

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
January 13 and 14, 1998**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, January 13 and Wednesday, January 14, 1998 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. Present on Tuesday, January 13 were Chair S. William Clark, Jr., Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A.W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White. Regents Shannon L. Amos and Kenneth W. Cannestra had asked for and been given permission to be absent. Chair Clark called the Board meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 13. He then gave a brief invocation.

INTRODUCTION OF AND PRESENTATION BY SENATOR MAX CLELAND

Chair Clark announced that Senator Max Cleland was honoring the Board with his presence at this meeting. He commented that Senator Cleland has accomplished much in his distinguished period of service to this State and our nation. However, he stressed, one of Senator Cleland's most astute acts as U.S. Senator was to ask the retired mayor of Pelham, Georgia, former Regent Elsie P. Hand, to join his staff as Deputy State Director. Chair Clark expressed that the Senator's gain was the Board's loss, because Mrs. Hand had been a valuable member of the Board of Regents. He welcomed Senator Cleland and former Regent Hand as well as State Director Bill Chapman, who accompanied them to the meeting.

"Senator Cleland knows the true meaning of service," stated Chair Clark. He explained that Senator Cleland had answered the call of his country in a time of conflict. The Chair praised the Senator's poignant account of his experiences in Vietnam, as written in his book, *Strong at the Broken Places*. He stressed that Senator Cleland's perseverance and ability to rise above adversity were admirable and led him to serve as a Senator in the State of Georgia, as Georgia's Secretary of State, and now as a U.S. Senator.

Chair Clark stated that as the youngest head of the Veterans Administration under President Jimmy Carter, Senator Cleland had presided over the largest educational assistance program in the country, the GI Bill. Additionally, Senator Cleland had directed the largest health care system in the nation, the Veterans Administration Hospital Program. The Chair remarked that Senator Cleland is a friend to the State of Georgia and to education, particularly higher education. With that, Chair Clark turned the floor over to Senator Cleland.

Senator Cleland said that State Director Bill Chapman is a graduate of North Georgia College & State University and that he and Mr. Chapman "both work for Miss Elsie." He expressed his admiration for Mrs. Hand, particularly with regard to her commitment to higher education, and he said that he was committed to that issue as well. He said that the GI Bill, which was signed into law in 1944 by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, launched the nation into a new level of appreciation for access to higher education and strengthened the generation which would in turn strengthen the post-World War II economy.

Senator

INTRODUCTION OF AND PRESENTATION BY SENATOR MAX CLELAND

Cleland said that as head of the Veteran's Administration after the Vietnam War, he had the privilege of sending more men to college under the Vietnam Veteran GI Bill than actually went to college after World War II. The GI Bill continues to have an impact on our country, he asserted. Furthermore, it illustrates the incredible impact that access to higher education can have on the well-being and economy of the United States.

Senator Cleland said that he was present last January when President Bill Clinton spoke about the HOPE Scholarship Program at the federal level. He said that through the HOPE Scholarship Program, the Governor has made both a powerful impact on Georgia and a powerful impression on the rest of the nation. President Clinton borrowed the idea and the name. The President proposed in January 1997 a federal HOPE Scholarship Program similar to Georgia's program. The President's program includes a \$1,200 tuition tax credit for the first two years of college, in an effort to make those years of college universally accessible. The plan also includes a 20% tuition tax credit for students in their junior and senior years of college as well as for those students returning to school after graduating from college and being in the workforce for some time. Senator Cleland explained that this program just went into effect this month, January 1998, but he asserted that the impact of the program will be positively felt, as it provides a supplementary program to Georgia's HOPE Scholarship Program. In Georgia, students with the grades and capability will have an access to higher education that they have never had before. Senator Cleland reported that the Governor had remarked that Georgia has leapt into the forefront of the South and the nation in opening the doors of access to higher education. He commended the Board for providing hope and aspiration to young people in Georgia and for leading not only the South, but also the country. Senator Cleland expressed that the Governor's speech on the impact of higher education included many exciting facts and statistics. The thing that caught his attention the most, however, was that Georgia now leads the nation in the creation of high-tech jobs. The Senator commended the fact that the Georgia Institute of Technology now outpaces the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as the nation's top engineering school. He said that this State is not only entering a new millennium, it is really moving into the frontier of higher education, due to both State initiatives and the federal help that piggybacks on the success of the State initiatives. He asserted that there is no limit to what the State of Georgia can accomplish in higher education.

Senator Cleland stated that success in higher education begins in good elementary and secondary programs, but he stressed that if students who have the capability are unable to move on beyond high school, then everybody loses. The individual, the State, the nation, and the nation's defense suffer when students do not have access to higher education. He contended that the nation's defense will never outnumber another country, but it will have to outsmart other countries. The defense strategy depends increasingly on a high-tech military and everybody in the chain being able to relate to an increasingly high-tech world. So, it is true that in the private sector, with small business entrepreneurs, and in terms of national defense, technology is crucial. Moreover, technology is used to educate people in their homes, which opens up many other possibilities. Senator Cleland said that this is an exciting time to be sitting on the Board of Regents. There are so many possibilities for opening up many other opportunities for young people to achieve the American dream and to succeed in their lives. He quoted from Marcus Aurelius, who said, "Men exist for the sake of one another. Teach them then or bear with them." He said that the lesson from this quote is clear in terms of the national defense and the future of our economy. Senator Cleland then thanked the Board for its efforts in helping Georgia's teachers to educate their students.

INTRODUCTION OF AND PRESENTATION BY SENATOR MAX CLELAND

Chair Clark thanked Senator Cleland for his remarks to the Board and asked the Regents if they had any questions for the Senator.

Regent Leebern noted that Senator Cleland is sitting on the Senate Armed Forces Committee, and he asked whether our defense could duplicate its efforts in the Gulf War if it had to do so again today.

Senator Cleland replied that it could not. The U.S. defense today has about half the force that won the Gulf War. He expressed that it is an awesome challenge for him to be on this committee, which both Senators Dick Russell and Sam Nunn also served on, both of whom rose to become chair of the committee. Senator Cleland explained that one of the opportunities of being on the committee is being able to visit one-on-one with prospective leaders in the Pentagon, because they come by as a courtesy call before they are confirmed. So, Senator Cleland speaks in person with the new chair of the joint chiefs of staff. Their discussion moves increasingly toward use of technology. The United States would not be able to muster a ground force for very long the size of the Persian Gulf operation. So, the potential for fighting a second war in the Persian Gulf that way is gone. The United States will now have to be smarter and quicker in its approach, which would rely heavily on technology. This applies both in the technology of weapons systems (i.e., the F-22 aircraft) and communications technology. Also, there is new technology in terms of maintenance. There are a \$500 million contract at Robins Air Force Base in Warner Robins and 200 to 300 new employees to maintain the C-5 aircraft, which is being upgraded to make it much faster. The C-5 is the best way to move military forces around the world quickly. In conclusion, Senator Cleland restated that the United States could not refight the Gulf War now and that the U.S. defense would have to be quicker and smarter in its operations. He stressed that this necessitates an infusion of young people who are smart and have the capability to learn.

Regent Baranco said that those who remember the Vietnam War remember how African-American men were pulled out of colleges and put on the front lines. She asked what policies are now in place to prevent that from happening again.

Senator Cleland said that this issue has dramatically changed since 1966. In 1966, he was a lieutenant at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. As the President built up the Vietnam War, the MacNamara Memorandum was established in 1965 to build up the land force. This memorandum instituted a policy in the Defense Department, primarily for the Army, that lowered the standards of the Army so that the persons who were the least educated and the least trained were deliberately put into the ground forces and infantry units, and as a result, they constituted the highest percentage of casualties. That meant that the front-line troops in Vietnam were basically African-Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics, and poor whites. Now, the pressure is to raise the standard rather than lower it. So, there are skills tests which are better enforced. The Army is now made up solely of volunteers, and it is highly selective. So, a young person who wants to pursue a military career now has to be pretty special in terms of training and background. Senator Cleland said that he did not think that the same thing that happened during the Vietnam War draft would happen again. He stressed that it was no longer the best defense strategy to create a large land buildup and that the United States has to be more selective about where it commits its military. He said that the best thing that the University System can do for all of its young people is to give them access to higher education. If they have the ability and the desire to better their lives, then they can do it through the HOPE Scholarship, through the federal tuition tax credit, and through the open doors to opportunity in higher education in Georgia. He said that the Board was providing all young people a great chance for hope in their lives. He then thanked the Board again and exited.

INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUEST

Regent Jones introduced to the Board John T. Mitchell, Sr., Senior Vice President of Public and Governmental Affairs at Mercer University, who had been his classmate at Gordon College a number of

years ago.

PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

Chair Clark reminded the Board that in 1995, it established the Office of Environmental Safety (the "Office") in response to problems that various System institutions were having handling and disposing of various hazardous chemicals and wastes. He then introduced Mark Demyanek, Director of the Office of Environmental Safety, who would update the Board on the status of environmental health and safety affairs in the University System of Georgia.

Mr. Demyanek thanked Chair Clark and the Board for the opportunity to speak before the Board about this issue. He explained that the Regents had been given copies of the newsletter that the Office sends out to all of the System institutions to assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities in the area of environmental safety. He further explained that environmental health and safety performance has become a significant business issue over the last 15 to 20 years. In 1970, the Environmental Protection Agency (the "EPA") and other agencies were formed, including the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which primarily targeted private industry. More recently, there has been increasing focus on the environment at institutions of higher learning.

Primarily for the benefit of those members of the Board who were not present in 1993 and 1994 when the issue of environmental safety first arose within the System, Mr. Demyanek said he would review a bit of the history of the issue and what has led to the present focus. Then, he would discuss the accomplishments of the Office and its recent efforts in this area. The Board would also be hearing from representatives of the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") and Kennesaw State University ("KSU"), who would give the Regents a glimpse of how they handle environmental health and safety and what some of their challenges are. From MCG, Mr. Jerry Woods, Vice President for Business Operations, would be speaking about administrative support for an environmental health and safety program, and Dr. James S. Davis, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, would be discussing some of the technical issues involved. From KSU, Ms. Dena Roth, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, would be discussing KSU's approach to the issue. There would also be a brief segment on legal issues, which would be presented by Mr. Dennis Dunn, Senior Assistant Attorney General, and Mr. Tim Ritzka, an environmental attorney also with the Office of the Attorney General. In conclusion, Mr. Demyanek would review some of the remaining environmental health and safety challenges facing the System.

To briefly review the history of the issue, Mr. Demyanek reminded the Board of some regulatory issues that arose at the University of Georgia ("UGA"), State University of West Georgia ("West Georgia"), and Georgia Southern University ("Georgia Southern"). UGA previously offered a program whereby it picked up excess chemicals and hazardous waste from all of the other institutions in the System. The regulators inspected that program and decided they did not like it for several reasons, which led to some increased scrutiny, and the program was closed down. At West Georgia, there was some question about the handling of used oil from vehicle maintenance operations, which, under certain circumstances, can be considered hazardous waste. There were some situations at Georgia Southern where the regulators felt that some of the chemical storage practices, particularly in the physical plant operations, were not up to standards, which also led to increased scrutiny. As a result of these findings, the University System began to encounter issues with both the State Environmental Protection Division (the "EPD") and the EPA. At that time, well over \$100,000 worth of penalties was proposed against the System institutions, which led to increased scrutiny and regulatory inspections at more System institutions. As a result, the Board made the decision to retain an environmental health and safety consulting firm to assess the overall compliance posture of the System. One of the first recommendations the consultants made was that the System should appoint environmental health and safety

PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

coordinators at every institution who would be responsible for compliance at each campus. A second

recommendation was to create the Office to provide a visible leadership mechanism in the Central Office in order to provide guidance, training, and technical support to the institutions; to assist them in compliance; to serve as liaison to regulators; and to deal with technical issues that may be encountered. A third recommendation was to assess the overall hazardous waste situation, because it was viewed as the highest priority. Mr. Demyanek reported that the System has made substantial progress with regard to this situation; there is now a State-agency contract in place with a private contractor to assist all of the institutions in disposing of their hazardous waste. Another recommendation was to establish environmental health and safety guiding principles. Straightforward directives are now in place to clarify for the institutions the Board's performance expectations. Another recommendation was that the institutions needed to conduct periodic self-audits in an effort to police themselves. The final recommendation was to more fully integrate environmental health and safety planning with facilities management and capital planning. Mr. Demyanek explained that there is a strong environmental component anytime an institution plans to renovate, construct a new facility, or acquire property. For example, it is now official policy that before the System acquires any property, it must perform a comprehensive environmental site assessment to make sure the property is not contaminated or otherwise environmentally unsound.

With regard to the System's environmental health and safety compliance posture, Mr. Demyanek stated that it has significantly improved compared to how it was in 1994, when the consultants first reported to the Board. The institutions now have a much better understanding of the technical issues related to the environment. For example, a number of System institutions have begun to develop micro-scale chemistry operations. This means that in chemistry labs, rather than having instructors and students using large beakers of chemicals, they now use small vials or test tubes which use less materials and create less waste. Less-hazardous chemicals are also substituted in lab research or other processes so that the byproducts do not become part of the hazardous waste stream. Recycling has also been employed at a number of System institutions as a viable means for disposing of hazardous waste. The level of training and technical expertise has improved as well.

There are still areas in which the System must progress, explained Mr. Demyanek. There are always things that can go wrong, no matter how careful institutions are. The goal is to strike the proper balance between commitment of resources and protecting human health and the environment. A great deal can be learned from experience, both the System's experience with environmental health and safety and the experiences of colleges in other systems across the nation. For example, Boston University was recently penalized over \$700,000 for hazardous materials violations; it had a leaking underground fuel-oil tank, which leaked some fuel-oil into the St. Charles River. There were also some hazardous waste labeling and training problems at Boston University. At Dartmouth University, a chemistry professor became the victim of her own experiment when one drop of dimethyl mercury was absorbed through her protective gloves and into her skin; within six months, she died of acute mercury poisoning. So, even the best programs are susceptible at times. Closer to home, a researcher at the Yerkes Regional Primate Research Center of Emory University recently died after being infected with the herpes B virus by a monkey during the course of her research.

Mr. Demyanek showed slides depicting chemical storage before and after environmental compliance, demonstrating the progress which has been made at a number of System institutions. The improvements include better containment methods for chemicals, reducing the likelihood of incidents of exposure or

PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

damage to facilities. He also showed slides of solid waste disposal sites and brush piles which had been cleaned up in compliance with the Georgia Solid Waste Management Act. The Office is also working on preventing occupational safety hazards.

Since the Office's last update to the Board, the System's relationships with both State and federal regulatory agencies have greatly improved, Mr. Demyanek reported. In fact, the System is working directly with the EPD in offering joint training programs, technical assistance initiatives, etc. Mr. Demyanek expressed that he felt confident that the EPD is aware of the System's commitment and good intentions to succeed in its environmental health and safety effort. However, not every relationship with every regulator is perfect, stressed Mr. Demyanek. Sometimes, there are differences of opinion about how certain statutes should be interpreted or how certain situations should be viewed. With the Systemwide effort, however, Mr. Demyanek expressed that he feels that the System is demonstrating the proper level of commitment to the effort and to reasonably negotiating such issues. Another accomplishment of the Office is that baseline compliance reviews have been performed at every System institution. This has helped greatly in setting priorities for future planning as well as in master planning. Mr. Demyanek expressed that these baseline assessments are a good start but that he would like to conduct more detailed reviews and hopefully identify other areas for continued efforts in the future.

Due to the proactive efforts and foresight of the Board in establishing the major renovation and rehabilitation ("MRR") funding mechanism, the critical facility infrastructure needs (which also happen to be environmental safety needs) are being repaired and rehabilitated. As an example, Mr. Demyanek said that leaky roofs on buildings create mold, mildew, allergens, and therefore poor indoor air quality, and some have connected this to the alleged "sick building syndrome" many complain about. With MRR money, this problem is being addressed. Old fire alarm systems are being repaired or upgraded with MRR funds, and broken chiller units, which in the past used ozone-depleting chlorofluorocarbons, are now being replaced with chiller units that use much less ozone-depleting substances.

Another significant accomplishment is that the System's Right-to-Know Program has been consolidated under the Office. The Georgia Department of Labor enforces a statute called the State Employees Hazardous Chemical Right to Know Act, which requires that every State employee be trained with regard to exposure to hazardous chemicals. In this past year, a new director, Mr. Gerald Donaldson, was hired to head up the program.

Mr. Demyanek explained that environmental health and safety coordinators have been appointed at every institution, as the consultants recommended in 1994. At some institutions, there are full-time coordinators, while at other institutions, physical plant directors or chemistry professors have been given that responsibility. Mr. Demyanek said that so far, the coordinators are generally doing an effective job in managing compliance with environmental statutes. He then introduced Mr. Jerry Woods, Vice President for Business Operations at MCG.

Mr. Woods thanked Mr. Demyanek and said that he and Dr. James S. Davis, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, appreciated the opportunity to speak to the Board about the MCG program. As a health sciences university with a teaching hospital, MCG is not a typical university setting. Mr. Woods asserted that it was more complex. Two years ago, MCG consolidated the management of waste, hazardous materials, chemicals, and radiation safety into a single Environmental Health and Safety Division under

PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

Business Operations. MCG's primary objectives are to protect its students, patients, faculty, and staff, as

well as the environment; to protect its investment in equipment and facilities; and to comply with federal and State regulations to reduce the risk of fines and other regulatory penalties. With strong support from Mr.

Demyanek and President Francis G. Tedesco, the program has made great improvements. According to Mr. Woods, the president's support is the most critical, as faculty and staff respond according to his endorsement.

Reasonable financial support is a good investment for these kinds of programs, provided the program has credibility and can produce some measurable results, Mr. Woods remarked. Due to MCG's complex teaching hospital, dental school, and research environments, its program costs about \$1 million a year to operate. Inspectors who visit the campus are treated with great respect, and even before they leave, MCG starts responding to any issues they raise. MCG is committed to a full and prompt response to all findings. If necessary, MCG will challenge inspectors' findings, preferably in a nonconfrontational way. Given the complexity of the large number of environmental and safety regulations, there is no guarantee that MCG's program will never fail, but it is prepared to take every reasonable preventive measure it can and to address immediately the cause of any regulatory violation that comes to its attention. Mr. Woods reiterated that Dr. Davis was joining him. He stated that Dr. Davis has a doctorate degree in radiation safety and is a very effective manager committed to ensuring that MCG's program supports its education, research, and patient care missions. He then invited Dr. Davis to speak to the Board.

Dr. Davis thanked Mr. Woods and the Board. He said that MCG has a unique academic mission that takes it out of the classroom and exposes it to the real-world risks associated with the practice of clinical medicine and the conduct of biomedical research. These risks include the potential for exposure to infectious diseases, needle pricks, and lacerations from invasive procedures; the use of potent and toxic drugs; the use of anaesthetic and combustible gases; and the use of some of the more than 6,000 chemicals at the college, many of which are hazardous. The use of radioactive materials and radiation-producing equipment is also widespread at MCG. Beyond the use of X-ray machines and CAT scanners, in the practice of nuclear medicine, patients are routinely injected with radioactive materials so that clinicians can diagnose and treat various medical conditions. Radioactive material is also encapsulated and placed within patients' bodies to kill cancerous tumors and is used to sterilize blood to reduce the risk of infection or rejection following transfusions. The disposal of the waste from these activities also has its own hazards, including needle pricks, the exposure to potentially infectious material and biomedical waste, inhalation and skin contact hazards, and potentially explosive hazards if chemical wastes are not disposed of properly. Researchers face their own set of risks, primarily from exposure to toxins, bacteria, viruses, and hazardous chemicals.

Dr. Davis explained that in addition to treating patients and conducting biomedical research, like all institutions, the facilities themselves can pose risks which range from poor indoor air quality to the release of volatile organic compounds during renovation activity to the acquisition and occupancy of new property which may be potentially contaminated with asbestos, lead, and other hazardous elements. The disposal of certain industrial products, such as pesticides and refrigerants, may also produce risk.

MCG trains approximately 500 to 600 persons a month on safety-related matters, reported Dr. Davis. In response to a single complaint of poor indoor air quality, the division may have to look at a multitude of issues. A comprehensive investigation would require persons with backgrounds in chemistry, physics, microbiology, and epidemiology, as well as knowledge of ventilation systems. Such diverse activities and complex investigations require a diverse and complex staff. MCG's Environmental Health and Safety **PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY**

Division is composed of 17 individuals in the Offices of Radiation Safety, Environmental Health and Occupational Safety, and Biological Safety. In the division, there is also a very diverse skills mix, with

individuals with doctorate degrees in health physics, nuclear engineering, and pharmaceutical chemistry; master's degrees in radiation safety and microbiology; and bachelor's degrees in industrial hygiene and geophysics; as well as associate degrees.

Dr. Davis stressed that while a diverse and well-trained staff is necessary for an effective program, it is not sufficient. There are at least three additional key elements: management support, information, and expertise. Management must not only make a sincere commitment and allocate resources; it must also demonstrate a commitment to ensure the safety of the staff and regulatory compliance with appropriate management actions. Additionally, there is quite a lot of information to absorb. There are approximately 26,000 pages of State and federal regulations. These regulations presume a highly technical background, they are often difficult to understand, they frequently change, and they are subject to varied interpretations. On the institutional level, clarity is needed with regard to this information. Dr. Davis thanked the Board for its foresight in establishing the Office, because it has made tremendous strides in the last year in assisting institutions such as MCG in meeting its information needs. It has done this through its newsletter, cosponsoring conferences and training events, establishing an Environmental Safety Advisory Council, creating a Web site, and providing direct consultation. He explained that the latter was the most important because it speaks to the essential element of expertise. The complexity and diversity of activities and the volume of regulatory requirements may exceed the capabilities on an institutional level. In addition to consultation, the Office has also provided effective interface with regulators on behalf of the institutions, conducted environmental audits, recommended areas where programs can be improved, and provided needed policy and guidance.

The challenges that face environmental health and safety offices are numerous, Dr. Davis stated. The two most critical at MCG are to raise the overall awareness among all staff about environmental issues and to incorporate this heightened level of environmental awareness into MCG's policies and procedures so it becomes just a part of how the college does its business. In conclusion, Dr. Davis remarked that environmental health and safety programs should not be regarded solely as regulatory compliance programs. Rather, they must be deemed to be the way to ensure the safety of people and a way to preserve the investment the System has made in them and in its institutions. Dr. Davis said that Ms. Dena Roth, Director of Environmental Health and Safety at Kennesaw State University, would next be speaking to the Board. He commented that she is a talented and capable director and runs a fine program at KSU.

Ms. Roth said that at KSU, she is always looking for ways to reduce costs, particularly costs associated with waste disposal. So, on this day, she gave to the Regents sample containers of "flubber," which children make in science camp at KSU during the summer. She presented the "flubber" as a memento to the Regents. She reminded the Board that KSU has 13,000 students and that it is a nontraditional, nonresidential institution. Its Department of Environmental Health and Safety was created in December 1993 when KSU hired its first director. Prior to Ms. Roth's hire in 1995, those who were asked to create her job description recognized that the position required a high level of technical skills and a strong capability in regulatory compliance. They also wanted to give the position enough authority to do the job correctly. So, they made the position a directorship which reports to the Vice President for Business and Finance. Ms. Roth considers herself the KSU in-house consultant because she is virtually a one-person department; she has only a small operating

PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

budget, a secretary, and one student assistant. She remarked that she gets a great deal of support from the Office of Business and Finance and that she has always been able to get the equipment and supplies necessary to keep the campus compliant and to reduce its liability and risk. The scope of her position extends from the Governor's first "Fast-Track" building, KSU's new science building, to habitat preservation for *Cypripedium Acaule* (commonly known as the pink lady-slipper), a protected plant species in the State of Georgia which is threatened by habitat destruction but which has a safe haven at KSU.

The three primary responsibilities of Ms. Roth's position are regulatory compliance, technical issues, and training. In addition to federal and State regulations, KSU is also bound by local regulations, such as municipal public-owned treatment works. The technical issues relevant to KSU include proactive accident and injury prevention, which includes job safety analysis during which a task is broken down into steps in which the greatest hazards for risk can be identified in an effort to eliminate or reduce those risks. Another technical issue is the renovation of the old science building, which will become the new nursing building. KSU is planning to implement the EPA Green Lights/Energy Star Program in this facility. The Green Lights/Energy Star effort is a voluntary partnership created by the EPA between businesses, colleges, universities, and the like whereby they agree to reduce energy consumption in exchange for less-expensive utility operating costs. So, in this renovation project, KSU has incorporated numerous energy conservation features. Other technical issues faced by KSU include hazardous waste disposal, indoor air quality, asbestos and lead paint abatement, infection control, auditing and monitoring, and fire safety. The third area of responsibility for Ms. Roth is training, which she stressed is very important. Training helps to meet regulatory obligations (e.g., the Right-to-Know Program), and it empowers faculty and staff with ways to more safely perform their jobs.

Ms. Roth's position requires certain types of equipment and facilities. One of the newest facilities is a hazardous waste storage building. The new building has better safety features than the old building, including an audible alarm, a flood fire suppression device, and a three-hour fire rating, which can be activated from outside the building.

Because she is essentially a one-person department, Ms. Roth's relationship to the Office is vital. It is a valuable resource for her for the same reasons it is a valuable resource to MCG. She explained that it is challenging for her to be a one-person department and have two job descriptions. She has both the resources of the Office and the support of the Office of Business and Finance at KSU, but there are still challenges. For instance, there are problems with inconsistent use of personal protective equipment by the persons who are designated to use it, and it is challenging to get faculty to label secondary containers properly. However, Ms. Roth also has the opportunity to do exciting things, like teach in science camp, where kids learn about working safely in labs and environmental stewardship. She also coordinates the KSU Earth Day program. She expressed that her job is most rewarding when she is teaching 10- to 12-year-old students and a few of them express interest in becoming scientists and "saving the planet." She thanked the Board for inviting her to speak and then stepped down.

Mr. Demyanek reminded the Board that there were representatives from the Office of the Attorney General present at the meeting, and he invited Mr. Dennis Dunn to speak to the Board.

Mr. Dunn explained that he had come before the Board in 1994 to ask it to take some actions with regard to the System's environmental concerns. He was very pleased to see at this meeting the results of the **PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY**

Board's hard work and dedication. He commented that it made both the Regents' lives and his life easier.

Mr. Dunn asked Mr. Tim Ritzka to also speak to the Board about some legal issues and help him answer any questions the Regents might have regarding the legal aspects of the Board's environmental actions.

Mr. Ritzka said he was pleased to be at the Board meeting and remarked that everything that had been discussed in this presentation boiled down to a few terms: hazardous materials, hazardous waste, and hazardous constituents. These three things pose a threat to health and the environment. The main acts the Office of the Attorney General is concerned with are the Hazardous Waste Management Act and the Hazardous Site Response Act. Looking back on some of the case law in the last few years, Mr. Ritzka said

that the System institutions are held to the same stringent standard as all private parties. He had several key pieces of advice in the legal arena for the Board: properly staff activities to minimize the risk of release; monitor and report regularly all levels of waste production; safely treat and store hazardous waste; consider pollution insurance; audit the compliance of institutions; communicate with the local community regarding the safeguards in place; bond a contingency account to cover future expenses; and establish a standard for accepting gifts of real estate or facilities to the institutions. Mr. Ritzka then stepped down.

Mr. Demyanek wanted to remind the Board of the remaining challenges. Training is key, he stressed, because the information constantly changes. Competition for human and financial resources will always be a challenge, but the Office is working in that area. He asserted that it was also important to preserve the goodwill of both the communities surrounding the campuses and the regulators. Finally, the Office is striving for more standardization in the System's approach to environmental issues in the future. Mr. Demyanek thanked the Board and asked if the Regents had any questions.

Chair Clark thanked Mr. Demyanek and all the presenters.

Regent Jones asked the MCG representatives how they dispose of hospital materials.

Mr. Woods answered that biomedical waste is incinerated in Hampton, South Carolina by a vendor that has been contracted for that purpose. However, MCG is in the process of considering another vendor to perform the service.

Regent Jones asked whether it was a service MCG could provide for itself.

Mr. Woods replied that the Clean Air Act has imposed extremely stringent requirements on the incineration of biomedical waste. The monetary cost of compliance with those requirements prohibits MCG from performing the service itself, although MCG had considered that possibility.

Dr. Davis added that MCG had at one time incinerated some of its own waste; however, the new regulations required modifications to the smoke stacks, and the expense of the new equipment was simply too high for MCG to do the task itself.

Regent Jones asked whether, if the financial issue were worked out, MCG could incinerate its own waste as well as contract to incinerate the waste of other institutions and businesses.

PRESENTATION: UPDATE FROM OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

Mr. Woods replied that contracting to perform that service for others would require even higher standards because of the added responsibility of transporting the waste.

Regent Baranco asked if there is a person responsible for compliance at all of the System institutions.

Mr. Demyanek replied that there are designated environmental health and safety coordinators at all of the campuses.

Regent Leebern asked if there is ever an attempt by the Office of the Attorney General or on the federal level to reduce the 26,000 plus pages of regulations.

Mr. Dunn replied candidly that those efforts have not been undertaken, primarily because it is not politically acceptable right now. The Clean Air Act has recently been amended. The EPA and the federal government are pushing for much stronger regulations. He added that it is really a political question faced mostly by Congress and the General Assembly. In the current political climate, it is very popular to be in favor of environmental regulation.

Regent Dahlberg asked who would be held responsible in the System for compliance with the Governor's Executive Order requiring State agency participation in the Voluntary Ozone Action Program ("VOAP"). (This order mandates that all State departments, agencies, and units of the University System located in the 13 ozone "nonattainment" counties in metropolitan Atlanta participate in the VOAP.)

Mr. Demyanek replied that his Office is heading up this compliance effort. He had met with Dr. Arthur N. Dunning, Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources, that morning, and they were in the process of developing a VOAP policy for the Central Office. (Each of the 7 System institutions located in the 13-county area will be required to develop its own plan, which the Office will assist in creating.) He expressed that he hoped to team with the private industry partners in Atlanta in this effort.

In closing, Mr. Demyanek again thanked the Board.

PANEL DISCUSSION ON 1998 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Chancellor Portch expressed that it was his pleasure to introduce to the Board two of his friends and colleagues in the legislature. He commented that the University System of Georgia has been blessed for a number of years with some terrific partnerships with legislative leadership. Present at this meeting were Representative Calvin Smyre from Columbus and Senator Jack Hill from Reidsville. The Chancellor stated that they would be making a few brief comments each and then would open the discussion for questions from the Regents. He expressed his gratitude that they could join the Board meeting, as they both likely had very busy schedules on this second day of the legislature. He then turned the floor over to Senator Hill.

Senator Hill thanked the Board for the opportunity to be present at the meeting. He said that in the four years since he became Chairman of University System Committee, there have been many great achievements. He attributed that to the leadership of the State under Governor Zell Miller. The era of cooperation in the last eight years was unprecedented. The Governor has been rearranging the State's priorities and budget and redirecting assets into education. Through all of this, Senator Hill had not heard anyone say that education was not worth the investment. Pay raises, which are controversial in some states, have been passed for the last eight years with very little controversy, except last year with the nonfaculty and administrative raises, and even then, Senator Hill felt the best thing was done in that instance as well. He said that nonetheless, this is amazing, considering the two-party pressure in the legislature now. Senator Hill attributed the fact that higher education has had solid support in the last eight years to the spirit of cooperation the legislature has had. He stressed that not too many states have put new resources into higher education. The business community in the State of Georgia has been a critical factor in the broad-based support for higher education. Senator Hill said that he attended a Southern Regional Education Board ("SREB") conference in October, and one of the programs at the conference was on performance-based budgeting and funding for colleges and higher education, which seemed to him to force higher education in one direction or another. After the session, he visited with the leader of the discussion and with a state leader who was there and asked some questions about this accountability and about the funding that is based on certain goals expected of higher education. He asked why this was not being discussed in Georgia as it was in that state. Both of them replied that this type of thinking grows from a suspicion by the business community that higher education is not a good value for the state and that it is perhaps wasteful or inefficient or does not respond to the needs of that state. Senator Hill expressed his belief that here in Georgia, business believes that it is well served by higher education in our State. Initiatives such as post-tenure review, the Georgia Research Alliance, and the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ("ICAPP"), in addition to the traditional industries and the partnerships with businesses, have planted the feeling that higher education is a good value for the citizens of our State. In closing, Senator Hill said that the 1998 elections may bring a lot of changes, but if the System continues to meet the employment, research, and business needs of the State, it will drive higher education where it needs to be in the State. He commended the Board for addressing those needs and for continuing to keep Georgia on the forefront of higher education in the nation.

Representative Smyre began by saying that he was delighted to be at the meeting and to work with Senator Hill on the initiatives presented by the Governor and the Board. He congratulated the three reappointed Regents, Regents Leebern, Baranco, and White. He also congratulated Regents Amos, Averitt, and Howell on their recent appointments to the Board. He thanked the Chairman and Chancellor for their devotion to higher education. He said that his comments to the Board could be easily summed up in an "Amen" to Governor Miller's speech that morning, one of the best speeches about higher education that he had ever heard. Representative Smyre said that the Governor's comments set the tone for the General Assembly

PANEL DISCUSSION ON 1998 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

for this year in terms of results-based budgeting. What appealed to him, he said, was how the Governor intertwined higher education, economic development, and job creation. He expressed that he was delighted to be a part of this process. He agreed with Senator Hill that one of the major components of the Governor's recommendation to the General Assembly was the retention of faculty and administrators in the System. Having qualified faculty and administrators should always be important, he said, and for that reason, he supports the Governor's plan to provide for a 6% pay raise across the System. He said that he was proud of the work the Board and the Georgia Research Alliance have done in terms of economic development and technology throughout the State. Senator Hill is chairing the Committee on Information Technology in the Senate, and Representative Smyre is chairing the Committee on Information Technology in the House of Representatives. After seeing the Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System ("GSAMS") and Georgia Library Learning Online ("GALILEO"), Representative Smyre was convinced that Georgia is on the right track with distance learning and other technology projects. He also expressed that he was proud of the number of students in the System, approximately 205,000, as well as the growth of African-American representation in the System, which has gone from 28,000 to 45,000. He expressed his appreciation to the Board and the Governor for trying to also create higher standards in higher education (e.g., the Partners in Success Program). He encouraged this effort to raise the bar. In closing, he said that the Governor had made the legislature's job easy in that it just had to hold the line to serve the people of Georgia well. He said he was very proud to be associated with Georgia higher education as Chair of the University System Committee in the House, since the State has really set the tone for the nation.

Vice Chair Jenkins expressed his appreciation to each of the panel members for speaking before the Board. He acknowledged that the University System Committee and the Committee on Higher Education in the State House and Senate, respectively, are the most important committees to the Board and to higher education in Georgia. He commented that the State could not have better leadership than it has had under each of the speakers and that the Board is deeply grateful for that.

Chair Clark expressed his agreement.

Regent Baranco asked what kinds of reactions Senator Hill and Representative Smyre were getting in response to the Board's efforts to raise the bar.

Representative Smyre said that the reaction has been two-fold. Overall, the reaction has been very positive; however, there is some concern about access to higher education. So, there was some hesitancy in some communities around the State at first, but Representative Smyre said that the figures had proved them wrong. He asserted that if people are challenged, they try to rise to the challenge and meet the bar. He felt he would be abdicating his responsibility if he did not encourage communities to rise to this challenge. He expressed that he was more comfortable with the System's approach to this issue than he was when he initially heard about the policy. Now, he supports the policy and encourages people to rise to the challenge.

Senator Hill said that the HOPE Scholarship has helped to publicize the raising of the bar because it has actually helped to raise the bar. He suggested that everyone could help get the message out and help students be prepared by fighting for Advanced Placement test funding for high school students. He asserted that the more prepared a high school student is to enter college, the more successful he or she will be. The bar raising means that the programs to get high school students prepared need to continue.

Senator

Hill

also

PANEL DISCUSSION ON 1998 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

expressed his support for taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test earlier, so students will know where they stand with respect to college. Students are more aware now of the higher standards because many want to qualify for the HOPE Scholarship or go to a certain institution.

Representative Smyre added that at a recent SREB meeting, it was stressed that the K-12 system needs to produce better students, which puts additional responsibility on the school systems.

Chair Clark asked if there were any further comments or questions, and seeing that there were none, he thanked Senator Hill and Representative Smyre again for coming before the Board. He said that they could count on the support of the Board, particularly with regard to the Joint Appropriations Committee hearing about the proposed budget. He encouraged all of the Regents to attend that hearing, commenting that there was a good show of support last year.

At approximately 2:45 p.m., the Board took a brief recess.

PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING

At approximately 3:00 p.m., Chair Clark reconvened the Board meeting and introduced Ms. Linda M. Daniels, Director of Facilities Planning, who would update the Board on master planning.

Ms. Daniels thanked Chair Clark and the Board. She explained that she had three brief points to cover. For the benefit of new Regents, she would provide a limited overview of master planning. Then, she would update the Board on the status of master planning in the System. Finally, Ms. Daniels would tell the Board about its access to the master planning documents, both the template and the individual master plans, which are available on the World Wide Web.

The definition of master planning provided by the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers includes both the process and the finished product, Ms. Daniels explained. The processes that the institutions are going through are just as important as the final documents. She quoted Peter Drucker, a management consultant, as saying, "Planning does not deal with future decisions but with the future of present decisions." Ms. Daniels then showed a brief video clip from Disney's *Alice in Wonderland* to illustrate her point that the institutions know where they want to go with their master plans. She commended the Board for its support of good planning, both in its own strategic planning and in its commitment to academic planning. She explained that the mission in facilities master planning is to provide the facilities that will support that level of strategic planning. Early in the process, the Chancellor insisted that a cross-departmental team from the Central Office be actively involved in the master planning at the campuses to ensure that the facilities plans actually support academic programs. Ms. Daniels noted that Dr. Joseph Szutz, Dr. John Wolfe, and Ms. Marci Middleton have provided valuable insight and leadership to the process. The interaction in the Central Office has reinforced the commitment of working together on the campuses with the facilities staff and faculty. Ms. Daniels remarked that this process has helped to inspire that type of thinking and creativity at the institutions.

There are a few benefits to be gained from the master planning process. Ms. Daniels stressed the value of the physical presences of the campuses. The last Carnegie Mellon survey reported that approximately 70% of traditional freshman chose the institutions they attended based solely on the way the campuses looked. Their parents made a direct correlation between how campuses are maintained and their comfort level with enrolling their children at those institutions. Ms. Daniels stated that campus master planning is also very efficient and effective. Some campuses have developed over a long period of time and have very limited existing documentation. She stressed that appropriate maps and building plans are essential for good facilities management, and this kind of planning will help campuses move forward in a much more efficient way. Master planning is particularly critical now to the presidents of the institutions who have heard the Board's charge that they cannot take State funding for granted. It is also an excellent opportunity to establish the kind of partnerships that can leverage State dollars in the future.

The goal the Board set in 1996 was to establish master plans at each of the System institutions before the year 2000. Ms. Daniels reported that the System is well on its way toward reaching that goal. She explained that Albany State University drafted its master plan in the wake of the flood recovery of 1994. Three other campuses, North Georgia College & State University ("North Georgia"), Floyd College, and Georgia Institute of Technology, presented their master plans to the Board in November and December 1997. Sixteen more institutions are currently involved in the master planning process, for a combined total of twenty campuses. These campuses have complete funding in place, and they are well on their way to completing the process. Ms. Daniels said that at this meeting, two System presidents would be presenting the master plans of their

PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING

institutions. Furthermore, each month for the remainder of the year, one or two additional master plans will be presented to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities.

If the Board is successful in its funding efforts, it can meet its goal to have all of the master plans completed by the year 2000, maintained Ms. Daniels. There will be 34 comprehensive and consistent master plans because of the Board's commitment to ensure the integrity and quality of these master plans. She explained that the Board had commissioned a template to guide the master planning process at all of the institutions. The template helps the institutions prepare their master plans, and it will assist the Board and the Central Office staff in their responsibilities. Ms. Daniels stated that the template covers the content, methodology, and deliverables that are expected as a result of the master planning process. She then introduced Mr. Brad Bacon, who is responsible for creating and maintaining the University System's Web pages. Mr. Bacon has worked with Sasaki Associates and his colleagues in the Office of Information and Instructional Technology to make the World Wide Web a state-of-the-art tool for master planning. He demonstrated for the Board how to find the Web pages on the Internet.

Ms. Daniels showed the Regents a slide of the master planning template and explained how it outlines the key cross-team master planning meetings where representatives from the Central Office work on campus with the institutions. Although the presidential presentations to the Board were located at the end of the page, she stressed that they were not the end of the master planning process. In fact, there are two additional stages of the process: finalization and implementation of the plan. During the finalization of the plan, all of the Web documentation is put into place. Then, in the implementation of the plan, the consultant works with the campus to integrate the master plan into campus-level thinking. For example, a campus might set up a standing committee to review proposed capital programs, major renovation and rehabilitation requests, or opportunity projects for compliance with the master plan. If an opportunity project were to materialize, the master plan may need to be revisited. For that reason, the master plan must always be a flexible document if it is going to continue to serve the institution.

Ms. Daniels next showed a slide of a typical master plan Web page. She pointed out that this document would meet the needs of the full range of institutions, from two-year institutions to research universities. On the top half of the page were the mandatory requirements that any institution would have to implement as part of its master plan. On the bottom half of the page were supplemental discretionary items that an institution such as a research institution might need. Next, Ms. Daniels presented the Web page of the finalized plan at North Georgia, which was presented to the Board at the November 1997 meeting, to demonstrate an example master plan Web page. She said that this type of documentation is what the Board can expect from each of the System institutions as it completes the master planning process. There will also be an executive summary to the Board and more detailed information at the campus. The information will be available on the institution's Web page as well as on the Board of Regents Web page.

In conclusion, Ms. Daniels stated that the template is an excellent tool for institutions in the master planning process. She stressed, however, that a tool is only used to facilitate the process and is only as good as the people who use it. Present at the meeting were President Michael L. Hanes of Georgia Southwestern State University ("Georgia Southwestern") and President William A. Bloodworth, Jr. of Augusta State University ("Augusta"), who would be presenting their respective institutions' master plans to the Board. Ms. Daniels commented that these presidents have made a commitment of key resources and key personnel at their institutions as well as a commitment of personal involvement. She then introduced President Hanes.

PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING

Georgia Southwestern and the Office of Facilities proposed a master plan for future development of the

campus, which President Hanes presented to the Board. Consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the strategic plan, academic programs, support programs, peer institutions, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented five- and ten-year options for academic programs, facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian patterns, campus beautification, land acquisition, and student housing. Georgia Southwestern worked closely with the consultants in an 18-month period of comprehensive institutional planning. The master plan recommendations included the following:

- Construct a new student center in order to integrate student life offices and facilities with academic and athletic facilities in one building
- Renovate 8 of the 34 existing buildings to provide usable instructional space, additional labs, and increased space in the library
- Implement a new campus design that includes the reconfiguration of some streets, the relocation of parking, and the construction of new walkways, creating a pedestrian mall which will connect academic, student life, and residential facilities on campus
- Make a number of modest improvements in landscaping and signage to enhance the appearance of the campus

Next, Augusta and the Office of Facilities proposed a master plan for future development of the campus, which President Bloodworth presented to the Board. Consultants reviewed five-year enrollment targets, the strategic plan, academic programs, support programs, peer institutions, and other variables. They met with the administration, faculty, senate, students, and community leaders to receive input and then presented five- and ten-year options for academic programs, facilities, parking/traffic patterns, student/pedestrian patterns, and campus beautification. Augusta worked closely with the consultants. The master plan recommendations included the following:

- Demolish six buildings with asbestos roofs within five years (The asbestos roof panels are being coated with sealant which will prevent further deterioration of the asbestos for the next five years.)
- Construct two multistory structures to replace the above-referenced six buildings, thereby gaining valuable land space
- Construct a much-needed student center
- Construct a continuing education center at an off-campus location
- Redesign the campus to make it more functional, preserve land space, provide sufficient parking, diminish traffic problems, satisfy the students as well as the community, and improve the overall physical environment

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 3:55 p.m., Chair Clark called for an Executive Session to discuss a personnel appointment. With motion made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents in attendance for the Executive Session were Chair S. William Clark, Jr., Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A.W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

At approximately 4:30 p.m., Chair Clark reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. He then asked Chancellor Portch to make a recommendation to the Board.

Chancellor Portch recommended the appointment of Dr. David A. Bell, who was currently serving as Interim President of Macon State College, as the permanent president.

Chair Clark asked for a motion to approve the Chancellor's recommendation.

Regent Jones made the motion, Regent Leebern seconded it, and all the Regents present voted affirmatively to suspend Regent Policy 202, as permitted by Policy 2001D, and to appoint Dr. Bell as President of Macon State College, effective January 13, 1998.

At approximately 4:35 p.m., Chair Clark reconvened the Executive Session for a discussion of legal issues. No actions were taken in the Executive Session.

At approximately 5:50 p.m., the Board returned to its regular session. At that time, Chair Clark recessed the Board meeting until 10:00 a.m. the following morning. He reminded the Regents that they were invited to dinner with the Department of Technical and Adult Education Board members and others at the Commerce Club that evening at 6:30 p.m. and that newly reappointed Regents Baranco, Leebern, and White would be sworn in the following morning at 9:30 a.m. in the Governor's Office.

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Jenkins reconvened the meeting of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, January 14, 1998. (Chair Clark had remained at the Governor's Office following the swearing in of newly reappointed Regents Baranco, Leebern, and White for the swearing in of his wife, Mrs. Sue Clark, as a member of the Georgia Council for the Arts.) Present on Wednesday, January 14 in addition to Chair S. William Clark, Jr. and Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins were Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A.W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Regent Thomas F. Allgood, Sr.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, January 14 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Amos and Cannestra had asked for and been given permission to be absent that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

Chancellor Portch began this Report to the Board by reminding the Regents that in his Report to the Board of January 1997, he had made a series of predictions. At this meeting, he intended to examine the accuracy of last year's predictions and make some new predictions for the upcoming year.

The first prediction the Chancellor made last year was that 1997 would be a very good year for the System, and this certainly came true. He also predicted that there would be a series of challenges: possibly a desegregation suit, some issues at Savannah State University, and the crisis at the Medical College of Georgia. The Chancellor predicted that the Governor would offer a strong budget and that the legislature would be largely supportive. He also predicted that there would be a surprise during the legislative session. One Monday morning, he received news that the House of Representatives had recommended reducing the salary increase from 6% to 4%, to which the Central Office staff and System presidents and staff responded magnificently. Chancellor Portch predicted that the HOPE Scholarship Program would be admired, envied, and imitated, but not duplicated. Not long after that prediction, President Clinton, in his State of the Union address, used the word HOPE in describing his proposed national program, and shortly thereafter, he came to Augusta State University to announce the details of that program, which have recently become federal policy. The Chancellor predicted that the Board would complete a successful presidential search for the University of Georgia ("UGA") and that it would be completed on time; this also proved to be true. He also predicted that the Board would get its number one candidates for the presidencies of UGA, Georgia College & State University, and Gainesville College, which it did.

Last year, Chancellor Portch further predicted that the System would gain national recognition for its P-16 program; in fact, he was invited to head up a national effort by the American Council of Education on P-16. Maryland, Oregon, and a number of other states have since initiated similar programs, and there is now national funding for such programs. He had predicted that Johnny Isakson would have great success leading the Board of Education, and he commended Mr. Isakson on the good job he is doing in that position. The Chancellor predicted that the System would increase its marketing efforts, and shortly thereafter it came out with its publication on all the institutions. Currently, the System is completing the final phases of the marketing campaign for the two-year institutions.

Chancellor Portch predicted last year that the Board would have excellent working relationships with the Department of Technical and Adult Education ("DTAE") and the Department of Education. He felt that the previous night's dinner with DTAE Board members and an upcoming opportunity to bring the Board of Regents and the Board of Education together demonstrated this effort.

The Chancellor had predicted that there would be a successful recruitment of the Vice Chancellor for Information/Instructional Technology, and the Board had found that in Dr. E. Michael Staman. He had predicted that the Board would complete the third phase of strategic planning, which it did. He predicted that there would be a new site in Gwinnett, which there now is. He also predicted that the System would be involved in at least one major business relocation, and it was actively involved in three such activities, the most prominent being the relocation of Philips Consumer Electronics Company which brought 300 jobs to Georgia.

There were a few key issues that Chancellor Portch had made some flash predictions about last year. For instance, he predicted that Jimmie McEver, former Chair of the Student Advisory Council, would finally graduate. Not only did he graduate, but he also got a job working for the Rand Corporation as a public policy

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

analyst in California. The Chancellor also predicted that the Runnin' Regents would be undefeated, which they were. He predicted that the Board and the Central Office would move to a new location with new technology, which they did. Although he predicted he would learn to pronounce Albany correctly, the Chancellor had not yet mastered that skill. Nonetheless, he was very proud of his 96.5% prediction success rate last year.

The Chancellor explained that not only does he strive for 100% accuracy every time, but he also worries about the things he may have missed altogether. For instance, who would have thought this time last year that both the Georgia Institute of Technology and UGA would be winning bowl games? Incidentally, the Chancellor did attend the UGA-Wisconsin game, where he visited the Wisconsin box at half-time to congratulate them on their band. He also advised them that their team would have been a lot quicker if they had worn regulation helmets rather than those aerodynamically challenged cheese heads!

Chancellor Portch then listed his predictions for 1998. He predicted that:

- The 1998 legislative session will be a record one for the University System of Georgia in operating, capital, and salary funding.
- There will again be at least one surprise in the 1998 session that will make the Board and the Central Office scramble.
- The Board will have to be especially vigilant during this election year that the State's priorities stay firmly fixed on education and that tax-cutting fever and prison-building fervor leave enough resources to continue the System's progress.
- The System will experience a record summer enrollment but slight dips in fall and spring enrollments next year as a result of its conversion to the semester system; the conversion will go well but unevenly from campus to campus.
- The System's average SAT scores will increase and its retention rates will improve.
- The Board's Teacher Preparation project will result in very concrete changes and in initiatives described in language that all Georgians can understand.
- More than one of the System's 30,000 employees and 206,000 students will do something that will embarrass the Board but it will respond appropriately and handle crises proactively.
- There will be unusually strong appointments at the System institutions at the vice president and dean levels.
- The percentage of students studying abroad will increase significantly.
- Interest in degrees delivered technologically will increase exponentially.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

The Chancellor then catalogued his "sure hits" for 1998. He predicted that:

- He will attend at least one lecture at Young Harris College.
- Ms. Kim Iddins and Mrs. Lisa Striplin will continue to amaze the Board with their technological wizardry.
- He will be spotted eating boiled peanuts and undoctored grits more frequently in 1998 than in the entire period from 1994 to 1997.
- The Board of Regents' female members will spearhead an initiative.
- One Regent will shock his or her colleagues pleasantly.

After the Chancellor had finished reporting his predictions for 1998, he remarked, "That should be enough to keep you intrigued." He projected that 1998 will be another great year for the University System of Georgia and its Board of Regents and that they will continue to enjoy working together, taking their work but not themselves too seriously. He remarked that it will also be a year of transition from a truly remarkable Governor into the era of a new Governor and Lieutenant Governor. He expressed his confidence that if the Board continues to perform, to be honest about what it needs to do better, and to provide bold leadership, the next administration will be highly supportive. As Tip O'Neill used to warn, "Never kick a man who's up." The Chancellor contended that the System can stay up in 1998 by working together to be the people's university.

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

Next, the Chancellor announced that he wanted to provide the Board with two concrete reasons why he feels the System will be up and why the Board's work is so important. He explained that he had invited two of the System's students to make presentations to the Board at this meeting. He reminded the Regents that their strategic plan is titled "Access to Academic Excellence." He further explained that these two students would illustrate the words access and excellence.

Beginning with the word excellence, Chancellor Portch stated that the first student presenter is an honor student. Catherine Nelson is a senior pre-medicine biology major at the State University of West Georgia. She is a native of Carroll County and one of nine children. She has appeared on a national panel on cellular studies and is scheduled to present to the Southeastern Collegiate Honors Council this spring. Her undergraduate record is so strong and her Medical College Aptitude score is so high that her application for admission to the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") was accepted last September, at the beginning of her senior year, under MCG's Early Decision Program. Ms. Nelson was accompanied by her thesis advisor, Professor Dave Osborne, Biology Department; Greg Stewart, Chair of the Biology Department; and Dr. Don Wagner, Director of Special Programs, which includes West Georgia's Honors Program. The Chancellor explained that each of the Regents had received a handout from Ms. Nelson, a copy of her senior honors thesis. He then introduced Ms. Nelson to the Board.

Ms. Nelson gave an in-depth presentation on pancreatic islet transplantation in the treatment of diabetes based on her senior honors thesis, which is titled "Interactions of Pancreatic Hormones in Regulating Gastrointestinal Cell Growth in Culture." After her presentation, she asked if the Regents had any questions.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Regents that they had just listened to an undergraduate student. He remarked that this presentation was a wonderful example of one of the best teaching methods: involving undergraduate students in live research projects in addition to their studies of what others are doing in the field.

Chair Clark commented that this had been a superb lecture on endocrinology and that Ms. Nelson should be lecturing in medical school in addition to attending classes. He commended her and her report.

Regent Jones asked Ms. Nelson to explain the difference between hypoglycemia and diabetes.

Ms. Nelson replied that hypoglycemia is low blood sugar, whereas hyperglycemia is high blood sugar. She explained that with diabetes, a patient can have both problems, because there is an abnormal fluctuation in blood sugar levels.

Chair Clark said that in his work as an ophthalmologist, he deals with retinopathy every day. His son works at the diabetic clinic, attending to indigent patients and screening them for retinopathy. He added that if diabetics are able to better control their blood sugar levels, they can decrease the likelihood of the development of retinopathy, to which Ms. Nelson agreed.

Regent Howell asked Ms. Nelson whether she had decided on her area of specialization in medical school and whether she would rather conduct research or practice medicine.

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

Ms. Nelson replied that she now thinks she would rather practice medicine, but she has not yet decided on

an area of specialization.

Chair Clark added that the specialty of every medical student is really just to pass the courses.

Regent Hunt asked whether the pancreatic islet transplantation procedure was being performed anywhere in Georgia yet.

Ms. Nelson replied that the procedure is being performed at the Mercer University School of Medicine. She had worked in cooperation with them in the study of laboratory rats for her research.

Dr. Osborne added that the procedure is not yet being routinely performed on humans, as it is still an experimental procedure. In the few cases where this procedure has been performed on humans, it has been performed on persons who are very seriously affected by diabetes. However, there are no conclusions at this time about the long-term effects of the procedure. At this stage, the researchers are trying to determine how long the pancreatic islets will last and what kind of benefits the procedure provides related to its long-term complications.

Regent Baranco commented that MCG has a wonderful M.D./Ph.D. program that she felt Ms. Nelson would be ideally suited for.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Regents that the other element of the strategic plan is access. The next student who would be speaking to the Board would be telling her personal story about the challenges of access. Laura Cruz won the Townsend Press National Essay Contest with her essay titled "Taking Charge of My Life." The Chancellor was so impressed with her struggle to get to college that he wanted the Board to hear her story. He remarked that it was important for the Regents to remember that some students have tremendous challenges as they try to meet their educational goals and dreams. Ms. Cruz is currently enrolled at Bainbridge College. She is a native of Mexico who has lived in the United States since 1983. She began college after learning the English language and earning a GED. Ms. Bettye L. White, a charter faculty member at Bainbridge College in the Technical Studies Division, accompanied Ms. Cruz to the meeting.

Ms. Cruz told the story of her lifelong dream to go to college. Even as a young girl, she had dreamed of going to college, but at 17 years old, living in Texas, she got married and began a family. When she told her husband of her desire to go to college, he replied that Mexican women are supposed to stay home and take care of their families. However, she did not let this dissuade her. She wanted to be a role model for her children and for other women who share her aspirations. So, she began taking English as a second language courses. Despite many setbacks, including having to work, learning to drive a car, and divorcing her husband, she worked diligently to obtain her GED. With the help of her sister-in-law and the encouragement of her children, Ms. Cruz accomplished that goal. In 1994, she remarried and moved to Colquitt, Georgia. She registered at Bainbridge College after she moved to Georgia. Now, in addition to being a student, she is a Spanish tutor at the college, an English tutor at a Hispanic church, and a translator for a community writer. Her new dream is to go to Darton College this summer to study to become a physical therapy assistant. Ms. Cruz thanked Bainbridge College for the opportunities it has given her. She then asked if the Regents had any questions.

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

Chancellor Portch commented that this is an example of why the Board's work is so important.

Regent Jenkins asked Ms. Cruz if her children attend public school in Bainbridge.

Ms. Cruz replied that they do and that she started college when her youngest child began kindergarten. She said that she hoped by the time her children reach high school, she is in an exciting career.

Regent Jones asked whether there are many Latin-Americans in the Bainbridge area.

Ms. Cruz responded that there are many Spanish-speaking people in the area who would like to attend the college, but they have to learn the English language first.

The Chancellor added that according to the demographics of the State, this issue would likely present future challenges to the System.

Regent Hunt commended Ms. Cruz's persistence and said that the Regents were proud of her.

Regent Baranco asked Ms. Cruz what percentage of Bainbridge College students are nontraditional students.

Ms. Cruz estimated that 20% to 30% of them are Spanish-speaking students.

Chancellor Portch remarked that he knew no better way to start 1998 than to illustrate "Access to Academic Excellence."

Chair Clark added that these two students are the reason the Regents are privileged to serve on the Board, because the students are certainly the heart and soul of the University System of Georgia.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Clark announced to the Board that Regent Averitt had accepted his invitation to replace former Regent Elson as Vice Chair of the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension.

NEW BUSINESS

Regent Leebern, Chair of the University System of Georgia Foundation, Inc. (the "Foundation"), presented a plaque of recognition to Mrs. Betty Gene Birdwell from the office of Mr. Ben Harris at Georgia Power Company for her many hours of service on behalf of the Board during the establishment of the Foundation. He added that for the past two and a half years, Mrs. Birdwell has greatly served the Foundation's administration.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next meeting of the Board of Regents will take place on Tuesday, February 10 and Wednesday, February 11, 1998 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia. She also announced that the Chancellor's budget presentation to the Joint Appropriations Committee will take place at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, January 21, 1998 at the Capitol.

Chair Clark encouraged the Regents to attend the budget hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m. on January 14, 1998.

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

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