section 2.15) and MCG procedures. Center funds will be administered through an MCG account. Extramural funded research will be administered through the MCG process to conduct research and its oversight. The Center's director will report directly to the Associate Dean for Curriculum and to the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs in the School of Medicine.

The three key factors inherent in funding the Center are the application of mission-based management principles, the impact of early retirements, and anticipated sponsored support. Funding sources will be aligned with mission priorities to ensure high-quality education throughout the School of Medicine. In addition, it is anticipated that the Center will acquire extramural support.

11. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training

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

Georgia State University

Cardiopulmonary Care	1
Georgia Hospital Assoc.	2, 3R
Kinesiology and Health	7
Nursing	3
Physical Therapy	3, 1R
Social Work	1

Medical College of Georgia

Allied Health Sciences	10, 6R
Dentistry	9, 1R
Medicine	5, 4
MCG Research Institute	5, 2
Nursing	1, 1

University of Georgia

Child and Family Dev.	4	
Communication Sciences		1R
Health Promot./Behavior	1	
Pharmacy	18R	
Recreation and Leisure	4	
Social Work	1, 29R	

Georgia Southern University

Allied Health	1, 2R	
Family and Consumer Sci.		1
Health and Kinesiology	8	
Leadership/Technology	2	
Nursing	7	
Recreation/Sport Mgmt.	3	
Sociology/Anthropology	1	

Armstrong Atlantic State University

Education	13R	
Medical Technology	1	
Nursing	4, 1R	
Physical Therapy	1, 1R	
Radiologic Sciences	2	

Augusta State University

Nursing	2	
Psychology	1	

Georgia College & State University

Health Sciences	4	
-----------------	---	--

Georgia Southwestern State University

Nursing	2R	
---------	----	--

Kennesaw State University

Nursing	10, 3R	
---------	--------	--

North Georgia College & State University

Nursing	9, 6R	
Physical Education	1	
Physical Therapy	5, 7R	

State University of West Georgia

Nursing	7R
Floyd College	
Health Programs	8R
Total	236

R = Renewal

12. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Georgia State University			
Train Teachers of the Deaf	Georgia Dept. of Administrative Services	1/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$72,380
Support Georgia's Reading First Program	State Board of Education	4/17/00 - 9/15/00	\$22,750
Study process and product improvement	Georgia Food Processing Adv. Council	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$76,017
Study Georgia's tire scrap management program	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	5/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$32,727
University of Georgia			
Assess bacteriosis spray models	Georgia Commodity Comm. on Peaches	1/1/00 - 12/31/00	\$850
Evaluate moderate chilling peach and nectarine breeding	" " "	1/1/00 - 12/31/00	\$5,000
Conduct survey to validate tomato spotted wilt index	Georgia Commodity Comm. on Peanuts	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$2,000
Compare peanut cultivar response to growth regulator	" " "	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$3,000
Study row spacing in peanuts	" " "	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$2,000
Conduct education programs for peanut profitability	" " "	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$6,000
Conduct workshops for mental illness educators	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	5/5/00 - 4/30/01	\$45,832
Conduct program for juvenile counseling and assessment	Georgia Dept. of Juvenile Justice	4/05/00 - 6/30/00	\$6,000

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
University of Georgia (Continued)			
Improve decision-making for disaster response (Pt.1)	Georgia Emergency Management Agency	4/19/00 - 8/31/00	\$125,670
Identify host source original of fecal coliforms in Georgia	Georgia Environmental Protection Division	4/20/00 - 9/30/00	\$90,000
Conduct NE Georgia school-to-work project	North Georgia Technical Institute	01/21/00 - 06/30/00	\$22,000
Georgia Southern University			
Perform offshore seismic studies	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	07/07/98 - 12/31/00	\$30,887
Conduct vocational staff development fiscal year 2001	North Georgia RESA	03/31/00 - 06/30/01	\$29,000
Study global current in Southern history	Georgia Humanities Council	6/15/00 - 5/31/01	\$10,000
Study reducing college underage drinking	Children and Youth Coordination Council	6/01-00 - 5/31/01	\$17,000
Floyd College			
Provide computer training	City of Rome Police	4/24/00 - 6/02/00	\$2,000

TOTAL AMOUNT - JULY/AUGUST	\$ 688,883
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2001 TO DATE	\$ 688,883
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 00 (TO AUGUST)	\$ 2,845,102
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 00	\$25,106,814

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, August 8, 2000 at approximately 3:10 p.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Juanita P. Baranco, Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins, and Regents Charles H. Jones and Elridge W. McMillan. When the full Board reconvened, Vice Chair Jenkins reported that the Committee had 17 applications for review; 4 were continued, and 13 were denied. There were also two other agenda items, one of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

- a. In the matter of 13 faculty members at Gordon College, concerning changes to the faculty handbook, the application for review was continued.
- b. In the matter of Barbara Love at the University of Georgia, concerning denial of readmission to the Veterinary School, the application for review was denied.

- c. In the matter of Theodore Hill at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning a grievance of June 2, 1999, the application for review was continued.
- d. In the matter of Desmond Littlejohn at Macon State College, concerning an academic infraction, the application for review was denied.
- e. In the matter of Dennis Senol at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was denied.
- f. In the matter of David Butler at Valdosta State University, concerning a housing refund, the application for review was continued.
- g. In the matter of Beverly Sharpe at Valdosta State University, concerning a job reclassification, the application for review was denied.
- h. In the matter of Tracey Anyanwu at the University of Georgia, concerning academic status, the application for review was denied.
- i. In the matter of Leonard Smith at Fort Valley State University, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was continued.
- j. In the matter of William Wilcox at Savannah State University, concerning termination of his employment, the application for review was denied.
- k. In the matter of Julie Cannon at the State University of West Georgia, concerning non-renewal of his contract, the application for review was denied.
- l. In the matter of Leticia Stinson at Georgia State University, concerning academic expulsion, the application for review was denied.
- m. In the matter of Francis Flaherty at Valdosta State University, concerning his request for an internal investigation, the application for review was denied.
- n. In the matter of Barbara Davis at Fort Valley State University, concerning passing the Praxis Test, the application for review was denied.
- o. In the matter of Emmanuel Rutledge at the State University of West Georgia, concerning disciplinary suspension, the application for review was denied.
- p. In the matter of Gerald McIntosh at Fort Valley State University, concerning removal of a letter of reprimand from his file, the application for review was denied.
- q. In the matter of Dayon Mack at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning a disciplinary decision, the application for review was denied.

2. Policy Manual Revision: Election of Presidents by the Board

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

201 ELECTION OF PRESIDENTS BY THE BOARD

A. The Board shall elect the presidents of institutions at the April monthly meeting. Presidents shall not hold tenure at the institution but may hold, retain, or receive academic rank. They shall be elected each year for a term of one year. The Chancellor shall notify them of their appointment but such presidents shall not be entitled to a written employment contract. All such appointments will be made expressly subject to the Policies of the Board of Regents.

B. Effective September 1, 1991, persons holding tenure in the University System who receive an initial presidential appointment shall be required to relinquish their tenure before assuming the office of the president. No person shall be awarded tenure while serving as president. (BR Minutes, 1991-92, p. 34)

C. A person accepting the position of acting president at a University System institution shall not be a candidate for president of that institution. (BR Minutes, Aug. 2000, p. 63).

3. Information Item: Standing Committees of the Board

Bylaw V.3 of the Board's Bylaws lists the standing Committees of the Board of Regents. This section should be amended to (1) add a standing Committee to oversee University System information technology matters, and (2) change the name of the Executive Committee to the Executive and Compensation Committee. The creation of a standing Board Committee on Information and Instructional Technology is necessitated by the growing number of technological, pedagogical, and financial issues raised by the use of new technologies in higher education. The renaming of the Board's Executive and Compensation Committee will more accurately reflect this Committee's role in making recommendations to the Board regarding the Chancellor's compensation and in reviewing recommendations regarding the compensation of the presidents and the officers of the Board.

Because Bylaw IX requires all Bylaw amendments to be considered for one month, this matter will be presented to the Board for action at the Board's regular September 2000 meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business at this meeting.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the funeral for Regent and Mrs. Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. would take place on Wednesday, August 9, 2000. She then announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, September 12 and Wednesday, September 13, 2000 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

Chancellor Portch noted that Augusta State University would be hosting a lunch for the Regents and some community guests after the funeral.

Chair White thanked Secretary Weber for her help coordinating his first meeting as Chair under unusual circumstances. He also thanked those in attendance at the meeting for their patience in working around the Board's unusual schedule at this meeting.

Regent Leebern thanked Chancellor Portch for his remarks on Regent Allgood.

Chair White agreed that the Chancellor had done an exemplary job speaking about the life of Regent Allgood.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:45 p.m. on Tuesday, August 8, 2000.

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

s/
Glenn S. White
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia