

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
February 8, 2006**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent J. Timothy Shelnut, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 2006. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Shelnut, were Vice Chair Patrick S. Pittard and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, Robert F. Hatcher, Julie Ewing Hunt, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbutton III, Richard L. Tucker, Allan Vigil.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, by Regent Hugh A. Carter, Jr.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that all Regents were in attendance on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on January 10 and 11, 2006, and the special meeting of the Executive and Compensation Committee held on January 18, 2006, were unanimously approved as distributed.

WELCOME TO CHANCELLOR ERROLL B. DAVIS, JR.

Chair Shelnut offered a warm welcome to new Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr. He said that the Regents were thrilled that the Chancellor had come to the University System of Georgia, that they look forward to working with him, and that they will accomplish a great many things together.

Chancellor Davis thanked Chair Shelnut for his warm welcome and said that he appreciated being there.

REPORTS FROM BOARD'S TASK FORCES

Chair Shelnut reminded the Regents that at the January 2006 Board meeting, President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) reported that the University System of Georgia’s total economic impact on the State of Georgia is \$23 billion annually. Last month, Regent Pittard and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Media and Publications, Arlethia Perry-Johnson, also reported on the proposed strategic communications plan. Chair Shelnut said that there would probably be a recommendation on this plan at the March 2006 Board meeting. At this meeting, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels; the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp; and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, would be updating the Board on their task forces. He called upon Ms. Daniels to begin her presentation.

Ms. Daniels said that at the January 2006 Board meeting, she had promised to bring back the capital resource allocation principles for final action at this meeting. The Board had left the principles on the table for consideration, and the staff had also requested input from the leadership of the institutions. Ms. Daniels reported that, on the whole, the proposed principles were well received. She discussed the principles once more and shared some of the input from the institutions. The proposed principles were as follows:

1. Capital investment will support the University System of Georgia’s strategic plan and its statewide mission.
2. Capital investment will implement the strategic mission and goals of System institutions.
3. Capital will be allocated within a comprehensive program of integrated projects prioritized in adherence to systematic physical planning and sound financial models.
4. Capital investment will be economically and environmentally sustainable, promote optimal stewardship of existing state resources, and have a superior long-term benefit-cost ratio.
5. Capital investment should meet the following criteria to the greatest extent possible:
 - Increase quality of instruction, research and public service
 - Maintain or increase capacity (as strategically warranted)
 - Enhance regulatory compliance.
 - Enhance productivity and operating efficiency
6. Capital investment should enhance output to geographic areas and in occupations and technologies that support state workforce needs and economic development goals.
7. State capital investment should be leveraged and enhanced by external funds at a rate

appropriate to the characteristics of the individual institution, program, and project.

Ms. Daniels explained that the first two principles place paramount importance on institutional strategic planning that is both thorough and appropriately integrated with System strategic planning. The third principle supports the campus master planning initiative and champions ongoing analysis of facilities policy and process in a holistic way. It challenges the predisposition to jump too quickly into architectural planning of construction solutions and requires a business case analysis first. In other words, before the Regents prioritize any capital project, they will ask the more fundamental question: Is facility construction superior to other alternatives that would provide the same outcome in instruction, research, or public service? Assuming a capital project is the best option, the fourth hammers home that project life cycle costs take precedent over initial costs in project development and prioritization. The fifth principle is a series of bulleted points, in a hierarchy of importance, related to the System's core mission. Ms. Daniels stressed that this principle is a hierarchy, just as the principles themselves are in priority order. The sixth principle addresses the System's ever-increasing role in economic development and meeting critical state work force needs. She noted that some had expressed concern that this emphasis diminishes the System's core mission in other degree programs that might not be associated with economic development. Having reviewed this concern, she submitted that the earlier reference to System and institutional mission in the first two principles addresses this issue, but she welcomed the Regents to discuss this further if they disagreed. The seventh principle addresses an emphasis on projects that leverage state dollars. A few presidents expressed concern that this principle may negatively impact some institutions. After careful consideration, the task force felt that the language in the principle sufficiently qualifies the emphasis on leveraged funding. She stated that this is a very important and timely issue and that she sought the Regents' concurrence.

Ms. Daniels recapped some of her earlier presentations to preface this discussion. She reminded the Regents that two years ago, the staff undertook an initial assessment of the System's capital needs over the next ten years. She then presented a recent reassessment that reported projected needs of \$3.1 billion in new space, \$2.4 billion in renovation, and \$1 billion for infrastructure. She noted that the projected needs methodology, using national standards such as benchmarks, does not quantify "special" projects; for example, "sponsored research" initiatives like the GIT nanotechnology project. These opportunity projects, which meet multiple state strategic needs (i.e., economic development, public health, etc.), are an important part of the System's mission and expectations in the future, but the staff have no traditional guidelines for benchmarking or projecting what those needs or opportunities might be.

Ms. Daniels noted that she had previously shared the System's funding track record. The gap to get to \$650 million annually is apparent and even more difficult and complicated than the data imply. She showed the Regents a chart depicting the amount of funding over time for public-private ventures projects and General Obligation ("G.O.") bond funding. She noted that with the exception of fiscal year 2005, the System has received a healthy (average 25%) share of the state's total bond

sale.

Previously, Ms. Daniels also had shared a look at projections of what the System can expect from these and an additional funding method compared to the System’s funding needs over time. After comparing the needed project types in the System’s backlog with funding methods, both existing and proposed, it is clear this matter merits discussion. She presented the following proposed ten-year capital projects funding model:

<u>Method</u>	<u>Ten years</u>	<u>Annual</u>
State G.O. Bonds	\$ 2.7 B	\$ 270 M
Public-Private Ventures	\$ 1.3 B	\$ 130 M
State Revenue Bonds	\$ 1.5 B	\$ 150 M
Other	<u>\$ 1.0 B</u>	<u>\$ 100 M</u>
Total Funding	\$ 6.5 B	\$ 650 M

She noted that this model is based upon current and anticipated constraints on various funding methods that are known today. G.O. bonds are a limited resource. However, it is critical that the Board protect this legacy funding for core academic facilities that lack any other revenue source. Public-private venture funding has been a boon to the System in recent years. Unfortunately, based upon needed project types and size, the System cannot sustain the current level of public-private ventures financing over ten more years. Nevertheless, the good news is that public-private ventures financing may be a good option for future special projects, at least significantly leveraging state or other economic development funds to that end. With regard to proposed state revenue bonds, Ms. Daniels reported that staff are working to open up this method. They anticipate advancing the Georgia Higher Education Facilities Authority (“GHEFA”) legislation to accomplish this soon. She reported that the needed legislation is ready.

With regard to other funding, she said that as the state builds up its reserves, staff hope they will move major repair and renovation (“MRR”) funding back into cash formula funding versus G.O. bonds. The years that the System has had to pay for MRR projects with G.O. bond funds has taken \$50 million to \$60 million in projects from the majors and minors lists. In addition, the System must be more aggressive in its pursuit of gifts or outside grants. The institutions may consider funding more facilities through capital campaigns and under the research funding umbrella to access or leverage construction funds. She stressed the complexity and importance of analyzing and matching projects with the most appropriate funding methods. Moving forward, the Board of Regents must be disciplined in their leadership to ensure projects use the funding method that maximizes external funding to the extent possible.

Ms. Daniels said that the Regents must keep a laser focus on the first two principles, which pertain

specifically to the University System of Georgia's mission, as they apply the seventh principle. These days, many are committed to leveraging their own agendas. In the quest for external funding, the Board must be ever mindful of the System's core mission. The Board cannot be misguided in a quest for external funds to ignore the System's priorities, nor can the Regents deny the System's core mission in the absence of external funding. In closing, Ms. Daniels said that she is less concerned that the seventh principle will handicap any System institutions because the qualification language is in place in the principle. She is more concerned that any further qualification of the seventh principle will diminish its strategic importance. She stressed the importance of bringing in external funding as a complement, not a replacement, for state funding. This must be done if the Regents hope to meet the System's comprehensive needs.

Chair Shelnut asked Ms. Daniels to clarify the proposed ten-year capital projects funding model.

Ms. Daniels responded that this model depicted the primary methods of funding the task force recommended as the best options going forward with a rough estimate of the amounts of funding that might be available.

Chair Shelnut asked whether \$650 million annually over ten years will be enough to construct the facilities the System will need.

Ms. Daniels responded that the model is based upon the Council of Educational Facilities Planners International ("CEFPI") guidelines for core mission academics. The model does not address projects like Technology Square at GIT or the Paul D. Coverdell Center for Biomedical and Health Sciences at the University of Georgia. As higher education plays an increasingly important role in the research arena, the University System of Georgia will be a significant player. There are no traditional methods for benchmarking that role, but there are ways to expand that research and its impact on research facilities.

Chair Shelnut asked how many projects currently are on the major capital outlay list.

Ms. Daniels responded that there are approximately \$800 million in projects on the list.

Regent Coles asked whether the \$6.5 billion includes the \$800 million on the list, and Ms. Daniels responded that it does.

Regent Coles asked how long it would take to bring one of the projects on the list online.

Ms. Daniels responded that it is uncertain but that the Regents must partner with the legislature to get an understanding of how to go forward with facilities funding.

Ms. Daniels reiterated that the model takes into account the state's legacy commitment of 25% of

the total G.O. bond sale. The model is conservative and not over-reliant on the bond sale. However, it aims to ensure that public higher education maintains its place at the table. The ability of the state to leverage the other kinds of funds for the benefit of economic development and public health is the benefit of supporting higher education.

Regent Tucker asked how the model is applied to individual projects.

Ms. Daniels explained that prior to the annual capital request process, all institutions go through a master planning exercise. So, the University System Office staff have a good analysis of their current and projected needs for a five- to ten-year period and sometimes even a more visionary look going forward. Each year, the presidents submit their requests based upon their institutions' needs, which are then prioritized at the System level. Through this initiative, this process has been revamped and streamlined. The staff are working with the institutions to determine which of the funding methods would be most appropriate for each individual project and whether there is the potential for a capital campaign or a public-private venture. Each June, the staff bring forward the most crucial projects for Board consideration and prioritization.

Regent Tucker said that different institutions have different capacities to take advantage of various kinds of funding.

Ms. Daniels agreed. She said that it is the role of her staff to analyze the needs submitted in light of the master plans and to sift the needs through the model and funding mechanisms to present to the Board their best recommendations for prioritization and funding.

Regent-Elect Hatcher noted that the \$6.5 billion estimate does not include inflation over ten years, and Ms. Daniels agreed. So, Regent-Elect Hatcher remarked that \$6.5 billion was actually a minimum figure that represents a quantum leap over where the funding stands now.

Chair Shelnut stated that \$800 million in major capital projects have been approved by the Board and included on the System's major capital outlay list. In fiscal year 2005, only one of the top five projects on the list was funded. In addition, the Regents will consider new projects for the list in June 2006. He wondered whether the System will get further behind even with the proposed new funding model. He said it seemed there needed to be a way to catch up.

Ms. Daniels responded that a few months ago, she discussed how North Carolina and Connecticut had done aggressive bond packages to jump-start their facilities programs. North Carolina made a large commitment but spread it out over time. She said that she was presenting the System's basic needs to ask for feedback from the Regents and the funding partners regarding how successful this approach might be. She noted that North Carolina is coming back to the drawing board because the state did not address infrastructure and MRR needs in its plan. The proposed model presents a

holistic picture of all of the System's facilities issues with the caveat of where sponsored research and special needs projects go. She said that this kind of funding will always be a moving target.

Chair Shelnut asked Ms. Daniels if she knows what projects will be coming before the Board for future consideration.

Ms. Daniels replied that the staff are proposing to go forward with the usual capital process in June 2006 optimistic that the legislature will provide as much funding for the existing lists as it can. If there is only modest funding of the existing lists, the staff may ask the Regents to review the current priorities lists because it may be unrealistic to continue to add on to the bottom of the list in that case. However, at this time, the staff are moving forward as usual.

Regent Coles said that even if the Board approves a project for the major capital outlay list this year, the soonest that project would be funded is in four years, and Ms. Daniels agreed. Further, Regent Coles said that it could take as long as five to eight years for a project approved in June 2006 to be completed, and again, Ms. Daniels concurred.

Chair Shelnut agreed that this is exactly what the Board must work to improve.

Regent-Elect Hatcher said that adding the revenue bond option is a good idea but that the Board must also identify other funding sources.

Chair Shelnut asked whether the Regents had any further questions or comments for Ms. Daniels, and they did not. He thanked her for this proposal and agreed that the Board must find more funding sources to accelerate the capital projects process.

Ms. Daniels then officially recommended these seven principles, as originally submitted at the January 2006 meeting, for Board approval.

Regent Carter said that this matter must be the highest priority to the Board.

Chair Shelnut thanked Ms. Daniels and her staff for doing an excellent job in spite of budgetary constraints. He noted that the Regents receive many complaints about student housing in the System, and these types of projects are not even on the major capital outlay list.

Regent Coles stated that at least those types of projects can be addressed by the public-private venture program.

Ms. Daniels added that the Regents should share those complaints with the Executive Director of Real Estate Ventures, Marty Nance, because there is a vehicle for addressing such products.

Regent Coles said that the legislature should really consider creating a bond of \$200 million to \$300 million to get the University System caught up because if there is already \$800 million in projects on the major capital outlay list, that figure will be \$1 billion before the projects actually are built because of inflation and other cost factors. He noted that Hurricane Katrina had driven up construction costs just this year.

Regent Tucker suggested that there be some kind of task force between the facilities, finance, and political parties to talk on a regular basis and bring forward suggestions.

Chair Shelnut said that Chancellor Davis had recommended a similar approach and that this was in progress. He then made a motion to approve the seven proposed capital resource allocation principles. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously approved, the Board of Regents adopted these principles.

Chair Shelnut next called upon Dr. Papp to begin his update on the retention, progression, and graduation (“RPG”) initiative.

Dr. Papp reminded the Regents that the RPG initiative has these major goals: to understand why the University System’s RPG rates are not better than they are; to expand and initiate programs that will increase the System’s RPG rates; to bring the institution-specific graduation rate at least to the national average by 2010; and to become a national leader in graduation rates in the longer-term future. He noted that RPG targets and plans have been submitted by 34 System institutions. There has been one Systemwide workshop on RPG best practices. As a result, some institutions are already revising their RPG targets and plans. A second workshop will take place on February 28, 2006. At the March 2006 meeting, Dr. Papp will make some recommendations to the Board of Regents on ways that financial incentives might affect RPG rates. The general education task force, chaired by President Dorothy Leland of Georgia College & State University and President James A. Burran of Dalton State College, is examining the impact of freshman and sophomore level courses may have on retention and progression. Dr. Papp noted that the System loses approximately 20% of students between their freshman and sophomore years, so it is important to look at whether the general education curriculum has a bearing on this. The RPG initiative is also moving forward in the area of data development and mining. He said that in coming months, staff will mail out surveys to all students who enrolled in System institutions in fall 2004 as first-time students but did not return in fall 2005 in order to determine why they did not return. The final element of the RPG initiative is student engagement. In spring 2004, every System institution administered either the National Survey of Student Engagement (“NSSE”) or the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (“CCSSE”). Dr. Hudson and the Office of Strategic Research and Policy Analysis have been examining the survey data to provide some very valuable information for the Regents. Dr. Papp asked Dr. Hudson to present the results of this research.

Dr. Hudson’s presentation focused on why student engagement is important to the RPG initiative

and covered the data provided by NSSE and CCSSE. She provided initial results from those two surveys and linked some of those results to the RPG initiative. The surveys evaluate the extent to which students engage in effective educational practices that have been shown to increase student learning and student development. Activities such as increasing time on task, setting high expectations, writing, encouraging cooperation among students, providing prompt feedback, and encouraging interaction with faculty together promote increased levels of student engagement. Greater student engagement leads to higher levels of learning, personal growth, and academic success.

Several decades of research in higher education show that the impact of college is determined in large part by individual student effort, stated Dr. Hudson. Students are not passive recipients of education. What students do and the efforts they put forth are important determinants of student learning and success. Students who are actively involved in both academic and out-of-class activities gain more from the college experience than those who are not involved. Institutions cannot make students study more or engage in activities, but they can shape academic and extracurricular offerings to encourage student engagement.

Dr. Hudson explained that the University System of Georgia chose existing national surveys to assess student engagement primarily because of the existence of national norms. Both the four-year and two-year surveys are relatively short. She noted that the Regents had received copies of reports on both surveys, which included copies of the surveys themselves. The four-year college survey was given to random samples of freshmen and seniors. Each institution decided what survey method to use. The two-year college survey sampled classes, rather than students, and it was administered in class. She noted that the surveys would not have been possible without the work of the System committees and the Policy Research Associate, Susan Campbell. She thanked Dr. Campbell and the students who participated in the surveys.

Dr. Hudson focused first on the four-year college survey, NSSE. This year, over 500 colleges and universities across the nation were surveyed, representing over 237,000 students. She noted that NSSE has been used in all 50 states and in Canada. The average response rate is approximately 39% nationally, and it is 33% for all public universities. In the University System, all research, regional, and state universities and two state colleges were surveyed, and there were over 10,000 respondents. The average response rate in the System was 30%, which Dr. Hudson characterized as a good response rate such that the results are generally representative of all freshmen and seniors. In System and the nation, the sample underrepresented part-time students, so results were weighted to balance that.

NSSE asks students to report the frequency with which they engage in activities that represent effective educational practice, such as the number of class presentations or the number of times they discussed an assignment with an instructor. The survey also records their perceptions of the college environment associated with achievement, satisfaction, and persistence. Then, students estimate their educational and personal growth since starting college. Finally, students provide information about

their background, including age, gender, race or ethnicity, living situation, educational status, and major field.

There are various ways that the NSSE results can be analyzed, said Dr. Hudson. First, staff can compare each activity to an ideal view of college and ask questions such as how many papers a student should write or whether all students should make a class presentation sometime during college. Second, staff can compare freshman results to senior results with the expectation that seniors should be more engaged. Finally, staff can compare University System of Georgia data to national data.

Dr. Hudson reported that most four-year college students reported they would attend the same institution if they could start over again, and most students say they had a good or excellent educational experience. However, NSSE also revealed some disappointing news. Approximately 21% of first-year students reported that they came to class often or very often without preparing for class. For seniors, that was 22%. Approximately 61% are sometimes unprepared for class. In addition, the System added questions to the survey to better understand barriers to graduation. From these questions, staff learned that slightly over half of four-year college students felt that their job responsibilities interfered with college occasionally or frequently. From national comparisons, staff also know that System students work off-campus more than the national students did; 55% of System students worked for pay off campus, compared to 44% of the nation's students. Moreover, 32% of System students worked more than 20 hours per week, compared to only 20% of national students. Almost half (47%) of System students felt that family responsibilities interfered with coursework, and 16% of them reported spending 20 or more hours per week providing care for family members, compared to 9% of the nation's students. Approximately 46% of System students reported that financial difficulties interfered with their studies, while 27% felt academically unprepared for courses.

To make it easier to compare data over time and across institutions, NSSE developed benchmark scores. Dr. Hudson explained that NSSE combined 40 questions into 5 benchmark areas. Each benchmark is expressed on a 100 point scale, where 100 is the highest possible score on the survey and 0 is the lowest possible score. For example, if the question were, "How often do you use computers to complete your assignments?" and if every student answered, "Very often," then the score would be 100. If every student answered, "Never," then the score would be 0. The first benchmark, Level of Academic Challenge, includes the combined responses to 11 questions. They include the hours spent per week preparing for class, number of assigned textbooks and books, number of written papers or reports, and whether the institution emphasizes spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work. Dr. Hudson noted that University System of Georgia freshmen and seniors are only slightly below national freshmen and seniors on this benchmark, and there is significant change between the freshman and senior years, both in the System and in the nation. She said this is promising news for the future. One of the questions for this benchmark asked how many hours students spent preparing for class. She stated that there is a

general rule in college that undergraduates should spend at least two hours preparing for class for every one hour in class; in math and science, the expectation is three to four hours of study per class hour. Both freshmen and seniors spend only about half the amount of time that they need to prepare for class, both in System and the nation. In general, students do not spend enough time preparing for classes. Another question in this benchmark area asked how many papers of more than 20 pages the student had written. On this question, System students and national students are very similar. While 82% of freshmen have never written a 20-page paper, 50% of seniors have never written a 20-page paper.

Dr. Hudson stated that collaboration with peers is important in learning. Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and encouraged to think about and apply their knowledge in different settings. This benchmark, Active and Collaborative Learning, includes seven measures of how much students participate in class, work with other students, and participate in community-based projects. System freshmen and seniors lag national students on this benchmark, but there is considerable change between the freshman year and the senior year. One of the questions in this benchmark examines how often students report that they ask questions in class. Very few students say that they never ask questions. Only 22% of System freshmen ask questions very often, compared to 27% of national freshmen. Only 38% of seniors ask questions very often, compared to 43% of national seniors.

The student-faculty interaction benchmark is based upon the concept that interaction with faculty is extremely important for student success. Research shows that it is not just the fact of interaction with faculty that makes a difference, but also the quality of the interaction. Casual interaction, such as participating in a pizza party with faculty, does not make as much difference as discussion of ideas or assignments from class. RPG literature also reports that increased faculty-student interaction leads to higher graduation rates. System students report less interaction with faculty than national students, both at the freshman and senior levels, but there is significant change between the freshman and senior students. System freshmen reported that they received prompt feedback slightly less often than did national freshmen, reported Dr. Hudson, but 60% of both System and national seniors responded that they receive prompt feedback often or very often. Meanwhile, 72% of seniors report that level of feedback.

The next benchmark Dr. Hudson presented, Enriching Educational Experiences, included foreign language study, study abroad, independent study, senior capstone study, learning communities, and community service. There is significant change between the freshman year and the senior year on this benchmark. She noted that taking foreign language courses increases a student's understanding of the world. About 17% of freshmen and 36% of seniors reported taking foreign language courses. The percentage of seniors taking foreign language courses is about the same in the University System and the nation, but the proportion of System freshmen taking foreign language lags the nation. Dr. Hudson said that this question is an example of another way to evaluate the results from the survey: What proportion of seniors *should* have taken foreign language courses? Course requirements for

degrees are set by institutions and faculty, but the Board should consider whether there is an ideal to which institutions should aspire.

Approximately 58% of System students reported having serious conversations with students of different beliefs, and about 57% reported having serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity. On these measures, a slightly larger proportion of System students than the nation's students report having had serious conversations outside class. The final benchmark, Supportive Campus Climate, includes students' perspectives of campus environments. It asks questions such as whether an institution provides support a student needs to succeed academically. Dr. Hudson reported that the University System is near the national median on this benchmark.

Next, Dr. Hudson discussed the survey results from CCSSE. Nationally, 257 colleges participated in the survey in academic year 2005 for a total of 133,281 respondents and 11 participating states or systems. In the University System of Georgia, 13 two-year colleges, or 7,364 USG respondents, participated in the survey. The CCSSE benchmarks are slightly different from the NSSE benchmarks. There are several questions in the CCSSE benchmark for active or collaborative learning. She stated that 62% of System two-year college students reported that they often or very often ask questions in class, and the percentage in the nation was 65%; 30% had made a class presentation. Slightly more than half of two-year students had discussed course ideas outside of class. About 1 out of 6 students in the nation and the System reported that they came to class often or very often without completing the assigned readings. Only 7% of students report that they have not written a paper at a two-year college.

Dr. Hudson ended her presentation with good news. Two University System of Georgia colleges were top performers in the CCSSE results. She noted that only 8 colleges out of the 257 participating colleges are chosen as a top performer for each benchmark area, so this is quite an honor for these two institutions. Gainesville State College ("GSC") was a top performer in student-faculty interaction, and Georgia Perimeter College ("GPC") was a top performer on the student effort benchmark. She congratulated GSC and GPC on their high scores.

In closing, Dr. Hudson discussed possible uses of the survey data. The staff have established baseline information on current levels of students engagement. Now, institutions can ask themselves whether the current levels of engagement are satisfactory. The institutions can compare their survey results to those of their peers and can benchmark their progress over time. A committee will examine target areas for improvement across the System. The Board may also use these data to modify programs and policies as appropriate. Moreover, the institutions can be more deliberate in teaching students what is required to succeed. Staff will use this information to monitor student, institutional, and System performance.

Chair Shelnut asked whether this information would be turned over to the System institutions so that they might use it to help with RPG rates.

Dr. Hudson responded that this would be the primary use of the data. However, a Systemwide committee will also examine what can be done at the System level to improve RPG rates.

Chair Shelnut said that this will also provide a way to benchmark future progress in this effort.

Dr. Papp stated that Dr. Hudson had presented the aggregated data for all System institutions. Each of the institutions has its institution-specific data for its institutional application.

Regent Jolly noted that the System seems to lag the national norm in many benchmarks. He asked whether the System lags the national norm in retention.

Dr. Hudson responded that student satisfaction affects retention. She noted that System students work more and have more family responsibilities than the national norm. She stressed that the System is not far from the national norm in student satisfaction or retention.

Regent Jennings asked Dr. Hudson to clarify the differences between NSSE and CCSSE.

Dr. Hudson replied that the CCSSE was developed after NSSE. The CCSSE questions are more specific to two-year college students.

Vice Chair Pittard said that when a student who is not performing well academically is not retained from the freshman to sophomore year, it is a different situation than when a student performs well and is not retained. A student who does not perform well was not well-prepared coming into college, and that must be addressed in a different way. However, the Regents must closely examine why a student who is performing well is not retained. The System must find ways to keep students engaged and enrolled in college. Otherwise, intellectual capital is being wasted, and that will have an effect on the economy and on those students' families.

Chair Shelnut said that Dr. Papp would provide a summary of all of the information divulged as a result of the RPG initiative.

Regent Hatcher reiterated that this was aggregate data. He asked whether there are wide differences among the institutions.

Dr. Hudson responded that there are differences between institutions. The most important finding at the national level is that there is similarly wide variation within an institution between the most engaged students and the least engaged students.

Regent Hatcher asked whether Dr. Hudson would provide more detailed information about the differences among and within System institutions.

Dr. Hudson responded that she would.

Chair Shelnut said that RPG rates are even more critical to the Board's strategic goal of a more educated Georgia than even facilities issues.

Dr. Papp commented that financial issues are critical to System students. The number of students' parents who did not graduate from college is also a critical factor. So, there are some issues in the System that may have policy implications at the System level and implementation decisions at the institutional level.

Regent Hunt asked whether staff would provide more information about retention of students who are prepared versus those who are not.

Dr. Papp responded that in March 2006, he would provide information about the grade point averages ("GPAs") of those students who did not return as full-time students their freshman year and that he expected this information would provide more insight into this particular issue.

Vice Chair Pittard said that he would like to know what kind of outreach programs are in place to help those students who are not retained.

Chair Shelnut asked Dr. Papp to provide a breakdown at the March meeting of these aspects of the RPG issue.

Dr. Papp noted that it would be very interesting to see the SAT scores and high school GPAs of the students with GPAs of 0 to 2.0 who are not retained. He stressed that poor preparation may not be the only factor affecting these students' retention. It may be an acclimation issue as well.

At approximately 11:05 a.m., Chair Shelnut called for a brief recess.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Chair Shelnut next convened the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities as a Committee of the Whole and turned the Chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Vigil, the Chair of the Committee.

At approximately 11:10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, Committee Chair Allan Vigil called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a potential acquisition of property. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Committee members in attendance were Chair Allan Vigil, Vice Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr., and Regents Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Elridge W. McMillan. Other Board members in attendance were Regents William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank

Harris, Robert F. Hatcher, Julie Ewing Hunt, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbuton III, and Richard L. Tucker. Also in attendance were Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr.; Interim Chancellor Corlis Cummings; the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber; the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels; President Michael F. Adams of the University of Georgia (“UGA”); President Daniel W. Rahn of the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”); UGA’s Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration, Henry M. (Hank) Huckaby; President Adams’ Executive Assistant and Chief of Staff, Thomas S. Landrum; and UGA’s Senior Vice President for External Affairs, Steven W. Wrigley. 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 11:50 a.m., Chair Vigil reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. Seeing that there were no further questions or comments, Chair Vigil adjourned the meeting of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting back to Regent Shelnut.

At approximately 12:00 p.m., Chair Shelnut adjourned the Regents into their Committee meetings. He invited Regents-Elect Hatcher, Jenkins, and Tarbuton to attend the meetings of their choice, but he asked that they attend the meeting of the Committee on Organization and Law so that there would be adequate Regent representation. He said that in March, the new Regents would be sworn-in and would be assigned to Committees.

Following the Committee meetings, Chair Shelnut reconvened the Board in its regular session at approximately 1:20 p.m.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Chair Shelnut next called upon the State Librarian for the Georgia Public Library Service (“GPLS”), J. Lamar Veatch, Jr. to introduce someone special to the Board of Regents.

Dr. Veatch greeted the Regents and welcomed Chancellor Davis to Georgia. He explained that this presentation was in the spirit of the Governor’s focus on quality customer service and said that it was his pleasure to introduce a recipient of the 2005 *New York Times* Librarian Award. The 27 recipients (from 13 states) of the award were selected from 1,200 submissions from 48 states. *New York Times* readers nominated favorite librarians who provided outstanding public service and who had a strong positive impact on their nominators. GPLS’s recipient is Mr. Scott Routsong, Children’s Services Coordinator for the Three Rivers Regional Library headquartered in Brunswick. He was nominated by Debbie Osgood, who with her family divides their time between Boston and Brunswick. In her nomination, she wrote, “In Brunswick, children do not visit the public library. They visit Mr. Scott. He exudes a certain kind of energy and friendliness that children love. He’s

always ready to help both children and adults find exactly the right books to enjoy.... At each library program, Mr. Scott tries to instill the love of reading and learning, so the children leave with a substantive message.”

Dr. Veatch stated that Mr. Routsong grew up in Florida. He is a four-year veteran of the U.S. Air Force and served in Operation Desert Storm. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in History from Valdosta State University in 1996. He earned his Master’s in Library Science from Florida State University in 1999. On November 16, 2005, the 27 recipients of this year’s award were treated to a reception in New York. They were each given a \$2,500 award. Dr. Veatch invited Mr. Routsong to the podium.

Mr. Routsong greeted the Regents and said he was honored to be recognized by the Board for his recent award. He recognized the Director of the Three Rivers Regional Library, Joe Shinnick, as well as the staff. He also thanked his fellow state librarians for their dedicated service to the citizens of Georgia. In closing, he said he was very happy to be a children’s services librarian and that he was very proud to be a Georgia librarian.

Chair Shelnut thanked Mr. Routsong for his contribution to GPLS and the State of Georgia.

Dr. Veatch noted that children’s librarians are essential to engage children in learning at the earliest age in the effort to create a more educated Georgia.

Chair Shelnut noted that Senator Johnny Grant was in attendance at the meeting.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION ON GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

Chair Shelnut called upon President Dorothy Leland of Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) to share something special going on at the university.

President Leland greeted the Regents and said that when the General Assembly authorized the Georgia Normal & Industrial College in 1889 as the female counterpart to the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), no one could have imagined the multiple transformations that would take place over more than a century of development. None is more significant than the policy decision made by this Board in 1996 to create a new sector in Georgia’s system of higher education, a public liberal arts university, and to bestow this classification upon GCSU. A decade later, GCSU has been able to take on many of the characteristics of its national peers in the public liberal arts sector – smaller class sizes, healthy enrollments in the liberal arts and sciences disciplines, faculty-led initiatives in undergraduate research and other out-of-class experiences with students, service learning, global awareness and study abroad opportunities, and the formation of strong learning communities. GCSU is rapidly becoming one of the most academically competitive institutions in the University System of Georgia, and its growing statewide appeal demonstrates success in providing Georgia’s brightest

students with a competitive and affordable alternative to in-state and out-of-state private liberal arts colleges.

This success is also reflected in national rankings, said President Leland. *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* magazine recently named GCSU as one of the 100 best values in public higher education in the nation. Along with GIT and the University of Georgia, GCSU was one of three institutions in the University System of Georgia to earn this designation. Earlier this year, *U.S. News and World Report* ranked GCSU above all public master's degree-granting institutions in Georgia and number 15 in the South, a region ranging from Virginia to Texas. GCSU was also the only public institution in Georgia named as a college of distinction for its intensely student-focused and academically challenging learning environment.

To create the kind of learning environment that it prizes, GCSU has worked hard to recruit faculty who are committed to instructional innovation and student learning. When GCSU invites prospective faculty to apply, it states its expectations clearly. For example, GCSU expects faculty to integrate their research or scholarship actively into their teaching. The institution also expects faculty to extend learning beyond the classroom by engaging students in research and service-learning activities. GCSU expects faculty to do much more than lecture at their students and encourages them to find ways to involve students creatively in learning and discovery processes. At this meeting, President Leland discussed an instructional initiative that grew out of GCSU's teaching philosophy, one that has gained national and international attention. It illustrates what can happen when faculty seek to find better ways to engage students in the learning process. It shows what can result when faculty ask themselves, "How can I help my students to connect better to the course content in my discipline?"

President Leland held up an Apple iPod, explaining that the iPod was originally created to provide musical entertainment for people on the go and it has proved to be immensely popular among college-age teenagers. Given its popularity among students, she said, it is not surprising that innovative educators soon began to explore the iPod's potential for enhancing learning. The Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology and Chief Information Officer for the University System of Georgia, Randall A. Thursby, and the Chief Information Officer for GCSU, James Wolfgang, were among those educators. Thanks to their encouragement and support, experiments in the use of iPods to enhance student learning took root at GCSU with remarkable results.

The pilot program began small, with 50 donated iPods to support two interdisciplinary courses, and the program focused on documenting student learning outcomes. This initial experience demonstrated that the iPod provides flexible, location-independent access to digital multimedia course material, offers opportunities to utilize classroom time better, and enhances student engagement and interest in course content and classroom discussions. Today, GCSU faculty are using iPods in a variety of creative ways to enhance learning inside and outside of the classroom. For example, Dr. Lila F.

Roberts, Professor and Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, uses the iPod to provide students with convenient, portable access to visualizations of mathematical concepts augmented by audio explanations. Dr. Henry (Hank) Edmondson, Professor of Public Administration and Political Studies, uses iPods extensively in his study-abroad courses to create a mobile electronic classroom.

This year, GCSU launched the nation's first virtual learning community by connecting a cohort of freshmen students via iPod technology even before they arrived on campus. These students, known as the iVillagers, have created their own community identity and projects, and are now preparing to serve as guides and mentors to a second generation of iVillage inhabitants. President Leland showed the Regents a brief video clip of students discussing the iVillage experience. At the conclusion of the video, she stated that the program gets students involved and engaged in learning, which is a documented key to student retention and persistence. If the iVillage proves to be as successful as traditional living-learning communities in improving student retention, progression, and graduation, it will become a national model for connecting and engaging freshmen who neither live together nor enroll in a common cluster of courses.

Earlier this year, GCSU hosted the Apple Digital Campus Leadership Institute. This institute, previously sponsored by Apple Computer, Inc. in the Midwest at the University of Missouri, provided GCSU with an opportunity to showcase the innovative use of instructional technology at the institution. President Leland said that she was particularly heartened by the praise of participants who observed the faculty and students interacting in learning and discovery processes. She quoted the Director of Academic Technology Services at Emory University, Alan Cattier, as saying, "To have students as active partners in exploring curricular and co-curricular offerings; to have faculty who are willing partners in letting students show the way in areas where their expertise (cultural expertise) can enhance academic work (subject expertise), to have a group of learners, faculty and students alike, learning how change can make them better teachers and learners – these are remarkable achievements." She further quoted him as saying that the program is "...an unbelievably powerful set of dynamics that are obviously transformative for [GCSU] as an institution." She said that she likes to think that this "unbelievably powerful set of dynamics" is what being Georgia's public liberal arts university is all about.

In closing, President Leland thanked the Regents for this opportunity to speak to them at this meeting. She ended the presentation by showing a final video clip of the university's award-winning cheerleaders.

Chair Shelnut thanked President Leland for this very interesting presentation.

Regent Coles asked whether students use the video iPod.

President Leland said that the institution is phasing-in the video iPod, which provides access to

mathematics visualizations anywhere, anytime.

Regent Coles said that his company also uses the video iPod for training purposes.

Chair Shelnut again thanked President Leland for her presentation.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chair Shelnut next convened the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the Chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern, the Chair of the Committee.

Chair Leebern said that the Committee’s agenda focused on two critically important issues for Georgia and the nation: the health professions and education. In Georgia and nationally, the demand for health professionals far outpaces supply. He called upon President Daniel W. Rahn of the Medical College of Georgia (“MGC”), who would present a midterm report of the Regents’ task force on health professions.

President Rahn stated that health workforce shortages are not new and that the problem is nationwide and across almost all developed countries. Georgia has worked through multiple initiatives over the past five years to increase numbers of health professionals, but the strategies have principally been opportunistic as opposed to strategic and long-term. Georgia and the nation often turn to other nations to meet short-term workforce needs, but the economic emergence of these nations is rendering that strategy ineffective. Despite the efforts that have been underway over the past several years, the demand for healthcare professionals still greatly outpaces the supply. Population growth, the increasing proportion of older adults, and the increasing diversity of the State of Georgia compound existing shortages. Georgia is the ninth largest state in the nation but is one of the worst in supply of health professionals per capita. However, Georgia ranks thirty-ninth with regard to per capita supply of physicians; forty-seventh with regard to psychologists, social workers, and dietitians; and forty-second with regard to physical therapists and registered nurses. Georgia does not reach its population ranking in any comparative category of health professionals supply. At the same time, projected need is substantial. Healthcare positions in Georgia account for 8 of the 20 fastest growing occupations, and by 2012, the health industry will account for one in every 12 jobs in the state. Nearly 20,000 additional registered nurses will be needed by 2012. At maximum capacity, the University System of Georgia is presently able to graduate an average of 1,500 new nurses annually. Due to facility constraints and faculty shortages, System institutions had to turn away an estimated 3,000 qualified applicants for associate and bachelor’s degree nursing programs and 142 applicants to clinical psychology programs in fall 2004. In short, there are pervasive shortages, but System institutions turn away qualified applicants, and there will likely be worsening shortages in the future.

The University System of Georgia has a very important role in addressing this need, stated President

Rahn. Public colleges and universities educate the vast majority of Georgians and produce the overwhelming majority of health professionals for the state. Degrees in the health professions are among the most costly to provide in higher education. Few private institutions offer these degrees because of the economics; most that do are expensive and contribute only marginally to Georgia's health workforce. However, health professions education relies on a qualified pipeline from the K-12 system and a core university curriculum that provides the foundation for the health sciences disciplines. To address shortages, the University System must consider ways to increase the size, diversity, and quality of the health workforce while strengthening academics Systemwide.

For all of these reasons, the Board of Regents commissioned a health professions education task force September 2005. President Rahn noted that this is the first System-led group to focus specifically and comprehensively on this issue. The task force consists of 14 members representing University System institutions and the leadership of the Department of Technical and Adult Education ("DTAE"). He recognized the Associate Director of the Georgia State University Institute of Public Health, Valerie A. Hepburn, who has led the research support group with support from MCG, the University of Georgia ("UGA"), and Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU"). The task force has met three times and has received significant input from public and private sector partners. The charge of the task force is to review information on the quality, accessibility, productivity, and cost of health professions education offered by the University System of Georgia; to document supply and demand expectations, to include the need for increased diversity and cultural competency, for health professionals in Georgia through 2015; to identify gaps (geographic and curricular) and potential redundancies in health professions education within the public and private postsecondary and higher education systems in Georgia; to illuminate special characteristics of health professions education and related resource challenges and considerations; to propose appropriate refinement and further definition of the role of the University System; to identify emerging opportunities and document the best strategies to prepare an adequate number of graduates in health professions programs and ensure that those graduates can be successful contributors to the twenty-first century health workforce; and finally, to submit a final report to the Board of Regents by June 30, 2006.

President Rahn presented some preliminary findings of the task force. He stressed that the issues are complicated, pervasive, and multifaceted. Therefore, the System must prioritize its efforts. He said that the System simply cannot comprehensively address all of the health professions shortages at once. There are also major issues within the System. The three most important issues are System related to infrastructure, faculty shortages, and clinical training sites. With regard to faculty shortages, President Rahn noted the aging of faculty, competition with private-sector jobs, and small pools of faculty candidates. He noted that in many health professions, there is little economic incentive to pursue an advanced degree, but to be a faculty member, one must have an advanced degree. There are also issues of facilities capacities, geographic distribution, and technology infrastructure that will be addressed in the final report of the task force. With regard to clinical training site, he explained that as reimbursement for clinical services and the fiscal environment in

healthcare delivery becomes tighter, the ability to provide adequate training in clinical settings is frequently constrained. This in an area where accreditation requirements of programs can compete with the need for supply of additional health professionals. Georgia is competing with other states, he said, because Georgia's issues are by no means unique within the region or across the nation. More and better qualified students must be recruited and retained, and solutions must be comprehensive, collaborative, and long-term in nature

The health workforce problem is not one that can be solved by money alone, said President Rahn. There, the problem is complex and will require creative, sustainable strategies. He noted that other states and national governments have models that hold promise for replication. The task force promotes the following areas of strategic focus:

- Strong partnerships with the K-12 systems, DTAE colleges, and private academic institutions;
- Working closely with the business sector and replicating models like the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP[®]”) Health Professionals Initiative;
- Exploring new academic linkages to include seamless career laddering, alternative learning technologies, and shared facilities;
- Structuring new and expanded student education financing programs;
- Identifying new research initiatives in health workforce supply, mix, and practice patterns;
- Reviewing model state programs in ongoing data collection, forecasting, performance review, and strategic planning; and
- Considering core mission roles for the University System and whether any expansions or contractions are warranted.

In closing, President Rahn stated that the Board of Regents will need to consider distinct and innovative strategies in health professions education driven by quality, return on investment, accountability and coordination, sustainability, and economic viability for the state. He reiterated that the final report of the task force would be submitted to the Board in June 2006. He noted that the final report will be structured as a strategic plan and will include health workforce drivers, characteristics of the education system and of the health workforce, forecasts for future needs, and recommendations for the System and its business partners. The plan will suggest a long-range direction and a comprehensive process to move the University System of Georgia proactively to address health professional education needs well into the twenty-first century.

Regent Jennings asked President Rahn whether the task force had given consideration to the management of the healthcare delivery system.

President Rahn responded that the clinical environment is quite chaotic right now and the liability of that environment is part of what makes the health workforce challenges so difficult to predict. So, the task force is taking this into account and will recommend a structure that will enable the System to respond to the instability in the market and how the system is managed.

Chair Leebern next called upon the Vice Chancellor for Academic, Student, and Faculty Affairs, Frank A. Butler, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Co-Facilitator of the Georgia P-16 Initiative, Jan Kettlewell, to present to the Board the American Diploma Project (“ADP”) action plan for the University System of Georgia.

Dr. Butler stated that ADP is a national project involving 22 states. It is coordinated by Achieve, Inc., a partner of the National Governors Association, which held the 2005 National Education Summit on High Schools (“2005 National Summit”) in February 2005. The purpose of ADP is to raise expectations for American high schools toward goal of all high school graduates being ready for both college and the workforce. Each state is expected to coordinate its ADP efforts through a partnership. The lead partners coordinating Georgia’s ADP action plan are the Georgia Department of Education (“DOE”), the University System of Georgia, DTAE, the Governor’s Office, and the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, which is the state’s major school-business partnership. Dr. Butler noted that Dr. Kettlewell is the point person for Georgia’s partnership in the 22-state ADP network, and he called upon her to present an update on Georgia’s ADP effort to date.

Dr. Kettlewell stated that the 2005 National Summit strengthened the sense of urgency among political, corporate, and educational leaders across the county. At a time when most new jobs will require some education beyond high school, the national high school drop out rate is about 25%. Additionally, about one-third of high school graduates who enter college are placed in remedial courses. Employers also cite deficiencies in those entering the workforce. Dr. Kettlewell noted that Georgia’s high school graduation rate has steadily improved over the past few years. However, there is still much room for improvement. Speakers like William (Bill) H. Gates, Chairman and Chief Software Architect of Microsoft Corporation, and others at the 2005 National Summit stressed the urgency of improving America’s high schools because national and state economies and the quality of life in local communities across this nation are at risk.

Dr. Kettlewell explained that she is Georgia’s ADP point person for a few reasons. First, at the 2005 National Summit, high school reform was described as a preschool through college (P-16) rather than a K-12 issue. In other words, the redesign needs to meet the expectations of what comes after high school. This includes colleges, such as University System of Georgia institutions, as well as the business community. In order to redesign high schools to meet college and business expectations, it

is reasonable to start the redesign with those expectations. She stressed that ADP is not a Board of Regents initiative. Rather, it is a statewide partnership with the DOE, DTAE, and other stakeholders.

Second, in the mid-1990s the Board created the P-16 Department, which Dr. Kettlewell directs. The P-16 Department serves as the Regents' outreach arm to the public schools and other postsecondary institutions on key transition points for students and educators. Its focus is the successful student transition from school to college as well as the preparation of teachers and other educators so they are able to succeed in the public schools with all P-12 students. As such, the ADP project fits squarely within the mission of the P-16 Department within the University System.

All 22 states in the ADP network have signed on for a four-point agenda to address what it takes to be prepared for college and work. The first point of the agenda is to align academic standards in high school with expectations for college and workplace success. The second point is to upgrade high school course requirements so that a college- and work-readiness curriculum is required for a high school diploma. The third point is to redesign selected high school tests in English and math to also serve as college- and work-readiness tests. The final point is to hold high schools and colleges accountable for the success of their students. Like all states, Georgia has developed an action plan through which to meet these four expectations. Dr. Kettlewell noted that copies of Georgia's action plan were included in the Regents' notebooks.

Using the four-point agenda, Dr. Kettlewell briefly reviewed the high points of each of the four sections in Georgia's action plan. Each section corresponds to one part of the four-point agenda. She thanked the State Superintendent of Schools, Kathy Cox, and the leadership of DOE for collaborating well with the University System and DTAE colleges. She said that the new Georgia performance standards stand up well nationally and have been benchmarked against ADP standards. As a state, Georgia is in very good shape. Dr. Kettlewell noted that the action plan calls for the Board and other ADP partners to consider approval of the proposed college and work standards in June 2006.

The second part of Georgia's action plan relates to course requirements. She said that the idea is to establish high school mathematics and English "threshold" courses through which students are to meet the standards. This component of Georgia's action plan also calls for revisions of the High School Graduation Rule, which states the requirements for high school graduation including requirements for the academic core of courses that must be completed successfully and tests that must be passed to graduate from high school. She reiterated that there will be extensive involvement of all partners including the University System. The goal of this section of the action plan is for an aligned system from high school to college. The academic core of courses to be articulated in the revised High School Graduation Rule and that lead to the college- and work-readiness standards would also satisfy the college preparatory curricular requirements for admission into the University System of Georgia. She noted this latter decision would be made by the System and DTAE.

The third part of Georgia's ADP action plan relates to assessment. Again, the goal is an aligned

system between high school and college. The idea is for selected high school assessments to be sufficiently rigorous that they would satisfy college placement examinations. Dr. Kettlewell stated that it may be necessary to have an optional supplement to the selected high school assessments that students would complete only if interested in attending the University System of Georgia, like that which is in place in the California State University System. The work will be coordinated by DOE and USG with extensive participation of all partners. The ADP team anticipates having an assessment plan for this component of the ADP Action Plan ready for Board consideration in September 2006. It also the intent for the plan to be considered by the DOE and DTAE boards.

The fourth and final component of Georgia's ADP action plan is accountability. Dr. Kettlewell noted that Georgia already has an accountability plan. However, a few dimensions will be added to assist in following student progression from high school to college and tie into the initiative on retention, progression, and graduation.

In closing, Dr. Kettlewell asked the Board of Regents to approve Georgia's ADP action plan so that the partnership can begin work on its implementation. She noted that the same ADP action plan is being considered by the DOE and DTAE boards this month.

Chair Leebern asked what would be the cost of this action plan.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that there should be no cost implications for the University System of Georgia.

Chair Leebern asked whether this effort is a duplication of the efforts of the Education GO Get It ("GO") initiative.

Dr. Kettlewell responded that the GO initiative will be transferred to the DOE effective July 1, 2006.

Seeing that there were no further questions, Chair Leebern called for a motion to approve Georgia's ADP action plan. Motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board of Regents approved the action plan.

Chair Leebern then adjourned the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting back to Regent Shelnut.

Chair Shelnut called for a brief recess at approximately 2:10 p.m.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

At approximately 2:20 p.m., Chair Shelnut reconvened the Board meeting, and Chancellor Davis gave his report to the Board, which was as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Elaine and I are excited to be in Georgia and to have the opportunity to work for such a great University System and with this outstanding Board of Regents. We have been overwhelmed by your legendary Southern hospitality and we like it!

Knowing that our meeting is being webcast, I also want to extend my greetings to our 35 colleges and universities as well as to our System staff. As the administrators, faculty, and staff of this System, your work is an important contribution to our state and in many instances to our nation. We must be driven by our mission of “creating a more educated Georgia” – a mission that changes individual lives and enhances the overall quality of life for our state’s citizens. This is a significant mission. In today’s modern world, education is a common denominator to success – successful intellectual participation in society and successful participation in our nation’s economy.

And, it is your work and effort each day that make a nationally recognized higher education available throughout the State of Georgia. As I mentioned at last week’s Regents’ Awards for Excellence in Education celebration, this System also powers Georgia’s economic engine. It’s no surprise that this state is the fastest growing east of the Mississippi. That did not happen by accident. People and businesses are drawn to centers of education and intellect, and you are the nucleus of that intellectual activity. And you must be the catalyst for its expansion. That is why what you do has so many implications for the future prosperity of this state. I appreciate all that you do to create and sustain a world-class system of public higher education, a system that serves more than 250,000 talented students, who understand the indisputable impact that education – quality education – will have in their lives.

And to those students who might be listening, first, I hope that you are not missing any classes. We appreciate your commitment to educational excellence and achievement. By seeking to enhance your horizons, you reflect well on our state and its future promise. You are the primary reason that more than 38,000 employees work so hard each day to ensure your access to high-quality academic programs, top-flight faculty, and first-rate facilities. As the beer commercial states, “You only go around once.” Enjoy yourselves. Savor the experience, but try to do it quickly! I urge you to take every advantage of the outstanding resources you have at your disposal on our campuses. By optimizing your educational experiences, you give us all hope and assurance that our future will be in excellent hands, in yours, our next generation of leaders. So, I say to the entire University System family, it is an honor to begin this association with you, and I look forward to meeting many of you in the coming weeks and months.

Before I go any further, there's one individual I would like to publicly thank at the outset. (I should have done this before I began.) And that is Corlis Cummings. Corlis, you have my heartfelt thanks for the outstanding job you have done as Interim Chancellor, and I especially appreciate your "dumbing down" the communications to me during this transition period.

I am in a learning mode at the moment. I am learning already that no decision here is quite as simple as it seems. That is probably appropriate, given the scope, size, and complexity of this organization. Corlis and Tom [Daniel, Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities] are presently guiding me through the arcane nuances of Southern politics. It probably will take more than one session to become familiar with this important area, however.

I expect that I will make changes over time in many areas, but they will not be precipitous. Change should be rational, its basis understood, and where possible, be fact and data driven. As most of you already are aware, this is a large, yet public organization. To paraphrase Blanche Dubois for the last time, "We depend upon the kindness of strangers" for our existence. We need to recognize and to fully appreciate this fact in our daily work. Such awareness means that we must be open, transparent, and accountable, and we must develop and operate with a high "say-do" index.

For those new Regents who have just joined this Board, we have something in common. As we face this complex System, we share the need to begin to understand its history, its accomplishments, and the challenges ahead. This Board draws much of its strength from its continuity. We have great institutional memory among our long-serving Regents such as Elridge McMillan and Don Leebern. We also have new Regents anxious to get on with the task of governing this vast institution. I am anxious as well to get moving on my new assignment.

As I've talked with many of you, my "to do" list seems to grow exponentially by the hour. I am truly being "force fed from a fire hose." Already, I have had meetings with staff and phone conversations with legislators and have been charged by the Governor with safeguarding Georgia's "crown jewels."

I do plan to meet with each of you on this Board individually. I am anxious to learn your views regarding what is working and what isn't as we jointly establish the future direction of this System. Similar questions will be posed to faculty, to students, and to community and business leaders. So, I plan to be busy perfecting my active listening skills.

My immediate goal is to visit all of our campuses over the next three to four months. Initially, I wanted to complete these visits in the first 90 days, but understand that I have significant legislative responsibilities as well. I did, however, have the pleasure of spending

time on my first day at the Lanette L. Suttles Child Development Center at Georgia State University, seeing the intersection of our education programs in a laboratory setting. I will use such visits as data-gathering opportunities to help formulate my vision and plans for the future. I want to better understand our System, its current performance, and the needs and issues on our campuses before drawing any conclusions. I also plan to meet with our legislative partners while they are in session and after they return home. I value their support, but we must continue to work to earn it.

Our 2007 budget is off to an excellent start, thanks to what I understand from many individuals was an outstanding budget presentation by Corlis to the Joint Appropriations Committee, as well as the daily follow-up work by many throughout the System, led by our own Tom Daniel. The System received a number of strong fiscal year 2007 budget recommendations from the Governor. Our top priority for this budget was to achieve full funding of the formula. The Governor delivered for us on this key objective, and now it's up to us to help him secure this in the final budget appropriation from the General Assembly. We also will be working with the legislature on other key recommendations by the Governor, including a strong capital package and well-needed merit salary increases, as well as some strategic initiatives we believe are critical to the state.

As I noted earlier, it will be important to me – and the team I assemble – to act in ways that create a record of accountability. Our results can be measured in any number of ways. They can be gauged by the numbers of students we encourage to enroll, how academically prepared they are for college, the numbers of students we retain in our System, the pace at which we move them through the System, and the numbers we graduate ready to assume their roles as contributing members of society. It can be measured by our impact on communities, the number of jobs our technologies create or the way we impact the quality of life for people in this state.

So, in the coming weeks and months, I'll be working with you and others to shape a coherent strategy that we can use to move the System forward. The world does not stand still, of course, while we develop strategy. As we move toward recommendations, we will continue to tackle critical policy issues as they arise.

We heard several important reports during this meeting, such as President [Daniel W.] Rahn's briefing on the Health Professions Task Force. These reports emphasize the need for policy decisions to be made by this Board to get moving in these areas. Cathie Mayes Hudson [Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis] also outlined data from two student surveys. The survey data indicates that while our students perform at about the national average for student engagement, we have room for improvement. To me, that is a signal that we must make improvement. These survey results also mesh well with Governor Perdue's new statewide focus on customers. We need to be in sync with the

Governor's call to identify and implement ways to improve customer satisfaction. These two projects were initiated well before my arrival, but they are excellent examples of how data should inform decisions, a process I definitely will continue to encourage.

Some might view all of this activity as a bit daunting. I take a different viewpoint. The activity I see – budgets being developed, new presidents being named, academic programs being evaluated, and economic development taking place – all reflect the incredible vitality and significance of this University System. My pledge – my contract – with you is to develop and articulate clearly what we will do, how we will do it, what our end results should be, and certainly how they should be measured.

This is a great time to be involved in public higher education. Never before in the nation's history has the creation of a more educated society held such great significance for the future direction of this state and our nation. In a world in which some countries are just starting to realize the dynamic power higher education holds to transform societies, our role in affirming that truth here in Georgia takes on a new, competitive urgency. I'm excited to be here in Georgia, working in this role and with this dynamic board, our 35 institutions, and our funding partners. I'm also looking forward to working with the talented staff here in the University System Office. Let me close by again thanking you for the opportunity to serve. I look forward to celebrating our future achievements together.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 2:40 p.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, Chair J. Timothy Shelnut called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel and compensation issues. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Shelnut, Vice Chair Patrick S. Pittard, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, Robert F. Hatcher, Julie Ewing Hunt, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbutton III, Richard L. Tucker, Allan Vigil. Also in attendance were Regent Emeritus Connie Cater, Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr., Interim Chancellor Corlis Cummings, and the 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 2:50 p.m., Chair Shelnut reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. He then called upon Regent Connie Cater.

Regent Cater thanked Regents Jennings and McMillan for serving on the Special Regents' Committee for the Fort Valley State University Presidential Search. He also thanked Interim Chancellor

Cummings and Secretary Gail S. Weber for their assistance. He then asked Chancellor Davis to make a recommendation for Board approval.

Chancellor Davis recommended the appointment of Dr. Larry E. Rivers as President of Fort Valley State University (“FVSU”). He will begin his presidency on March 13, 2006.

Motion properly made and variously seconded, the Board unanimously approved the appointment of President Rivers as President of FVSU.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Committee on Academic Affairs met on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, at approximately 12:05 p.m. in the Sixth Floor Training Room, room 6041. Committee members in attendance were Chair William H. Cleveland, Vice Chair Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Regents Joe Frank Harris and James R. Jolly. Board Chair J. Timothy Shelnut and Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr. were also in attendance. Chair Cleveland reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 8 of which required action. Item 7 included 111 regular faculty and 5 other appointments, which were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Establishment of a Major in Information Systems under the Existing Master of Science, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to establish a major in Information Systems under the existing Master of Science (“M.S.”) degree, effective February 8, 2006.

Abstract: The M.S. with a major in Information Systems is designed to meet the needs of students who want to build a strong background in information systems and the application of information and communications technology in business. The purpose of the program is to produce graduates who are able to combine their general business knowledge with the latest information systems tools and techniques to enable organizations to compete in the global marketplace.

Need: A continuing shortage of specialists and managers in information systems occurs with regard to industry needs in business and technology. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its 2000-2010 employment projections, forecasts that eight of the ten fastest growing occupations would be computer-related. These jobs include software engineers, support specialists, network analysts, database administrators, and systems analysts.

Objectives: Graduates will be prepared for careers in a variety of areas, such as information systems management, consulting, project management, database management, business process design, and

systems development. In addition, students will demonstrate knowledge of theories, models, and tools relevant to their concentration areas.

Curriculum: The 36-semester-hour program includes courses in wireless networks, mobile application development, enterprise architecture, assistive technologies, telecommunication design, knowledge systems, process innovation, and Web development.

Projected Enrollment The institution anticipates enrollments of 102 students during each of the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program has been developed with new and existing courses. Specialized institutions and research projects, such as the Center for Process Innovation and the Lab for Research on Human-Computer Interface Design, make teaching the major in information systems more amenable with practical experience. President Patton has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

2. Establishment of a Major in Public Policy under the Existing Bachelor of Science, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University ("GSU") be authorized to establish a major in Public Policy under the existing Bachelor of Science ("B.S.") degree, effective February 8, 2006.

Abstract: The B.S. with a major in Public Policy will draw upon the existing strengths of GSU to provide an undergraduate degree that enhances the mission of the university and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. The program will provide students with an intellectually challenging curriculum that will give them tools to perform analyses on a wide range of public policy issues.

Need: The essence of a Public Policy degree is to educate students who may then provide valuable advisement to government agencies. The baccalaureate degree arose out of a departmental reevaluation of its undergraduate offerings and an opportunity to more effectively utilize the resources of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Although job growth, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is projected to grow more slowly than average (e.g., an increase of 0% to 8%) for all occupations through year 2014, the need for public policy analysts varies by agency and specialty area.

Objectives: The common core of courses will provide students with 1) an understanding of the

environment and the processes in which public policy is proposed, formed, and implemented; 2) an understanding of how the economy works and how outcomes of the market economy are evaluated; 3) an understanding of the goals and tools of public policy; 4) quantitative and qualitative methods useful in the design and evaluation of policy; and 5) the means by which to evaluate and recommend policy.

Curriculum: The B.S. with a major in Public Policy will provide students an opportunity to work in a variety of policy areas through their elective courses. The 120-semester-hour curriculum includes core courses in the public policy process, research methods, microeconomics for public policy, and leadership, citizenship, and public ethics.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 30, 50, and 60 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will be supported through existing courses offered through the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. President Patton has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

3. Establishment of a Major in Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism under the Existing Bachelor of Science in Forest Resources, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish a major in Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism under the existing Bachelor of Science ("B.S.") in Forest Resources, effective February 8, 2006.

Abstract: The mission of UGA's Daniel B. Warnell School of Forest Resources is to prepare leaders in the conservation and sustainable management of forests and other natural resources, to discover ways to restore and better use the earth's natural resources, and to put into practice forestry and natural resources knowledge. The addition of a new major in Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism will broaden the scope of the Forest Resources program by addressing the human component of natural resources.

Need: Employment opportunities for graduating students include positions in tourism development, protected area management, environmental education, environmental interpretation, park management, and recreation/tourism planning. Potential employers include local/county, state, and national parks and forests; public, private, and not-for-profit nature centers; adventure and wilderness programs; environmental education centers; wildlife sanctuaries and preserves; and nature-

based tourism and outdoor recreation organizations. The program would address ecotourism initiatives.

Objectives: The objective of the major in Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism is to prepare students to work in environmental settings that provide natural resource recreation and/or tourism opportunities.

Curriculum: The proposed 123-semester-hour program will require one new course in tourism and sustainable development. The major includes core courses in ecology of natural resources, spatial analysis of natural resources, and forest resources policy, as well as other major requirement courses in wilderness management, tourism and sustainable development, and outdoor recreation and environmental awareness.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 12, 20, and 25 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will be supported through a combination of existing and new courses. President Adams has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

4. **Establishment of an External, Existing Master of Education with a Major in Occupational Studies Offered Fully at a Distance via the Internet, University of Georgia**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish as an external degree, the existing Master of Education ("M.Ed.") with a major in Occupational Studies offered fully at a distance via the Internet, effective February 8, 2006.

Abstract and Delivery: UGA proposed to offer the existing M.Ed. with a major in Occupational Studies through Internet instruction primarily using WebCT® and impending Vista platforms. Student/instructor interaction will take place through a variety of Internet-based technologies. The proposed online major in Occupational Studies is designed to enhance the knowledge base and professional practice of accomplished career and technical educators at the graduate level. The program is designed for individuals who have completed a bachelor's degree in education with a specialization in an area of career and technical education.

Need: Demand for a distance learning program was determined after reviewing 1) the need to retain career and technical education teachers currently in practice in Georgia, 2) the number of other career and technical education online programs offered at comparable universities, 3) the characteristics of currently practicing career and technical education teachers, and 4) the emergent national trend towards technology-based graduate education. The program will contribute to professionalization of the field. Traditional master's degree students in this major are working career and technical educators at secondary and postsecondary levels. Having the capacity to offer an M.Ed. through distance learning will enable the Department of Workforce Education, Leadership, and Social Foundations to better meet the needs of students who may be unable to attend on-campus classes due to remote geographic locations or other circumstances.

Objectives: The objectives of the existing M.Ed. with a major in Occupational Studies are to offer a comprehensive, broad-based curriculum; to focus on workforce preparedness; to integrate research on workplace issues; to integrate technology and basic skills applications into courses; and to prepare educators to work with diverse populations.

Curriculum and Admissions: The same admission standards used for the on-campus major in Occupational Studies will be used for admittance to complete the program through the online option. The program of study requires the same set of core courses as required in the traditional M.Ed. program. These courses include, but are not limited to, assessing student learning in occupational studies, developing curricula and programs for modern work, principles and practices of career education, technology for education in the workplace, and methods of research in education.

Projected Enrollment: The degree program will utilize a cohort approach with 20 students admitted each fall semester. A maximum of 40 students will be enrolled in the online degree program at any one time. Students will be required to complete all course requirements of the degree program in the sequence outlined.

Funding: The program will be supported through existing courses. President Adams has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: All courses offered through the online option will be consistent with UGA's principles of good practice for electronic programs and courses. The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

5. Establishment of a Master of Music Education, Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Dorothy Leland that Georgia College & State University ("GCSU") be authorized to establish a Master of Music Education, effective June

1, 2006.

Abstract: Building upon its baccalaureate program in music education, GCSU is seeking approval to offer a Master of Music Education. The program was developed, in part, to meet the demand of music educators. In Georgia, certification of music teachers is broad and comprehensive. Teachers who are certified to teach music are expected to be competent in music from grades prekindergarten through high school in choral music, general music, and instrumental music.

Need: Music and the arts collectively meet individual needs to participate in life enriching activities. Continuing education beyond the bachelor's level will give teachers and pre-service teachers the tools to add a dimension to students' lives found only through the arts. The degree was developed, in part, because of student demand by those presently enrolled in GCSU's Bachelor of Music Education program and by teachers in the area who want to continue their education.

Objectives: Students who seek the Master of Music Education will generally consist of pre-service teachers who have completed a bachelor's degree in music and will expand their studies before entering the workforce and those who have been teachers in public school music programs and will continue to improve their teaching skills while continuing to teach. For both groups, objectives of the program would include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) to assist teachers in developing ways to assess student learning in order to improve schools, 2) to assist teachers in strengthening areas that they perceive as weak in their teaching, and 3) to provide support research and scholarship that will enhance the instructional effectiveness and quality of music education programs.

Curriculum: The proposed program will be housed within the Department of Music and Theatre within the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The 36-semester-hour curriculum will be divided into three areas: the research component, the music education content component, and the elective component. The proposed program of study includes, but is not limited to, courses in research in education, curriculum and methods, methods (brass, percussion, string, woodwind, or voice), choral literature, advanced conducting, history review, world music, and advanced technology. The Department of Music and Theatre is fully accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music, the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 10, 20, and 25 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will be supported through a combination of existing and new courses. President Leland has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure

the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution's programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

6. Redesignation of the Bachelor of Science in Education with a Major in Secondary Education and the Alternative Master of Education to a Master of Arts in Teaching with Four Tracks, Georgia Southern University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce Grube that Georgia Southern University ("GSOU") be authorized to redesignate the Bachelor of Science in Education with a major in Secondary Education and the Alternative Master of Education to the Master of Arts in Teaching ("M.A.T.") with four tracks, effective July 1, 2006.

Abstract: GSOU proposed to redesignate the Bachelor of Science in Education in Secondary Education and the Alternative Master of Education to the Master of Arts in Teaching with four tracks: Secondary Education, Middle Grades Education, Special Education, and P-12 Education (Art or Spanish). The proposed program will lead to initial teaching certification and a master's degree for those individuals holding a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution.

Need: Data collected from prospective students indicate a need for the proposed program. The program is designed to prepare teachers in the critical shortage field areas of mathematics, science, business education, English, special education, foreign language education, and middle grades education.

Objectives: The program will prepare teachers to effectively enhance student learning and demonstrate the high level of knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for teaching in diverse settings. The program will provide an alternative preparation program for individuals holding a bachelor's degree seeking teacher certification.

Curriculum: The degree offers four study concentrations or tracks in following areas: Secondary Education (English, Business, Mathematics, Science or Social Studies), Middle Grades Education (complete two concentrations from Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies, and Mathematics), Special Education, or P-12 Education (Art or Spanish). Curricula will be aligned with specific discipline-related professional societies and based upon the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Additionally, the curricula meet the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education unit standards and the Regents' Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 25 to 30 students annually during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will build upon existing courses through revisions and reconfigurations.

Current faculty at GSOU will teach in the program. President Grube has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the program. The program will be reviewed in concert with the institution’s programmatic schedule of comprehensive program reviews.

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

Approved: The administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by the Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs and approved by the Board. The full list of approved appointments is on file with the Office of Faculty Affairs in the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

8. Establishment of the Robert B. Greenblatt, M.D., Chair in Endocrinology, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel W. Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the Robert B. Greenblatt, M.D., Chair in Endocrinology, effective February 8, 2006.

Abstract: MCG requested approval to convert the existing Robert B. Greenblatt, M.D., *Professorship* in Endocrinology to the Robert B. Greenblatt, M.D. *Chair* in Endocrinology. The Medical College of Georgia Foundation, Inc. (the “Foundation”) has over \$705,000 in this fund to cover the endowed chair. The family of the late Dr. Greenblatt has made this request, and because the funds are available in the Foundation account, MCG requests Board approval to make this change.

9. 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 payment as indicated:

Georgia State University

Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide consultation and support as necessary to regional offices and other stakeholders to assist training providers in implementation of human immunodeficiency virus (“HIV”) early intervention, treatment, and rapid testing	10/1/05 – 9/30/06	\$452,115
Georgia Department of Human Resources	8/16/05 –	\$748,635

Provide tuition, fees, and books to bachelor's and master's of social work students enrolled in the child welfare training program	8/15/06	
Georgia Department of Education Evaluate department's implementation of 21st Century Community Learning Center programs and activities in order to meet federal and state program requirements	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$508,985
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide training provision of eight Web-based modules, and disseminate information about Georgia's Babies Can't Wait training availability through multiple modalities	10/1/05 – 9/30/06	\$380,780
Georgia Department of Education Examine the implementation and effectiveness of Learn and Serve Schools in Georgia, and analyze and report all data gathered	8/19/05 – 6/30/06	\$40,000

Georgia Department of Transportation Develop and pilot surveys in 2005 through 2007 on its processes and performance to external stakeholders to improve the efficiency, and develop a more productive working relationship with them	5/1/05 – 2/28/06	\$16,527
Georgia Department of Community Health Develop a rural health plan and update the Rural Health Network Profiles	6/30/06 – 12/31/06	\$32,500
Department of Technical and Adult Education Provide for a faculty development institute statewide under direction of department	9/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$91,869
Georgia Department of Human Resources Develop intensive educational program to orient state, district, and local public health staffs' capacity to address chronic disease prevention	6/28/05 – 6/30/06	\$247,320
Georgia Department of Human Resources Develop a clearly defined, commonly held vision for the future of public health	7/1/05 – 12/31/05	\$211,462
Health Resources and Services Administration Develop rural health network and planning and outreach technical assistance network	9/1/05 – 8/31/06	\$1,061,417
Georgia Department of Human Resources Recruit and select 16 senior companion volunteers who will participate in the program at the volunteer station	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$45,036
Georgia Department of Community Health Provide funding under the Medicare Rural Hospital Flexibility	7/1/05 – 12/31/05	\$30,000

program for contractor to conduct a best practices conference in 2005		
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide technical assistance in research, planning, policy development, and evaluation of Georgia's nutrition and physical activity plan for the prevention of obesity and other chronic diseases	10/1/05 – 6/29/06	\$150,390
Senate Budget Office Provide an executive education program to the senate budget and evaluation office	9/1/05 – 11/1/05	\$17,820

Georgia Department of Community Health Provide grant-writing skills and funding resources to rural health networks	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$23,195
---	------------------	----------

University of Georgia

Georgia Commodity Commission for Cotton Fund participation in Beltwide Cotton Production, Mechanization, and Research conference by county agents for purpose of improving technical skills and cotton educational programs	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$18,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Cotton Provide funds for educational programs on cotton, including publications, mass media, demonstrations, meetings, tours, field days, and special award for county extension agents	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$31,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Cotton Fund extension cotton team to conduct variety of on-farm tests and demonstrations to evaluate practices and new technology over a range of conditions and applications not always possible at experiment stations	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$25,500
Georgia Department of Community Affairs Fund Georgia Commission for Service and Volunteerism	10/1/05 – 9/30/06	\$234,152
Georgia Department of Community Affairs Provide consulting services that will enable the department and its partner, the Georgia Rural Development Council, to better deliver its Leadership Infrastructure Investment Fund and enhance leadership development opportunities in the state	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$175,000
Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning Improve quality of childcare training statewide to staff of licensed and registered childcare facilities	10/1/05 – 9/30/06	\$123,593

Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning Develop key components of a development system for professionals who provide care for children from birth to school age	8/31/05 – 2/28/07	\$200,512
Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning Develop and maintain 42 copies of a lending resource kit containing nonconsumable materials needed to implement curriculum units on preventing childhood obesity to referral offices across the state	9/20/05 – 9/30/06	\$68,140
Georgia Department of Education Collect, analyze, and assess Comprehensive School Reform program and report data on student academic achievement and other indicators in the 2005-2006 funded schools; compile and report information to the state Title I office on the extent of implementation and results of student achievement testing statewide	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$380,936
Georgia Department of Education Redevelop the department's current writing assessment, including all redevelopment of the prompt banks, ancillary materials, instructional guides, and scoring and report designs for grades 3 through 11 and provide technical support	5/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$1,519,886
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide social work education and child welfare training for current department child welfare workers and students who are preparing for employment with the department to begin, continue, or complete their study of the bachelor's or master's of social work programs	8/16/05 – 8/15/06	\$642,391
Georgia Department of Human Resources Work with older adults to increase fruit and vegetable intake, increase physical activity, screen and refer those with high diabetes risk, and improve diabetes self-management in older adults that actively participate in senior centers in Georgia	8/15/05 – 8/15/06	\$194,000
Georgia Department of Human Resources Develop and conduct a minimum of three state and/or regional training sessions based upon the state priorities and identified needs; provide technical assistance in at least four individual districts to local early prevention coordinators; support a shift to evidence-based, coaching model of service delivery	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$240,670
Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority	10/1/05 –	\$70,000

Work with multiple segments of the agricultural population to provide education, demonstration, and general information regarding the efficient use of energy sources	9/30/06	
Georgia Forestry Commission Develop a series of maps from 2005 Landsat imagery representing the distribution of tree canopy, impervious surface, and land cover in Georgia and to analyze the change since 2000	8/22/05 – 8/31/06	\$50,000

Georgia World Congress Center Authority Study and assess the impact of the center in 2005 and deliver a report with the new data	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$10,000
Georgia Cancer Coalition Identify cancer clinicians and scientists who meet the requirement of the program in order to establish Georgia as a national leader in cancer prevention, treatment, research, and education	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$460,000
Governor’s Office of Highway Safety Develop and implement a process whereby the data related to funded programs will be compiled and analyzed; submit report that includes summary and interpretation of all preliminary data collected during fiscal year 2005	10/1/05 – 9/30/06	\$177,100
Northeast Georgia Regional Development Center Provide nutrition education, nutrition assessment, and health promotion/wellness programs as specified in the area-wide aging plan and with the Department of Human Resources guidelines	7/1/05 – 6/30/06	\$59,512

TOTAL AMOUNT – FEBRUARY	\$ 8,738,443
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2006 TO DATE	\$ 25,591,166
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2005 TO FEBRUARY	\$ 17,065,238
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2005	\$ 24,771,582

10. Information Item: Plus/Minus Grading Pilot

In response to a request from the two institutions, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, discussed the possibility that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) and Georgia State University (“GSU”) be permitted to issue grades of A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, F on a three-year pilot basis. Provosts Arnett C. Mace, Jr. (UGA) and Ronald J. Henry (GSU) elaborated on the reasons for the requests. No additional resources will be required from the System.

11. Information Item: Regents’ Test Review

The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, discussed the possibility of eliminating the existing Regents' Test and replacing it with a process for ensuring students' capability to read and write at the collegiate level at a time closer to the point of admissions. Staff are already undertaking a study to consider alternatives that will involve appropriate constituencies with an intent to make recommendations to the Board at its April 2006 meeting.

12. Information Item: Reactivation of Specific Fort Valley State University Education Programs

The Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, discussed the reinstatement by Interim Chancellor Corlis Cummings of three specific education programs at Fort Valley State University ("FVSU") that were deactivated by former Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith earlier this year. The programs reinstated were as follows: Bachelor of Science in Education ("B.S.Ed.") in Middle Grades Education with concentrations in English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies; Master of Science in Education in Middle Grades Education; and B.S.Ed. in Agriculture Education. An external review team appointed by the former Chancellor made the recommendation to reactivate these programs as a result of a careful review and redesign of the programs.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, at approximately 12:05 p.m. in the Seventh Floor Training Room, room 7059. Committee members in attendance were Chair W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., Vice Chair Patrick S. Pittard, and Regents Julie Ewing Hunt, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Richard L. Tucker. The Committee met jointly with the Audit Committee beginning at approximately 12:10 p.m. Representing the Audit Committee were Chair Julie Ewing Hunt and Regent Rodwell. Regent-Elect Felton Jenkins was also in attendance. Chair Jennings reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committees had reviewed four items, two of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Professional Program Tuition for Kennesaw State University Master of Business Administration Program at Dalton State College

Approved: The Board approved a special tuition rate for the Master of Business Administration ("M.B.A.") program offered by Kennesaw State University ("KSU") at Dalton State College ("DSC"), effective February 8, 2006.

Background: In January 2006, the Board ratified the approval of the establishment of an external

M.B.A. degree on the campus of DSC. The business community in the DSC service area has expressed a need to have access to a graduate business program. The institution anticipates an enrollment of 40 students in the first cohort, and it is expected that enrollment will increase by up to 15 additional students each year.

KSU's M.B.A. program at DSC is a specialty program that can be completed in 30 credit hours as a well-defined cohort MBA program. Although the program was primarily requested by, created for, and targeted to carpet industry employees, it is open to all community members who meet the admission requirements for the program. This cohort model, inclusive of in-class and out-of-class work, allows students to finish the M.B.A. in five consecutive semesters. It will be offered via face-to-face instruction two evenings per week each semester with the same curriculum as the M.B.A. program at KSU.

KSU proposed a cohort premium of \$150 per credit hour (equal to \$900 per term) for all students participating in the program. This results in total semester cost per student of \$1,720, including fees, and a total program cost of \$8,600.

2. Acceptance of Gift for Savannah State University

Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of Savannah State University (“SSU”) a gift-in-kind from the following:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Items</u>
Trustees of the Estate of James “Jimmy” Brown	\$1,000,708.90	Cash and Time Warner, Inc Stock

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. SSU has advised that there are no material costs associated with the acceptance of this gift.

3. Information Item: Presentation of the University System of Georgia Fiscal Year 2005 Annual Financial Report (Joint Meeting with Audit Committee)

The Associate Vice Chancellor of Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, began the presentation with an explanation of the process for preparing the annual financial report (“AFR”) and how it differed in fiscal year 2005 from prior years. This is the first year the University System Office has been responsible for providing the State Accounting Office with the consolidated University System of Georgia information for inclusion in the State Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (“CAFR”). The University System Office was able to meet their deadline of November 23, 2005, which enabled the State Accounting Office to meet the December 31, 2005, deadline mandated by the Governor for completion of the CAFR.

Mr. Stark then focused on the condensed comparative Statement of Net Assets. Mr. Stark gave a brief explanation for some of the larger differences between fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005. He explained that the major increase in the past four years has been in capital assets, which have grown from \$2.7 billion in fiscal year 2002 to \$4.3 billion in fiscal year 2005. This is due in large part to the growth of capital leases in the System from \$2 million in fiscal year 2002 to \$233 million in fiscal year 2005. Mr. Stark presented the full Statement of Net Assets with explanations of the Net Assets section. Each category of Net Assets was explained in detail.

Next, the Executive Director for Business and Financial Affairs, Debra J. Lasher, presented the Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets and explained some of the significant differences between fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005. She explained that operating revenues and expenses both decreased in fiscal year 2005. This was due to the fact that this was the first year the University System was required to include elimination entries in its numbers. There were elimination entries of \$20 million for inter-System transactions and \$158 million for health insurance contributions. These adjusting entries were made to avoid duplication of revenue and expenses.

Ms. Lasher explained that the largest single source of revenue for the University System of Georgia is state appropriations. The second largest source of revenue is gifts, grants, and contracts. She also explained that operating expenses can be classified as “natural” or “functional”. When looking the natural classification, the largest single classification is salaries and benefits. When looking at the expenses functionally, the largest classification is instruction, research, and public service.

Finally, Ms. Lasher explained the year-to-year differences and the content of accounts with significant balances.

4. Information Item: Update on the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 45 (Joint Meeting with Audit Committee)

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, explained Governmental Accounting Standards Board (“GASB”) Statement No. 45, “Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Post-employment Benefits Other Than Pensions.” He said that most governments have not set aside money to pay for these benefits, but fund them on a pay-as-you-go basis. The new GASB requirements change accounting and funding needs. Mr. Stark explained what governments must do in order to comply with this new GASB statement. He concluded by stating that the University System of Georgia is now determining the potential financial impact and evaluating alternative solutions. He stated that the System will be working with the State of Georgia to determine a statewide solution.

Regent Rodwell asked if Mr. Stark knew the number of baby boomers employed by the University System, and he indicated that he would get this data for her.

Regent Hunt questioned the appropriateness of working for 20 years in the University System and receiving benefits for life.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, at approximately 12:05 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Allan Vigil, Vice Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr., and Regents Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Elridge W. McMillan. Regents-Elect Robert F. Hatcher and Benjamin J. Tarbuton III were also in attendance. Chair Vigil reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 8 of which required action. Item 8 was withdrawn prior to the Committee meeting. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Acquisition of Real Property, 56 Clearview Circle, Columbus, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.414 acre of real property located at 56 Clearview Circle, Columbus, from Foundation Properties, Inc. (“FPI”) for \$85,500 for the use and benefit of Columbus State University (“CSU”).

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

Understandings: This real property was acquired by FPI in 2003 for \$85,000. Additionally, FPI has incurred costs of \$5,325 to remove structures from the property.

Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the CSU master plan.

This real property will be vacant when acquired. If acquired, approximately \$10,000 of improvements will be made for use as a parking lot for approximately 20 vehicles.

An environmental site assessment has been conducted and indicates no significant adverse environmental issues.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Harry F. Boyce, MAI, Columbus	\$85,500	
Richard Moorfield, Columbus	\$126,100	\$100,700
William B. Cliatt, Columbus	\$90,500	

There are no known easements, reversions, or restrictions on the real property.

Funding for the purchase is from auxiliary reserve funds.

2. Acquisition of Real Property, 64 Clearview Circle, Columbus, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.473 acre of real property located at 64 Clearview Circle, Columbus, from Foundation Properties, Inc. (“FPI”) for \$101,000 for the use and benefit of Columbus State University (“CSU”).

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

Understandings: This real property was acquired by FPI in 2004 for \$100,000. Additionally, FPI has incurred costs of \$4,750 to remove structures from the property.

Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the CSU master plan.

This real property is vacant. If acquired, the real property will be used for green space between two exits to an adjacent parking lot.

An environmental site assessment has been conducted and indicates no significant adverse environmental issues.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Harry F. Boyce, MAI, Columbus	\$101,000	
Richard Moorfield, Columbus	\$144,300	\$117,100
William B. Cliatt, Columbus	\$106,000	

There are no known easements, reversions, or restrictions on the real property.

Funding for the purchase is from auxiliary reserve funds.

3. Acquisition of Real Property, 65 Clearview Circle, Columbus, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.491 acre of real property located

at 65 Clearview Circle, Columbus, from Foundation Properties, Inc. (“FPI”) for \$112,000 for the use and benefit of Columbus State University (“CSU”).

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

Understandings: This real property was acquired by FPI in 2003 for \$95,500. Additionally, FPI has incurred costs of \$15,475 to remove structures from the property, and for site work.

Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the CSU master plan.

This real property is vacant. CSU will construct a pavilion at this location, which is adjacent to intramural fields, for use as coaches’ offices and soccer field support.

An environmental site assessment has been conducted and indicates no significant adverse environmental issues.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Harry F. Boyce, MAI, Columbus	\$112,000	
Richard Moorfield, Columbus	\$149,800	\$122,933
William B. Cliatt, Columbus	\$107,000	

There are no known easements, reversions, or restrictions on the real property.

Funding for the purchase is from auxiliary reserve funds.

4. Acquisition of Real Property, 3915 University Avenue, Columbus, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.277 acre of real property located at 3915 University Avenue, Columbus, from Foundation Properties, Inc. (“FPI”) for \$97,000 for the use and benefit of Columbus State University (“CSU”).

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

Modified: This item was modified to correct the address. The correct address is 3915 University Avenue.

Understandings: This real property was acquired by FPI in 2002 for \$98,521.

Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the CSU master plan.

This real property is vacant. It will be utilized as part of the intramural fields.

An environmental site assessment has been conducted and indicates no significant adverse environmental issues.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Harry F. Boyce, MAI, Columbus	\$97,000	
Richard Moorfield, Columbus	\$96,500	\$100,833
William B. Cliatt, Columbus	\$109,000	

There are no known easements, reversions, or restrictions on the real property.

Funding for the purchase is from auxiliary reserve funds.

5. Acquisition of Real Property, 3932 Clearview Circle, Columbus, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.869 acre of real property located at 3932 Clearview Circle, Columbus, from Foundation Properties, Inc. (“FPI”) for \$454,500 for the use and benefit of Columbus State University (“CSU”).

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

Understandings: This real property was acquired by FPI in 2003 for \$345,000. Additionally, FPI has incurred costs of \$468,000 to completely renovate the existing approximately 5,767-square-foot brick veneer building. If acquired, this facility will be utilized as the International House for the Center for International Education.

Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the CSU master plan.

An environmental site assessment has been conducted and indicates no significant adverse environmental issues.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Harry F. Boyce, MAI, Columbus	\$750,000	
Richard Moorfield, Columbus	\$570,000	\$641,667
William B. Cliatt, Columbus	\$605,000	

There are no known easements, reversions, or restrictions on the real property.

Funding for the purchase is from auxiliary reserve funds.

6. Intergovernmental Subrental Agreement, 1800 Century Place, Atlanta, Georgia Public Library Service

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of an intergovernmental subrental agreement between the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”), Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 9,061 square feet of office space located at 1800 Century Place, Suite 150, Atlanta, for the period through June 30, 2005, at a monthly rent of \$13,969.04 (\$167,628.48 per year annualized/\$18.50 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for five consecutive one-year periods at the same rent rate for the first and second option periods and then increasing to \$19.25 per square foot per year for option periods three and four and then increasing to \$20.25 per square foot per year for option period five for the use of the Georgia Public Library Service (“GPLS”).

The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Clairmont Place, LLC, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 2,591 square feet of office space located at 1800 Century Place, Suite 580, Atlanta, for the period April 1, 2006, through June 30, 2006, at a monthly rent of \$3,994.46 (\$47,933.62 per year annualized/\$18.50 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for four consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing to \$19.25 per square foot per year for option periods two and three and then increasing to \$20.25 per square foot per year for option period four for the use of GPLS.

Authorization to execute these rental agreements was delegated to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities.

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

Understandings: In September 2005, the State Librarian for GPLS, J. Lamar Veatch, Jr., presented to the Board the GPLS strategic plan for facilities needs.

The space has been subrented from DTAE as the staff offices for the GPLS since 1997 is no longer adequate for this purpose. The combination of the space subrented from DTAE and the space in

Suite 580 will provide adequate office space to meet the needs of GPLS for at least four years.

All operating costs are included in the rent rate.

7. Rental Agreement, 600 Northside Drive East, Statesboro, Georgia Southern University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Publix Super Markets, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 47,814 square feet of space located at 600 Northside Drive East, Statesboro, for the period March 1, 2006, through June 30, 2006, at a monthly rent of \$19,400 (\$232,800 per year annualized/\$4.87 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for 3 consecutive one-year periods at the same rent rate for the first two option periods exercised, increasing to \$20,370 per month for the third option period exercised, for the use of Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) for use to house collections from the Zach S. Henderson Library (the “Henderson Library”).

Authorization to execute this rental agreement was delegated to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities.

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

Understandings: A temporary location is needed to house a portion of the Henderson Library’s collections during renovation of the facility. To accommodate needed asbestos abatement, entire floors of the library will need to be evacuated, precluding the possibility of shifting the collections around to accommodate renovations. Only half of the library’s collections can be accommodated in the new library space. This rented space will be used for the remaining 250,000 volumes. The location provides the necessary floor-loading capacity, has adequate parking to accommodate public access to the holdings, and has a loading dock to accommodate transport of the holdings. Additionally, the space is climate-controlled to protect the holdings.

Operating costs, including janitorial services, rubbish removal, pest control, maintenance, and utilities, are estimated to be \$90,290 per year.

8. Amendment to Subrental Agreement, 3475 Lenox Road, Atlanta, University of Georgia

Withdrawn: This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the Committee meeting.

9. Resolutions, 2006A and 2006B General Obligation Bond Issues, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia

Approved: The Board adopted the Resolutions prepared by the Revenue Division of the Department of Law covering the issuance of 2006A and 2006B General Obligation Bonds (“G. O. Bonds”) by the State of Georgia through the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission for use in funding projects for the University System of Georgia. These Resolutions are on file with the Office of Facilities.

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution to cover the sale of 2006A G. O. Bonds for the following project:

J-29	Student Center Georgia Perimeter College	\$780,000
------	---	-----------

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution to cover the sale of 2006B G. O. Bonds for the following projects:

J-72	Infrastructure Improvements Southern Polytechnic State University	\$ 500,000
J-34	Performing and Visual Arts Center University of Georgia	\$ 15,050,000
J-89	Sanitary Sewer Improvements Augusta State University	\$ 4,400,000
J-91	Infrastructure Improvements Georgia Highlands College	\$ 3,950,000
J-90	Student Success Leadership Center Columbus State University	\$ 4,500,000
J-96	Success and Retention Center (Planning and Design) Gordon College	\$ 275,000
J-95	Science Building South Georgia College	\$ 5,000,000
J-99	Rock Eagle Dining Hall University of Georgia	\$ 6,500,000
J-103	Fine Arts Renovations, Phase IV	\$ 5,000,000

Georgia Southern University

J-102	Upgrade Energy Distribution Medical College of Georgia	\$ 4,000,000
J-104	Building, Phase II Georgia Gwinnett College	\$ 5,000,000
	Bartow County Library Georgia Public Library System	\$ 840,000
	Gilmer County Library Georgia Public Library System	\$ 2,000,000
	Tyrone County Library Georgia Public Library System	\$ 1,270,000
	Bibb County Library Georgia Public Library System	<u>\$ 2,500,000</u>
	Total	\$60,785,000

10. Information Item: Proposed Science Park Project, Atlanta, Georgia State University

President Carl V. Patton discussed the first two of four science buildings Georgia State University (“GSU”) hopes to build: the science teaching laboratory and the science research laboratory. He reported that GSU has experienced tremendous growth in externally funded research, particularly in the biosciences. GSU’s research income now totals more than \$60 million a year, which in turn generates another \$180 million in spending. In order to continue to excel in science education and research, GSU is working to provide essential high-tech space by building a \$77 million science teaching laboratory building at the corner of Piedmont Avenue and Decatur Street. The science teaching laboratory is the first facility that will be a part of GSU’s science park. The Board of Regents has approved that facility. GSU continues to make plans for the remaining facilities.

GSU developed the concept of an integrated project that would take advantage of efficiencies in planning, design, and construction by building these two facilities simultaneously. GSU submitted a plan to the Board in March 2005 that combined teaching laboratory and research laboratory goals. This would be a 375,000-gross-square-foot building. The science teaching laboratory will be part of the \$142 million first phase of a \$500 million university science park. The second building, the science research laboratory, a \$65 million building, will be financed through GSU’s research indirect cost recovery.

GSU has raised most of the funding for the first two buildings that will be built on the western portion of the site. Governor Perdue has recommended \$37.5 million for the \$77 million science teaching laboratory in his budget, and GSU has identified all but a small portion of the balance.

The Georgia State University Research Foundation (the “Research Foundation”) will lease part of the land based upon similar arrangements that were used for the University of Georgia’s Paul D. Coverdell Center for Biomedical and Health Sciences and the Comprehensive Cancer Center at the Medical College of Georgia. GSU is working with the Office of the Attorney General to complete the lease process.

This project will help GSU increase its ability to produce science teachers to fill the empty slots in elementary, middle, and high schools. GSU’s teacher education initiative promises to double the number of teachers, double the diversity of teachers produced, and reduce the attrition rate of new teachers. GSU can also increase its ability to prepare healthcare professionals to address the shortage of nurses and other trained health professionals in Georgia.

President Patton indicated he will come back to the Board in the near future with an agenda item when GSU is ready to sign the lease with the Research Foundation.

11. Information Item: Master Plan Update, Georgia State University

President Carl V. Patton updated the Committee on the Georgia State University master plan. He provided a profile of the university and its students and noted the economic and social impact of the university on downtown Atlanta and the State of Georgia. He updated the Committee on the progress of implementation of the previous master plan, including the Decatur Street corridor, Aderhold Building, Student Center, Student Recreation Center, and other projects. He discussed strategic plan elements that informed the master planning process, including enrollment projections, program changes, and sponsored research, and he explained the planning principles that guided the update process. He discussed the space needs generated by future enrollment growth and program enhancement and demonstrated the physical and financial approach to meeting the space needs as established in the master plan.

12. Information Item: Executive Session, Potential Real Estate Acquisition (To Be Addressed by Committee of the Whole)

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met as a Committee of the whole on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, to discuss the potential acquisition of real estate. (See page 15.)

EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, at approximately 12:45 p.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair J. Timothy Shelnut, Vice Chair Patrick S. Pittard, and Regents William H. Cleveland, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, and Richard L. Tucker. Chair Shelnut reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which did not require action. That item was as follows:

1. Information Item: Executive Session: Personnel Issues

At approximately 12:45 p.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, Chair J. Timothy Shelnut called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel issues. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Shelnut, Vice Chair Patrick S. Pittard, and Regents William H. Cleveland, Donald M. Leebern, Elridge W. McMillan, and Richard L. Tucker. Also in attendance were Regent Emeritus Connie Cater, Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr., Interim Chancellor Corlis Cummings, and the 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 1:05 p.m., Chair Shelnut reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, at approximately 12:40 p.m. in room 7005. Committee members in attendance were Chair James R. Jolly and Regent Connie Cater. Chair Jolly reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee were recommending the approval of three walk-on items. Item 1 was withdrawn from the agenda. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

Withdrawn: Due to time constraints, this item was withdrawn from the Committee agenda.

2. Savannah State University Program Modification

Approved: The Board accepted the Interim Chancellor's report on the study to implement a program modification at Savannah State University.

Walk-on: This item was added by unanimous consent as a walk-on item to the Committee's agenda.

3. Request for Reconsideration of Earlier Application

At approximately 12:45 p.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, Chair James R. Jolly called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters and academic records of students. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Jolly and Regent Connie Cater. Also in attendance were Regents-Elect Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, and Benjamin J. Tarbutton III. 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 1:15 p.m. Chair Jolly reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that the following action was taken in the Executive Session:

Denied: The Committee denied the request of Attorney Julian H. Toporek to rescind actions taken at the January 2006 Board of Regents meeting with regard to appellants Mehdi Semsar and Charlesworth Martin.

Walk-on: This item was added by unanimous consent as a walk-on item to the Committee's agenda.

4. Ratification of Committee Membership

Ratified: The Board ratified a decision by Chair J. Timothy Shelnut to permit a Committee on Organization and Law consisting of two voting Regents to hear and make recommendations to the full Board at the January and February 2006 meetings.

Background: The Chair's request was made because the Bylaws of the Board of Regents provide for no fewer than four members on any Committee. Since the new Regents have not yet been sworn-in, their presence may not be counted for the January and February 2006 meetings.

Walk-on: This item was added by unanimous consent as a walk-on item to the Committee's agenda.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Shelnut shared with the Regents the following letter he had received from former Representative and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Georgia Louise McBee, who had been awarded the The Elridge McMillan Lifetime Achievement Award at the Regents' Awards for Excellence in Education Celebration on January 28, 2006:

Dear Chairman Shelnut:

Please express my sincere appreciation to members of the Board of Regents for a very special evening. I consider the... Lifetime Achievement Award to be the single most prized recognition of my professional career.

I will treasure the beautiful Tiffany Award. I am grateful to colleagues and friends who have helped me along the way, and grateful to your Board, who deemed me worthy of the recognition.

Warm regards,

Louise McBee

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business at this meeting.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, March 7, and Wednesday, March 8, 2006, in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia. She noted that the newly appointed and reappointed Regents would be sworn-in by the Governor at that time.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m. on February 8, 2006.

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

s/ _____
J. Timothy Shelnut
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia